TERMS OF REFERENCE

**EXTERNAL FINAL EVALUATION OF THE SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT FOR CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION AND MITIGATION (SLM-4- CCAM) IN MOYAMBA DISTRICT, SIERRA LEONE PROJECT.**

## INTRODUCTION

1. Situation justifying the project

Today, one of the major challenges for agriculture is its capacity to ensure sustainable food and nutrition security for the world’s growing population in the context of resources scarcity, aggravated by the impacts of climate change. Climate change is among the major challenges that needs urgent attention in the 21st century. Sierra Leone is vulnerable to climate change: the climate-sensitive agriculture sector provides livelihoods for 75% of its population and contributes more than 50% of its Growth Domestic Product. Agriculture is also among the largest emitting sectors as regards greenhouse gas emissions. Since 1960, there has been evidence of increasing temperature, decrease and unpredictable rainfall and substantial climatic hazards such as floods, changed rainfall patterns, strong winds, thunderstorm and seasonal droughts. In recent times the gradual change in rainfall patterns and temperatures in the country has threatened the fragile agricultural system. In addition adaptation efforts are still hindered by the lack of access to information, technical or financial support that could help farmers invest in more climate-resilient agriculture.

In 2015, Sierra Leone has drafted its Intended Nationally Determined Contribution: one of the strategies to mitigate greenhouses gas (GHG) emissions is the “Adoption and application of climate-smart and conservation agriculture through best agricultural practices that enhance soil fertility and improve crop yield”. Sustainable Land Management (SLM) strategies and practices can decrease GHG emissions, and can enable farmers and communities to become more resilient to climate change. Obviously, in order to sustainably ensure food and nutrition security for the most vulnerable populations and reduce climate-related deaths, there is a need for alternative approaches that aim to maintain and increase crop productivity while adapting and/or mitigating climate change. SLM is one of these approaches.

Cassava is the second most important crop in Sierra Leone, used as food and cash crop. It is highly adaptable to climate change and drought resistant and has the potential to build long-term resilience to the uncertainties posed by variability in climate. However, cassava is mainly planted as a sole crop on ridges or heaps in major cassava producing areas in the country. The conventional tillage practices often result to soil degradation and emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) in the atmosphere. Planting cassava on flat land to permit intercropping with legumes could lead to an improved soil fertility, an increase in amount of organic carbon storage in the soil through decomposition of crop residue, reduction of nitrous oxide (N2O) emissions through nitrogen fixation. Two studies conducted by SLARI on cassava-legume intercropping show that intercropping cassava with legumes is a SLM practice that can allow communities to better adapt to climate change, reduce the emissions of GHG in the atmosphere from nitrogen fertilizers, and maintain carbon stocks in soil and vegetation at relatively low cost, while also improving food production and securing diverse livelihoods.

1. Project stakeholders/target groups

The action will directly target 1,260 smallholder farmers (selected from 42 FBOs), each representing a household; 30 Agricultural extension workers from the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF) in Moyamba district serving at least 10 FBOs of 30 farmers; and research scientists with interest in the agriculture and climate change nexus globally. Therefore, the action will indirectly target/benefit 7,560 household members (and possibly other farmers from their communities exposed to the trials and demonstration-plots), with a multiplier effect from the Extension Staff benefiting up to 3,000 farmers.

1. Project intervention area

The project is implemented in Bagruwa and Kori chiefdoms, Moyamba district, Southern Province, Sierra Leone

## PROJECT DISPLAY

1. Presentation of the project intervention logic (objectives and activities).

The action aims to increase crop productivity, farmers’ adaptability to and mitigation of climate change through sustainable land management in cassava-legume based cropping systems in Sierra Leone.

This will be achieved through the assessment of farmers’ and agricultural extension staff’ perceptions on climate change and its impact on crop production and productivity (**Output 1**); the evaluation of the efficacy of cassava-legume intercropping systems as an innovation for climate change adaptation and mitigation, through action-research (**Output 2**); capacity building of farmers and agricultural extension staff on sustainable land management in cassava legume based cropping system (**Output 3**) and the dissemination of key findings and lessons learnt (**Output 4**).

Innovative practices including intercropping of cassava and legumes will be introduced and on-farm trials conducted to determine the profitability, sustainability, and farmer’s acceptability of this system. Farmers will also be taken through the basic principles and concepts of climate smart agriculture and sustainable land management. All these activities will allow to achieve 2 outcomes:

1) Generation and dissemination of evidence to inform climate change adaptation and mitigation in agriculture;

2) Increased resilience of smallholder cassava farmers through enhanced knowledge and skills on crop diversification and sustainable land management.

Activities are mainly comprised of studies, on-farm trials and action research, capacity building and inputs provision, and project results dissemination. To achieve **Output 1**: Formative studies to understand perceptions of farmers will be conducted, as well as an analysis of the climatic trends based on meteorological data from Sierra Leone Meteorological Station. These will allow to better engage with smallholders on the topic of climate change, thus improving the design of activities under Outputs 2 and 3. To achieve **Output 2**: On farm trials will be set up in collaboration with smallholders, and participatory action-research on cassava-legume cropping systems conducted. Control (cassava only) and treatment (cassava-legumes) plots will be established and analysis of differences in yields, pests and diseases attacks, productivity, soil organic matter and carbon stocks will be conducted. Results from Output 2 will help better design **Output 3**, which will consist in the capacity building of farmers and extensionists on sustainable land management and cassava-legume intercropping through trainings and exchange visits. To achieve **Output 4**: workshops will be conducted at various levels, articles and case studies published, and consortium members will participate in conferences. See project logical framework as annex one.

1. Other key project information

The project will promote gender mainstreaming and will encourage the participation of women and youth groups. The action will target largely women farmers, will discourage the use of children for labor work at any stage of the action, and will promote environment friendly practices.

Main risks identified are exceptional shocks on cassava or legume production, and the Covid-19 outbreak that could disrupt agricultural activities and programs. It is foreseen that, farmers will be willing to actively engage with the project, given that cassava is a major crop and highly in demand, and with support from the MAF, farmers will feel motivated to participate.

## STUDY OBJECTIVES

The overall objective of the evaluation is to assess the project's overall performance and determine whether the project's intended outputs and outcomes were achieved, with a clear explanation of why or why not through an integrated analysis of the entire result chain (inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes) as well as contextual factors.

The OECD/DAC criteria (Likely Impact, Coherence, Coverage, effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, and sustainability) will be used in the evaluation. In addition, the consultant will examine the design of the program. The evaluator must fill out the DAC assessment criteria table and attach it to the report as an appendix.

The specific objectives to be addressed by the evaluation are;

* To assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the outputs and achievements of the project;
* Drawing lessons learned for better implementation performance and for possible scaling up;
* Make recommendations to strengthen the impact and sustainability of achievements after the end of the project

As an expected result, the analysis of this evaluation data would answer the evaluative questions as highlighted in section 5 below.

1. **Users of the Evaluation**

The users of this evaluation are the following

Table 1: Users of Evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Action Against Hunger** | ACF-Unit disseminates evaluation findings to the entire ACF Network |
| **Implementing Partners** | SLARI |
| **Expertise France/EU** | Contribute to the evaluation of future proposals, financial considerations, and programming strategy |
| **Others** | Final reports will be distributed to relevant/important stakeholders, such as the Government of Sierra Leone (GoSL), and other contributors. |

## EVALUATION SCOPE

1. **Evaluation Focus**

The evaluation will look at the entire duration of the project and will cover two chiefdoms-Kori and Bagruwa (project geographical areas). It will focus on the project's beneficiaries and other relevant stakeholders in order to address the following issues:

1. Analysis of the project Theory of Change
2. The review should place a focus on how similar projects might be improved in the future, as well as limitations.
3. Replicability and scaling-up of good practices and lessons learned analysis

In addition, it will cover the following;

* The evaluation is expected to assess the entire financial and non-financial results of the program and its management by the Implementing Partners per the OECD/DAC criteria (Likely Design, Impact, Coherence, Coverage, effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, and sustainability)
* The evaluator may adapt the evaluation criteria and questions, but any fundamental changes should be agreed between the evaluation manager and the evaluator and reflected in the inception report.
* The evaluator will focus to analyze the design of the project (and beneficiaries’ participation into the design); and evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the project implementation by the partners (including Action Against Hunger) within the agreed contractual conditions.

In general, the scope of the evaluation is to consider but not limited to;

* Assess the program objectives, outcomes and recommend measures (if any).
* Investigate the relevance of the project objectives and identify the program priorities areas of interest and the needs of the beneficiaries. Hence, recommend means of incorporating those priorities for similar intervention.
* Review the appropriateness and clarity of the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders and the level of coordination between them.
* Review the program concept and design to the clarity of the addressed problems by the program and the soundness of the approaches adopted by the program team to solve these problems.
* Assess the performance of the program in terms of timeliness, quality, quantity, and cost-effectiveness of the activities undertaken including project procurement: both experts and equipment, training programs, etc.
* Assess the application of the project strategies, principles and prospects of the sustainability of the program outcomes.

1. **Elements not covered by the evaluation**

* The evaluation would not be covering indicator measurement performance per project objectives.

1. **Survey Area and Period**

The scope of this exercise will include operational communities in the 2 chiefdoms (Bagruwa and Kori) covered by the project throughout the 20 months period in Moyamba District. As a result, the complete intervention period (17th March 2021 to 16th November 2022) will be covered in order to provide a comprehensive finding, recommendation, and conclusion. The evaluation will be completed in seven weeks (18th October to 6th December, 2022), including planning, data gathering, and report writing. A final report must be submitted no later than December 6th, 2022.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

1. Evaluation Questions

The main evaluation questions are essentially linked to the standard OECD / DAC evaluation criteria. Thus the following key questions must have been answered at least:

***Relevance and consistency***

1. To what extent do project activities meet the needs of beneficiaries and to what extent are they aligned with national policies?
2. To what extent has the design and implementation of the project responded to the needs and risks related to climate change on Agriculture?
3. To what extent has the project established links and created synergies with other related actions, including other EU funding instruments and actions?
4. Is the project in line with Action Against Hunger intervention strategy?
5. Does the project fit into the institutional context and build on existing formal structures?

***Effectiveness and impact***

1. What is the performance of the project in carrying out the project activities?
2. Are there any negative or unexpected impacts of the interventions that the population identified during the implementation of the activities?

What solutions have been identified by the project to resolve these problems?

1. What are the perceptible effects and impacts (planned and unplanned) realized or to be anticipated on the adaptive capacity of the beneficiaries through the project? More specifically :

* To what extent have the target beneficiaries of the project improved their practices in adopting the climate-smart technologies promoted by the project?
* What carbon balance in the long term can we expect from the capitalization of the technologies promoted by the project in the field?
* What impact has the application of the promoted technologies had in terms of yield, food security and income?

1. How and why did the observed changes occur? What are the success or failure factors?
2. What recommendations to strengthen the impact of the project's actions?

***Efficiency***

1. Could the project strategy have been more effective with fewer resources? and how ?
2. What lessons have been learned from the project's adaptation to the impact of the COVID-19 crisis?

III. Did the project team receive the necessary support (financial, technical, and political) to carry out the project in the most efficient way?

IV. Are the results achieved in line with the resources used (both HR and financial)?

V. Were equipment costs appropriate compared to other similar projects in the intervention area?

***Sustainability***

1. To what extent does the project ensure the sustainability of its achievements and investments made?
2. What roles do the state and the private sector play?
3. What are the main factors influencing the viability or non-viability of the project?
4. What capitalization does the project ensure for the scaling up of the practices promoted?
5. What are the project's bottlenecks (areas for improvement) and strengths?
6. What specific recommendations to strengthen the sustainability of the project's action?

***Cross-cutting issues***

1. To what extent does the project contribute to the good reputation and visibility of ECOWAS, EU and ACP actions in the fight against climate change?
2. What was the consideration of cross-cutting aspects in the implementation of the project: gender, environment, throughout the project cycle and how to improve it?
3. What lessons have been learned since the project design phase, to improve the relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the achievements of this type of project?

## METHODOLOGY

This section explains the methodological technique for gathering quantitative and qualitative data that will be suggested to the external evaluator. The evaluator should create data collection instruments and methodologies that allow for gender and age-disaggregated (<18 years, 18-35 years and >35) data gathering. This equipment should allow for as much data triangulation as possible. This "Mixed" technique used in this assessment will investigates the intervention without comparing it to other aspects (individuals, communities, etc.) who were not involved in the intervention. The assessor must also look at those who took part in the program "before and after" the intervention.

1. **Evaluation Briefing:** The evaluator is required to attend an evaluation technical briefing with the ACTION AGAINST HUNGER team prior to the evaluation. Briefings by phone or other virtual platform must be scheduled ahead of time.
2. **Desk review:** The evaluator will conduct a desk review of the project materials, which will include the project documents and proposals, progress reports, project outputs (such as publications, communication materials, videos, recordings, and so on), results of any internal planning process, and relevant secondary source materials.
3. **ACTION AGAINST HUNGER HQ Interviews:** The evaluator will interview HQ technical team as part of the evaluation to obtain preliminary information about the mission and project being evaluated. Teams or skype briefings must be scheduled ahead of time.
4. **Inception Report:** The evaluator will prepare a brief inception report at the end of the desk review phase and before the field mission. The following sections will be included in the report, which will be written in English:

* Key elements of the TORs to demonstrate that the evaluator will adhere to the TORs;
* Present the methodological approach to the evaluation (including an evaluation matrix in annex to specify how the evaluator will collect data to answer the evaluation questions) and point out the limitations to the methodology if any;
* Provide a detailed evaluation work plan and;
* State adherence to ACTION AGAINST HUNGER Evaluation Policy and outline the evaluation report format.

The inception report will be discussed and approved by the MEAL Head of Department (HoD)-SL/Lib.

1. **Field Mission:** The evaluator will conduct interviews with key project stakeholders including expatriate and national project employees, national and local authorities, implementing partners and donor representatives. For these interviews, the evaluator will utilize the most appropriate format, as described in the inception report. The evaluator ask to gather data from beneficiaries directly. The evaluator will additionally undertake Focus Group Discussions and surveys with beneficiaries, non-beneficiaries and key informants to supplement triangulation.
2. **Field visits**: The evaluator/s will visit the project sites and the facilities provided to the beneficiaries.
3. **Debriefing and stakeholders workshop**

The evaluator shall facilitate a learning workshop in either Moyamba or Freetown to present preliminary findings of the evaluation to the project stakeholders 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:** A report documenting the approach utilized in activity implementation, tools, and recommendations would be expected at the end of the consultancy. ACTION AGAINST HUNGER MEAL Head of the Department will be the consultant's principal point of contact for this Service.

In addition, the MEAL HoD of ACTION AGAINST HUNGER may convene stakeholder meetings to follow up and disseminate the findings and recommendation.

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

* Cover page; (with Action Against Hunger and the donor Logo)
* A summary tableaccording to the template provided;
* Table of contents;
* List of acronymes;
* **Executive Summary:** It must be a stand-alone summary that describes the mission/program/project, the evaluation's principal findings, and the conclusions and suggestions. This will be no longer than two pages
* **Background Information;**
* **Methodology:** Describe the approach employed, offer evidence of data triangulation, and discuss the methodology's limitations and mitigating measures taken to minimize the risk of errors related to the identified limitations.
* **Findings:** contain an overall review of the project based on the evaluation criteria, a response to the assessment questions, all findings based on hard evidence, cross-cutting concerns are incorporated methodically, and unintended or unexpected outcomes are also mentioned.
* **Conclusions** (conclusions are formulated by synthesizing the main findings into statements of merit and worth, judgments are fair, impartial, and consistent with the findings);
* **Lessons Learnt and Good Practices** (presents lessons that can be applied elsewhere to improve program or project performance, outcome, or impact and; identify good practices: successful practices from those lessons which are worthy of replication; further development on one specific good practice to be showcased.
* **Recommendations:** Recommendations should be as practical, operational, and pragmatic as feasible, taking into account the actual circumstances in the context of the action, as well as the resources available to carry it out locally. They should flow logically from the conclusions, the lessons learned, and the best practices. The report must state who needs to take what action and when they need to take it. Recommandations must be offered in priority order.
* **Annexes** (These should be listed and numbered and must include the following: Good practice template/report, Evaluation Criteria Rating Table, list of documents for the desk review, list of persons interviewed, data collection instrument, evaluation TORs).

The entire report, excluding annexes, should not exceed 40 pages. After leaving the field, the draft report should be filed within 10 working days. The final report will be due no later than the consultancy contract's end date. The report‘s annexes will only be accepted in English.

1. **Debriefing with the SL ACTION AGAINST HUNGER team**

The evaluator should provide a debriefing to the MEAL HoD to discuss any issues related to the evaluation exercise/ report during the course of the execution.

1. **Debriefing with ACTION AGAINST HUNGER HQ**

The evaluator should provide a debriefing with the relevant ACTION AGAINST HUNGER HQ on her/his draft report, and on the main findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the evaluation. Relevant comments should be incorporated into the final report.

## KEY DELIVERABLES

The final evaluation will demonstrate the intervention's efforts in Moyamba, Sierra Leone, to strengthen the Sustainable Land Management for Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation. The lessons gained, problems, and successes mentioned in this evaluation will help ACTION AGAINST HUNGER position itself advantageously for the execution of comparable interventions to achieve the desired objectives. On that note, the consultant is responsible for leading, completing, and submitting the following within the agreed-upon timetable and budget:

Table 2: Evaluation Output

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DELIVERABLE** | **TIMELINE** |
| An inception report including proposed research methodology, details about sample size, sampling technique, etc. | Two weeks after signing the contract |
| Data collection tools and an updated timeline/work plan to implement the evaluation. | Three weeks after signing the contract |
| Data set of interviews conducted (transcripts, Excel files, photos) and analyses tables/charts/diagram | Five weeks after signing the contract |
| Draft evaluation report, which should not be longer than 50 pages, (excluding annexes). | Six weeks after signing the contract |
| A PowerPoint presentation of the findings and recommendations to stakeholders in addition to an article of 1 to 2 pages maximum summarizing the report in the form of a one-page newsletter for decision-makers would be useful. | six weeks after signing the contract |
| The final report will be submitted no later than the end date of the consultancy contract | Seven weeks after signing the contract |

**NOTE**: The quality of the inception and evaluation reports will be assessed using the ACTION AGAINST HUNGER quality checklist.

## SCHEDULE AND ARRANGMENTS

1. **Tentative Work plan**

The recommended lengths and numbers of working days are estimations. They may be changed if necessary, with the consultant and Action Against Hunger signing a written agreement.

Table 3: Tentative work plan

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activities** | **Evaluator Working Days** | **Dates** |
| Signing and evaluation briefing with MEAL HoD | 2 | 18th/10/2022 to 19th/10/2022 |
| Evaluation debriefing with Project team | 2 | 20th/10/2022 to 21st/10/2022 |
| Desk review, preparation of field work and prepare Inception Report | 5 | 24th/10/2022 to 28th/10/2022 |
| ACTION AGAINST HUNGER Team Review tools, inception report and provide feedback including responses from consultant and finalization. | N/A | 31st/10/2022 to 4th/11/2022 |
| In country interviews with mission/program/project staff | 2 | 7th to 8th/11/2022 |
| Interview HQ technical team | 1 | 9th/11/2022 |
| Field work, collection and analysis of secondary data & meeting with stakeholders including drafting and sharing report. | 14 | 10th/11/2022 to 23rd/11/2022 |
| ACTION AGAINST HUNGER Team Review draft report and provide feedback | N/A | 24th/11/2022 to 29th/11/2022 |
| Draft Report | 1 | 30th/11/2022 |
| Project Stakeholders Workshop-validation in country | 1 | 1st/12/2022 |
| Final report on the basis of stakeholders, Mission, HQ, and ACTION AGAINST HUNGER France comments | 1 | 6th/12/2022 |
| Total: | 29 days. |  |

1. **MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS**

All evaluation outputs will be sent directly to the MEAL Head of Department (HoD) by the evaluator. The MEAL HoD will conduct a quality check (to confirm that all needed elements are there) and determine whether the report is ready to be shared. The MEAL HoD will send a copy to key project stakeholders for comments and clarifications on factual findings. He/she will compile the comments and deliver them to the evaluator(s) by a date mutually agreed upon by him/her and the evaluator(s) or as soon as the comments are received from stakeholders. The evaluator will address all comments before completing the report and submitting it to the MEAL HoD, who will then distribute it to all project stakeholders.

Regarding implementation, the consultant should make every effort to provide the evaluation report on schedule. The MEAL HoD through other project staff will support the consultant in informing or connecting with appropriate respondents for the evaluation interviews where necessary. The suggested budget must include all resources required to perform the study, including the consultant's travel and accommodations.

## CONSULTANT PROFILE: QUALIFICATIONS, KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERIENCE:

1. **Essential:**

The Evaluation Steering Committee will choose the evaluator. This decision is made based on the quality of the proposal as well as the consultant's knowledge and experience. The evaluator must be able to demonstrate familiarity with and experience with the following:

* Relevant academic background with a minimum qualification of Master’s Degree in Agriculture related discipline, Development Studies, Research Methods or its equivalent
* Practical experience evaluating development projects, specifically in the area of food security and livelihood include climate sensitive (provide one evaluation report as proof);
* Previous involvement and understanding of ACTION AGAINST HUNGER’s procedures, monitoring, and evaluation guidelines is an advantage. Provide details including an explanation of the assignment, the value of the contract, and the specific role of the consultant (provide details as part of Technical Proposal);
* Analysis: Knowledgeable in a range of statistical and qualitative data analysis software and approaches (such as KOBO or other similar software)
* Demonstrated experience and expertise in the design and undertaking of programme evaluation using participatory methodologies, including both qualitative and quantitative methods.
* Understanding of the realities of data collection in remote and resource poor settings
* Ability to write clear and useful reports (may be required to produce examples of previous work);
* Significant experience in coordination, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes;
* Knowledge in Sierra Leone’s food security and livelihood; and climate resilience intervention as well as advocacy and research.

1. **The proposal should at least include:**

* A technical proposal of the execution of the evaluation;
* Clear work plan including outputs/deliverables and detailed time frames
* Detailed CVs of consultant/team members who will undertake the assignment as per the qualification criteria
* An explanation of the experience of the consultant with similar assignments
* A specification of the knowledge and experience of the consultants who will be working on the assignment;
* A detailed budget including a specification of tariffs (by members of the study team), a specification of days needed (by members of the study team), and a specification of other costs.
* A cover letter outlining the suitability of consultant/firm for the assignment, motivation, and summarizing relevant experience

## PAYMENT SCHEDULE AND CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT

Applicants must give a financial proposal for the entire exercise (including taxes). As per government laws, all tax amounts will be deducted from the total amount at source (i.e. ACTION AGAINST HUNGER). The consultant/consultant company will be paid in installments after important deliverables are completed and submitted. The following is the payment schedule:

* Upon submission of a satisfactory inception report, the consultant/consultancy company will get 40% of the contract sum.
* Upon completion of data collection, validation, entry, submission, and acceptance of a thorough final report, 60% of the contract price will be paid.

## TIME FRAME/DURATION

From 18th October to 6th December, 2022, the consultancy will be finished in 7 weeks. The consultant must ensure that the entire survey work process, including planning, development, testing, and review of survey instruments, real fieldwork, data analysis, dissemination of key findings to ACTION AGAINST HUNGER stakeholders, and final report review, should be accomplished within this time limit.

## LEGAL AND ETHICAL MATTERS

The ownership of the draft and final documentation belong to ACTION AGAINST HUNGER-SL and Expertise France/EU exclusively. The document, or publication related to it, will not be shared with anybody except Action Against Hunger (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 impact on both operational and technical strategies. This being said, ACTION AGAINST HUNGER is likely to share the results of the evaluation with the donor(s), government partners and various coordination bodies.

The consultant/evaluator must not have any links to project management, or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of the evaluation.

## 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.

## EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCESS

Table 4 : Grading and Selection Process

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Details** | **Percentage cover** |
| 1 | Technical proposal including proposed methodology indicating the overall process, sampling, quality assurance, time frame, etc. for undertaking the survey | 50% |
| 2 | Clear work plan including outputs/deliverables and detailed time frames | 5% |
| 3 | The financial proposal will include a detailed budget containing total costs as per man-day rates, work plan, and any other costs anticipated in undertaking the process of the assignment | 30% |
| 4 | Detailed CVs of consultant/team members who will undertake the assignment as per the qualification criteria | 10% |
| 5 | A cover letter outlining the suitability of consultant/firm for the assignment, motivation, and summarizing relevant experience | 2% |
| 6 | Sample of previous evaluation work done for other INGO | 3% |

The bid committee will evaluate the proposals by using a combined scoring method. The short-listed consultant/firm may be asked for a formal presentation before the final selection.

## DEADLINE FOR RECIEPT OF APPLICATIONS- Tender submission procedures

Interested candidates or firms are requested to send the above application requirements to the below email address: [**loghod@sl-actionagainsthunger.org**](mailto:loghod@sl-actionagainsthunger.org)or by hand-delivered in hard copy to our 10 Sall Drive, Off Aberdeen Road Freetown or 77 Sembehun Road, Moyamba Base Office latest October 7th, 2022 at 5:00PM. Action Against Hunger is committed to diversity and inclusion within its workforce, and encourages all competent person/ firm, irrespective of gender, religious and ethnic backgrounds, including persons living with disabilities, to apply and become part of the organization. Action Against Hunger has a zero-tolerance policy on conduct that is incompatible with the aims and objectives of Action Against Hunger, including sexual exploitation and abuse, sexual harassment, abuse of authority and discrimination.

## ANNEXES TO THE TORs

Annex I: Evaluation Criteria Table



Annex II: Good Practice Format

