



**EUROPEAN UNION
EMERGENCY TRUST
FUND FOR AFRICA**

**Alliance for Community Resilience (ARC)
Terms of Reference
Program Final Evaluation**

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACF	Action Contre la Faim (Action Against Hunger)
ARC	Alliance for Community Resilience
ACTED	Agence d'Aide à la Coopération Technique et au Développement
BRAC	Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee
DRC	Danish Refugee Council
DNPSES	Direction Nationale de la Protection Sociale et de l'Economie Solidaire
DRDSES	Direction Régionale du Développement Social et de l'Economie Solidaire
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EU	European Union
EUTF	European Union Trust Fund
HI	Handicap International
IRC	International Rescue Committee
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
PDM	Post Distribution Monitoring

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1. About ARC Consortium

ARC is a consortium led by Humanity and Inclusion (HI – lead NGO), in partnership with ACTED, Action Contre la Faim (ACF), Danish Refugee Council (DRC), International Rescue Committee (IRC), Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) and Solidarités International (SI). All the partners excepted NRC implement cash transfers. In addition, ACTED implements a transversal disaster risk reduction component of the program and NRC manages activities related to civil documentation, land tenure security and conflict management. ARC consortium implements a multi-year program with the same name and is co-funded by the European Union Emergency Trust Fund (EUTF) and USAID/Food for Peace since September 2016. If EUTF funding is a three-year project supporting a resilience-building component (December 2016-March 2020), Food For Peace has funded four projects: each year from September 2016 to April 2020 for the first 3 and from May 2020 to December 31 for the last. The four projects are considered as four phases of the program component financed by Food For Peace.

1.2. ARC Strategy

The ARC approach is based on the innovative "Progression Model" of the NGO Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC), and illustrated below. This model is a methodology for poverty reduction through the time-based programming of social protection, livelihood support and financial services interventions that create pathways out of extreme poverty. The poorest households are caught in a vicious circle, keeping them in a state of acute vulnerability and precariousness, and placing them in situations of recurrent food and nutritional insecurity. The practice and development of economic activities are constrained by a low investment capacity (no savings, and no access to financial services), limited access to quality agricultural inputs, and to adapted agricultural techniques and the lack of land tenure security for their land. State technical services have limited financial capacities that reduce their ability to provide sufficient support (extension, veterinarians, etc.). Financial services do not consider Malian small farmers and herders to be sufficiently reliable (lack of identity documents, poor organisational and management capacity, lack of collateral, etc.) to enable them to access credit at appropriate rates.

It is therefore an integrated and inclusive multisectoral approach to reducing extreme rural poverty by promoting the transition from the post-emergency phase to sustainable livelihood development.

The ARC project proposes to address these limiting factors with an intervention package combining social protection measures (Outcome 1), facilitated access to basic social services (Outcomes 1 and 2) and measures to support individual and community economic activities, including an increase in productive and human capital (Outcome 3).

2. EVALUATION CONTEXT

2.1 Presentation of the project

Project title	Alliance for Community Resilience (ARC)
Implementation dates	Phase 1: September 29 th 2016 to December 31 st 2017 Phase 2: February 6 th , 2018 to March 5 th , 2019 Phase 3: May 1 st 2019 to April 30 th 2020 Phase 4: May 1 st 2020 to December 31 th 2020
Location/Intervention zones	Timbuktu, Gao, Mopti and Menaka regions in Mali
Operational partners	HI, ACF, ACTED, DRC, IRC, NRC, SI
Target groups	Very poor households exposed to the risk of food, nutritional and economic insecurity
Project budget	USAID: Phase 1: 5,949,880 USD Phase 2: 8,600,000 USD Phase 3: 8,540,000 USD Phase 4: 6,828,000 USD EUTF: 15,900,000 USD

Project objectives	<p>General Objective: Increase the resilience to food and nutrition insecurity of vulnerable populations in the northern regions of Mali (Gao, Ménaka, Mopti, and Timbuktu)</p> <p>Specific objective 1: Strengthen the capacities of the most vulnerable communities, households and individuals to anticipate, absorb and recover from shocks affecting their food and nutritional security through the coordinated implementation of community-based actions</p> <p>Specific objective 2: Strengthen the leadership role of technical authorities and services at all levels in coordinating, monitoring and evaluating all interventions aimed at increasing the resilience of populations vulnerable to food and nutrition insecurity</p>
Expected results and indicators	<p>The project stands on four outcomes:</p> <p>Outcome 1: The livelihoods of vulnerable populations are secured through the establishment of a social protection floor and improved access to health services</p> <p>Outcome 2: Household nutrition is strengthened through better nutritional monitoring and support for activities to prevent undernutrition in intervention areas</p> <p>Outcome 3: Agricultural and food productivity, income and access to food for the most vulnerable households and communities are enhanced through the implementation of support measures</p> <p>Outcome 4: Food and nutrition security governance is strengthened</p> <p>For indicators, please see the attached the logic framework</p>
Main activities implemented	<p>The main activities of the project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cash transfer

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support targeted households with agro-pastoral inputs and/or training - Community projects with the aim of increasing agricultural and pastoral production - Civil documentation support and orientation - Training, Sensitization sessions and support on civil documentation and land tenure rights (Housing, Land and Property) - Analysis of awareness-raising approaches related to the prevention of undernutrition and implementation of innovative recommendations - Support to improve the optimal nutritional knowledge, skills and practices of vulnerable households - Monitoring Blanket Supplementary Feeding Programs (BSFP) activities (beneficiaries served, active screening, referrals, and information sessions) - Support for malnutrition screening activities for children under 5 years of age and pregnant and lactating women - Trainings on conflict management - Creation and monitoring of disaster risk reduction committees - Awareness sessions on DRR - Support of Early Warning System improvement in communes - Support to local governance
--	--

2.2 Reasons for the evaluation

After about four years of implementation, the ARC consortium needs to carry out a final evaluation to assess the overall achievement of the objectives set mainly in terms of resilience built with targeted communities. As the initial duration of the three phases of the ARC project was three years, this evaluation intervenes at the end of the third project life cycle and the end of the EU funding to inform consortium partners on the whole effectiveness of their partnership built for community resilience. The results of this evaluation will determine the possibility or not, as well as the conditions for an upcoming ARC Consortium collaboration. Thus, the primary motivation of this final evaluation is first of all a learning exercise for the consortium partners and then an accountability duty to inform donors, local and administrative authorities and targeted communities on the effectiveness and the impact of the project.

3. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

3.1 Specific purposes

This final evaluation, which will take place in the last two months of phase 4, will take into account all activities funded both by Food For Peace and EU Trust Fund and implemented over the life of the four projects and in all intervention regions.

Three specific purposes are assigned to this final evaluation:

- Question the project's theory of change and determine if proposed activities address targeted communities' real needs (**Relevance**)
- Assess the project's performance during the life of project (**Management, Efficiency, Accountability, and Ethics**)

- Determine to what extent project has produced changes in terms of community resilience (**Effectiveness, Changes, Capacities and Sustainability**)

Make clear and precise recommendations for similar projects.

3.2 Evaluation criteria and questions

On the basis of the Project Quality Framework defined by HI, the final evaluation will respond to the questions related to the key evaluation criteria. These questions have been tailored in light of the initial fundamental issues on the projects and taking into account the intervention context.

Framework criterion	Examples of questions
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To what extent has the project met the needs of its direct beneficiaries? - Did the intervention address the priorities of the various stakeholders involved on outcomes 1, 2, 3 and 4? - Has the project sufficiently adapted its actions to the context of the country and specifically the context of each intervention region? - Has the project sufficiently adapted its actions to changing needs? - Was the choice of participants appropriate for the achievement of the objectives?
Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did the project put in place suitable management conditions to ensure that the intervention was implemented correctly? - Has the project overall governance (including activities of Executive committee and technical committee) been effective following the "Protocole de Gestion"? - Was the project's internal and external communication adequate and adapted to the different targets? - Was the consortium coordination mechanism reactive and adaptive in regard with key security issues raised over the life of the intervention?
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did the intervention method used enable results to be achieved in a cost-efficient manner? - Have the targeted beneficiaries benefited from products, benefits and/or services implemented and developed by the project? - To what extent did the project team optimise resources? <p>These questions should be answered at both consortium level and each partner level.</p>
Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has the project given account of its actions to all the stakeholders in an impartial, equitable and accessible manner? - Has the project complied meticulously with international humanitarian law and the Malian laws? - Has the project put in place an efficient mechanism for collecting and managing feedbacks and complaints?
Ethics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Was the project inclusive and adapted to the needs of all the beneficiaries whatever their gender, age or disability? - To what extent was the principle of "Do no harm" respected in the project's implementation?
Changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has the project produced significant positive changes in household food security, nutrition, and resilience and are these changes sustainable? Did the project sufficiently take into account and/or avoid generating negative effects (environment, economy, security, etc.)? - Has the project contributed to increasing the response capacity of communities to crises?
Capacities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How has the project strengthened resilience capacities of targeted household and communities and increased their autonomy? - How has the project strengthened the capacities of local actors and increased their

	autonomy? - Were internal/external learning dynamics a significant enough aspect of this project?
Sustainability	- Has the project invested the means necessary for ensuring the continuity of activities after the project's closure? - Are targeted communities autonomous in the prevention and management of disaster risk reduction? - What progress were observed in terms of capacity building and household food security will last after the project? And in which conditions?

4. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

4.1 Collection method

As a mix of performance and quasi impact evaluation, this final evaluation will be carried out by an independent consultancy firm specialized in project / program evaluation.

Depending on the evaluation questions, the consultant will propose a detailed methodology taking into account a minimum of data collection methods stated in the next table. The consultant will collect quantitative as well as qualitative data in the field and at each level of stakeholders.

Framework criterion	Minimum of method to answer the key criteria's questions
Relevance	- Household survey based on a representative sample - Focus groups at community level and other stakeholders - Literature review
Management	- Key informants Interviews - Literature review
Efficiency	- Literature review with a comparison of other experiences based on costs and results
Accountability	- Household survey based on a representative sample - Focus group at community level and others stakeholders - Key informants Interviews - Literature review
Ethics	- Key informants Interviews - Literature review
Changes	- Household survey based on a representative sample - Focus group at community level and others stakeholders - Key informants Interviews - Literature review based on M&E documents, studies and activity reports
Capacities	- Household survey based on a representative sample - Focus group at community level and others stakeholders - Key informants Interviews - Literature review
Sustainability	- Household survey based on a representative sample - Focus group at community level and others stakeholders - Key informants Interviews - Literature review

4.2 Actors involved in the evaluation

The four projects involved several actors at local, regional and national levels.

Actors	Role
Donor (Food For Peace and EU Trust Fund)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Funded the projects - Provided guidance to align policies and rules - Conducted both a third party monitoring (the final report is available)
ARC consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The consortium is made up of seven international NGOs: Humanity and Inclusion (Leader), Action against Hunger (ACF), ACTED, Danish Refugee Council (DRC), International Rescue Committee (IRC), Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) and Solidarités International (SI). - Project field team implemented activities - ARC Technical Coordination Unit (Coordinator, M&E specialist, Nutrition specialist, DRR specialist and data manager) brings together human resources from the consortium NGO partners and provided a permanent assistance on the project - ARC technical committee suggested technical guidance on the project - ARC Executive committee made decisions on the projects' strategies
Technical clusters at regional and national level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technical coordination at the level of the protection, cash transfer, food security and nutrition clusters and working groups
Other partner like other KEY consortia funded by the European Union	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information and coordination
Regional and local government technical services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DNPSES and DRDSES ensured multi-sectoral coordination existing coordination frameworks at the regional and local levels
Local authorities and communal committees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure community mobilization, intervention coherence with local development plans, monitoring and coordination at commune level
Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Beneficiaries - Participated to project actions
Traders and services providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Involved in providing cash or food to communities - Provided other services like constructions, transportations, etc.

A steering committee composed by a member of each consortium partner and the technical coordination team will be set up to select the consultancy firm, facilitate the consultancy on the files and evaluate the evaluation deliverables.

5. PRINCIPLES AND VALUES

The selected consultancy firm will implement evaluation activities in compliance with Humanity & Inclusion's ethical rules and protection policies (child protection and protection from sexual exploitation and abuse etc.). Humanity & Inclusion places importance in ethics, transparency, discretion and independence of international evaluation standard.

The selected consultancy will strongly comply with USAID evaluation policy (will be attached as annex of the consultancy contract as well as Humanity & Inclusion's ethical rules and protection policies). Evaluation team should involve local actors and beneficiaries in the evaluation taking into consideration their point of view.

Due to security issues on the field, the evaluation team must comply with the safety rules in force put in place by each partner in his area of intervention.

6. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES AND PROPOSED SCHEDULE

6.1 Deliverables

The selected consultancy team should provide following deliverables in addition of the approved financial and technical proposal:

- ✓ Inception report specifying the methodology at the beginning of the evaluation
- ✓ Interim report and a possible feedback document (a refund must be provided for after integration of the feedback)
- ✓ Final report with, including a summary (mandatory)

The steering committee may limit the number of pages for each deliverable. This will be discussed with the evaluation team.

6.2 Evaluation date and schedule

The Total duration of the evaluation activity must not exceed thirty (30) working days between November and December.

The proposed timeline is below.

Stage	Period			Comments
	October	November	December	
Recruitment of team leader (14 days)				
Review of the literature + tools design for data collect + inception report (7 days)				Meeting with Steering committee and ARC coordination unit for briefing A last meeting can be scheduled to fix last issues before beginning data collection
Field mission (14 days of data collection including training)				Data collection should start before the second half of the month
Restitution of the preliminary results (1 day)				There will be a debriefing to all the partners to report on the missions and present the preliminary results.
Drafting of final report (6 days)				Include data analysis and the presentation of the results. Part of data analysis can begin during the field mission
Feedbacks and final report (3 days)				No later than 1 day before the end of the project. A final feedback from the steering committee on the draft final report must be provided. it will be exchanged by e-mail
Dissemination of the final report (21 days)				Up to 30 days after the project closure

7. RESOURCES

7.1 Expertise required from the consultant(s)

The recommended evaluation team should consider this key personal:

- 1 international consultant (chief of party) specialist of food security and resilience program evaluation, preferably in the Sahel
- 1 national consultant with experience in the evaluation of food security, nutrition and resilience projects
- 1 statistician with at least 5 years of experience

The consultancy firm should contract its own enumerators for field survey.

7.2 Resources available to the evaluation team (data, document, etc.)

- Projects IPTT
- Annual and quarterly reports
- PDM reports
- Third party monitoring reports
- Baseline, intermediate survey, endline reports
- Full proposals
- HI Project Quality Framework
- USAID evaluation policy
- An updated map of intervention area will be provided

8. APPLICATION

Firms wishing to apply must provide:

- A technical offer integrating the methodology to be adopted;
- A financial offer
- A detailed CV of the consultants, including references of at least three organizations (preferably international organizations) for which the firm has carried out an evaluation;
- Legal documentation of the firm (registry, tax return document, etc.)

The firms must meet the following conditions:

- The chief of party must have at least ten years' experience in evaluation as consultant. The others consultants must have at least five years' experience as consultant;
- Good experience in evaluating USAID-funded programs;
- Good experience in evaluating Resilience programs particularly in Sahel region;
- Good fluency in English, the report will be written in English.