



---

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### MID-TERM EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE CONVENIO

**“Advancing climate and disaster resilience transformation in the provinces of Agusan del Sur, Surigao del Sur and Davao de Oro” Philippines**

**(Nº REF: 18-C01-1236)”**

---

## **Technical Aspects:**

- 1.- Introduction
- 2.- The project
- 3.- Scope of the Evaluation
  - 3.1- Specific objectives of the evaluation
  - 3.2- Stakeholders
  - 3.3- Questions and criteria of the evaluation
  - 3.4- Methodology of the evaluation and planning
  - 3.5- Outline and submission evaluation report
- 4.- Evaluation team
5. - Timeframe and budget for the evaluation
6. – Presentation of the proposal and criteria for assessment/ selection

## **Annexes:**

Annex 1- Logical Framework

Annex 2 - Documents and information sources

Annex 3 - Premises of the evaluation, authorship, and publication.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

CODESPA and Action Against Hunger (AAH) are implementing the Convenio (ProACT project): "Advancing climate and disaster resilience transformation in the provinces of Agusan del Sur, Surigao del Sur and Davao de Oro, Philippines", Exp:18-CO1-1236, approved in 2018, for 4 years.

The ProACT project implementation started on January 1st 2019, after an analysis of the situation in particular municipalities and barangays in Agusan del Sur, Surigao del Sur and Davao de Oro.

The evaluation is to be conducted after two years of the implementation of this ProACT project that is the midterm of its implementation.

The Consortium of NGOs of this ProACT project have agreed conducting a midterm external evaluation. The overall purpose of this evaluation is to **evaluate the degree of achievement of the expected results by the intervention** as well as the **strategies and mechanisms of implementation and coordination**.

## 2. THE PROJECT

A brief description of the ProACT project:

The **general objective** of the ProACT project is to improve climate resilience and socio-economic conditions of vulnerable communities in the provinces of Agusan del Sur, Surigao del Sur and Davao de Oro, in partnership with LGUs, CSOs, and the private sector

The **specific objective** of this ProACT project is to strengthen capacities for Climate Change adaptation, promotion of food security and income generation with value chain approach for 3,650 families affected by natural disasters in the provinces of Agusan del Sur, Surigao del Sur and Davao de Oro

There are **3 lines of intervention**:

### 1. **Strengthening of 75 local governments** for the implementation of **Climate Adaptive actions and DRR strategies**

Strengthen risk governance and integration of disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation into development planning towards an inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable communities. This component will facilitate:

- i) A gender-responsive and disability-inclusive bottom-up DRRM assessment and planning process at different levels of the local government starting with a Participatory Vulnerability Capacity Assessment for the communities to identify and plan their resilience needs and key interventions towards adaption, and supporting the integration DRRM plans priorities in the municipal and provincial DRRM and development plans;
- ii) The project facilitate local governments' access, understanding, interpretation and application to reliable climate forecast information

(Climate Outlook Fora), climate change scenarios and projections for the development of gender-responsive and disability-inclusive Local Climate Change Adaptation (LCCAP) planning and contingency plans which includes inclusive early warning system and evacuation processes and protocols, ensuring the needs of women, men, children and persons with disabilities are integrated; and

- iii) The enhancement of identified evacuation centers/warehouses providing as well resilient construction trainings to promote better disability access, gender-sensitive and safer shelter construction in communities.

## **2. Improve food security and production adapted to climate change for**

3,650 families affected by natural disasters

Developed more efficient and resilient livelihoods to ensure food security while fostering a more sustainable production system and equal access by men and women to assets, services, technologies, knowledge and decision-making, especially considering that agriculture has already experienced an important impact due to climate change and it is expected to further impact on food production. The ProACT project combine local production with alternative activities to increase their income and improve their capacity to recover from disasters, considering strategies to promote access to rural financial services. With a people-centered natural resource management and governance, the ProACT project aim to strength selected community-based forest management households through more efficient use of the available natural resources, climate change adaptation measures and good agricultural practices, using the generated climate data and agreed Early Warning System in their planning and decision-making processes, and developing public awareness programs to inform local stakeholders about the connection between ecosystems, their livelihoods, and climate change;

## **3. Promotion of economic opportunities for 250 low-income producers (50% women) through the development of inclusive business strategies and public-private alliances.**

Promoted economic opportunities for low-income men and women through the development of inclusive business strategies and public-private alliances to strengthen key AFF value chains of the main commodities identified by each province in their Provincial Commodity Investment Plan at: **i)** farmer / fisherfolk production level by diversifying their production, accessing to low cost technologies / services to enhance their production, and/or addressing possible gender constrains that hamper women's full participation in economic decisions; **ii)** organizational level by strengthening local agro-association organizations to develop business plans, improve their capacities to adapt their members' production to market demands, as well as their linkages with existing (local or foreign) value chains, etc. and; **iii)** anchor company level through their inclusion in their chain, possible technical assistance, etc.

12 Municipalities have been identified (60 barangays) in the three provinces considering the criteria of: Poverty, vulnerability, and security.

- Agusan del Sur: La Paz, San Luis, Talacogon, and Esperanza
- Surigao del Sur: Carmen, Lanuza, Cortes, and Lianga
- Davao de Oro: Maco, Mabini, Pantukan, and Nabunturan.

The communities in which the ProACT project is being implemented are the following:

<b>AGUSAN DEL SUR</b>			
Mun. Esperanza	Mun. Talacogon	Mun. San Luis	Mun. La Paz
Kinamaybay Tagabase Agsabo Balobo Milagros	Culiram Buena Gracia Labnig San Nicolas Zillovia	Poblacion Dona Maxima Dona Flavia Anislagan Sta Ines	Villa Paz San Patricio Panagangan Sagunto Poblacion
<b>SURIGAO DEL SUR</b>			
Mun. Carmen	Mun. Cortes	Mun. Lanuza	Mun. Lianga
Cancavan Esperanza Puyat Antao Sta Cruz	Balibadon Mabahin Tag-anongan Capandan Tigao	Sibahay Agsam Gamuton Bunga Nurcia	Ban-as Baucawe Payasan Liatimco Banahaw
<b>DAVAO DE ORO</b>			
Mun. Maco	Mun. Mabini	Mun. Nabunturan	Mun. Pantukan
Panaraon Anislagan New Asturias Lumatab Magangit	San Antonio Golden Valley Pangibiran Anitapan Cuambog	Magsaysay Basak Maganding Bayabas San Isidro	Tibagon Magnaga Napnapan Matiao Bongbong

Disaggregation by sex of the population in the 3 provinces:

<b>Agusan del Sur<sup>1</sup></b>			<b>Surigao del Sur<sup>2</sup></b>			<b>Davao de Oro<sup>3</sup></b>		
Men	Women	%Women	Men	Women	%Women	Men	Women	%Women
365.106	335.547	47,89%	305.365	286.885	48,44%	386.314	349.793	47,52%

## **Annex 01: Logical Framework**

1 PSA, June 2018

2 PSA, December 2017

3 PSA, May 2018

## **IMPLEMENTING ORGANIZATIONS**

The ProACT project is led by CODESPA Foundation, in partnership with the INGO Action Against Hunger, given the complementarity in their areas of expertise and their experience working together in various regions of the world.

**-CODESPA Foundation** is a non-profit organization whose approach to fighting poverty is helping low-income communities in developing countries to become fully involved in economic activities, so they can generate income as well as develop their own capacities and human potential. This common approach has led CODESPA to be recognized as a highly effective NGO specialized in the field of economic development, using microfinance, professional training, and access to the market as key tools in the fight against poverty.

CODESPA has been working in the Philippines for over 15 years in sustainable rural development, market access, microfinance, inclusive business, and natural disaster resilience. With the support of AECID, it has promoted the adoption of organic rice cultivation with natural fertilization of ducks in Mindanao, to diversify income and improve the resilience of 137 producers together with the private company Goldcorp and local microfinance institutions.

**-Action Against Hunger (AAH)** is a global humanitarian organization that takes decisive action against the causes and effects of hunger. It has a long track record of emergency, early recovery, and development work in the Philippines, one of the organization's biggest areas of intervention. Since 2000, the organization has provided humanitarian assistance to conflict-affected families in Central Mindanao and to the disaster-affected population across the country, including Metro Manila in the wake of Typhoon Ketsana (Ondoy), Super Typhoon Haiyan (Yolanda) in the islands of Samar, Leyte and Panay, the earthquake in Bohol and the siege in Zamboanga, and development projects in Masbate and various provinces in Mindanao. The organization's projects directly support the displaced and affected population and the host communities, while advancing gender integration, gender equity and women's empowerment so that all people - women, men, boys, and girls have equal abilities and opportunities to lead more fulfilling lives.

In addition to the implementing organizations, the components of the ProACT project specified in section 2, will be closely coordinated with the following governments entities/agencies and private entities:

### **Government entities/agencies:**

- Provincial and Municipal Governments of Agusan del Sur, Surigao del Sur and Davao de Oro.
- Barangays Councils in the covered areas.
- Office of Civil Defense.
- Department of Agriculture and related Agencies.
- PAGASA - Atmospheric, Astronomical and Geophysical Services of Philippines.
- Commission on Climate Change (CCC) of the Philippines.
- Department of the Environment.
- Department of Trade and Industry.
- Department on Social Welfare and Development.

The **Private entities** that collaborate with the project are:

- PEOPLE BANK 'S OF CARAGA y Pioneer Insurance, Microinsure.

- SSOFHDEV – Surigao Sur Organization for Human Development.
- Emergency Architects of the University of Philippines (UP-EA).

### **3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

The evaluation will be done in Agusan del Sur, Surigao del Sur and Davao de Oro, covering all the components in the ProACT project for PAC-1 and PAC-2 frame of execution.

The period to evaluate will be focused in the 2 years of the ProACT project's execution (January 1st 2019 – December 31st 2020), meaning, the previous period of diagnosis should not be considered, although the relevance of the intervention's design based on the diagnosis will be analyzed.

The ProACT project is implemented on the field in partnership with different local organizations according to what has been described in section 2 of this ToR. The evaluation will consider the role of each of them in the intervention.

#### **3.1 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**

- To assess, quantitative and qualitatively, if the ProACT project is contributing to the achievement of the expected results and attaining the planned targets, based on the criteria of the traditional logical framework approach (effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, sustainability and impact<sup>4</sup>).
- To analyze the intervention's strategies, identifying strong points and weak points in each region of intervention and determine whether the strategies promote synergy and complementation among the development actors.
- To elaborate recommendations in order to strengthen and - if needed - to redirect actions to achieve results and objectives within the timeframe of the ProACT project.

Therefore, the evaluation seeks to determine the necessary actions and mechanisms to improve the intervention in order to achieve the results and objectives of the ProACT project. The results of the evaluation will be used by CODESPA and Action Against Hunger to make the necessary adjustments in the project.

The key recommendations should focus on the strategy and methodologies of the intervention:

#### **STRATEGIC LEVEL**

At this level, the need arises:

- To analyse the current relevance of the strategy, taking special account of the social and economic transformations generated by the COVID19 Pandemic and the mobility and relationship restrictions in the border areas which may affect the achievement of the indicators and expected achievements.
- To analyze the critical factors to be taken into account to guarantee the sustainability of the intervention. In particular, it is considered necessary:
- To assess the involvement and capacity of the local governments, studying the

---

<sup>4</sup>Since it is an intermediate evaluation the impact measurement cannot be considered as such, but one can evaluate the quality of the impact indicators designed, the provision of achieving the desired impact through the results reached up to date and the possibility of identifying not desired effects.

processes implemented and promoted by the agreement, and related to the promotion of public policies, making recommendations for what remains to be done.

- To analyze the implementation of the strategy, with the aim of facilitating learning and promoting, where appropriate, the scaling up or replication of processes or tools implemented for the promotion of value chain.
- To analyze how the program is contributing to government strategy in CCA/DRR and livelihood, to the Philippine Development Plan and to AECID Country Strategy.

## **PROGRAMMATIC LEVEL**

At this level, the need arises:

- The evaluation of the agreement will consist of the assessment of the Logical framework and the Theory of Change<sup>5</sup> of the intervention, evaluating the design, the structural elements, the implementation processes for obtaining results.
- To analyse the level of participation of the beneficiaries and actors involved during the period evaluated.
- To analyse the criteria for selecting beneficiaries in terms of their level of vulnerability and poverty.
- Analyse the integration of the gender approach and Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in the intervention and propose strategies for improvement
- To analyze the strategy implemented in livelihood; in terms of food security and production of the 3650 families taking into account the adaptability to climate change and to make recommendations for improvements to the strategy defined in the agreement, once again considering the current economic and social situation generated by the Pandemic.

## **OPERATIONAL LEVEL**

At this level, the need arises:

- Recommend specific actions or communication strategies to overcome the conditions of social alienation and low connectivity in the areas of intervention and specifically by the groups of beneficiaries.
- Identify and propose alliances, which can be promoted by the Agreement between local actors, to contribute to the achievement of the results foreseen by the Agreement, and especially for the components of access to financing and promotion of entrepreneurship.

---

<sup>5</sup> Applying the theory of change, the aim is to analyze the main key processes and structural elements that have given rise (or not) to the objectives and results \_-expected and not expected, and that are expected/planned to be achieved at this time of the evaluation. Similarly, this approach to the theory of change should be complemented with the results-oriented methodology (Evaluation by Criteria), evaluating the different criteria.

In this way, the evaluation will make it possible to assess the project design based on its theory of change, as well as to measure the expected and unanticipated effects of the intervention, and also to analyze and assess the extent to which the most immediate and direct objectives established can be achieved, and are being achieved.



- To analyze if the current operational set-up (HR, consortium management, coordination) adequate to implement the project and reach the deliverable.
- To analyze if the current operational set-up and procedures adequate to avoid COVID-19 related risk among the implementing partners and communities.

### **3.2 STAKEHOLDERS**

The following stakeholders are involved in the evaluation, differentiating those who will be evaluated and those who participate in the management and/or follow up of the evaluation (some of them might be in several groups).

#### **- *Management Unit of the Evaluation:***

The Management Unit will include the staff at the headquarters and designed staff in the Philippines of the Consortium CODESPA – Action Against Hunger along with the Consortium Coordinator of CODESPA and Action Against Hunger for the execution of the ProACT project.

This Management Unit is responsible for preparing this TOR. The Management Unit will be responsible for selecting the candidates that will comprise the evaluating team to be hired. The Management Unit will agree on the final short list of candidates that will be presented to AECID, although The Consortium has the prerogative to propose the main evaluator.

The management Unit will have the Authority to approve the methodological proposal of the evaluation presented by the designated evaluation team.

The Management Unit will work with the coordinators of the NGOs of the ProACT project on the terms of the evaluation.

The Management Unit of the Evaluation will be responsible for the logistics of the evaluation. It will decide the evaluation agenda with the evaluation team and provide support in coordinating with the community and field visit.

#### **- *Committee of Evaluation Monitoring:***

The Managing Unit shall be responsible to the Committee. The coordinators of the area of cooperation will be members of the Committee. In order to make the communication with the evaluating team operative a person will be designated in Madrid and one in the Philippines (designated staff). In these communications they will always act as representatives of the Committee.

The members of the Committee of Evaluation Monitoring are also those participating in the Commission of the ProACT project Monitoring, therefore they will try to approach the subject of the evaluation in the ordinary meetings of the Commission of the ProACT project Monitoring, being it obligatory to maintain a meeting of discussion of the closing report of the evaluation.

The Committee of ProACT project's Monitoring's mission is to verify that the evaluation is being done according to the ToR and the Methodologic Proposal presented by the Evaluation Team and approved by AECID. It will be the one in

charge of agreeing with the evaluating team on the implementation of the evaluation and to propose changes if it considered it necessary.

Individually each member of the Committee will present in writing its comments to the draft of the evaluation final report submitted by the evaluating team. These comments will be reported to the evaluating team through the staff assigned in the Philippines and the staff in charge in Madrid.

**- Subjects of the evaluation:**

The evaluation will have to consider:

- ❖ The beneficiaries defined in the ProACT project (members of the communities' in which the different actions from the ProACT project are implemented):
  - Members of the Community Organizations
  - Leaders of the Community Organizations
  - Members of Barangay Councils
  
- ❖ As well as the technical personnel and services of the participant NGOs in charge of the execution and pursuit of the activities of the ProACT project.

It will also consider other key actors (leaders of basic organizations, local authorities, etc.) that can provide information on the effects of the ProACT project at the community level.

### **3.3 QUESTIONS AND CRITERIA OF THE EVALUATION**

The general criteria to be used will be adapted from the ones applied by the European Commission. They are briefly described in the following table<sup>6</sup>:

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION
Pertinence	Responsiveness of the ProACT project's objectives to the problems which it tries to solve and to the context in which it operates. Also refers to the quality in the identification and design of the ProACT project (logic of the planning process, design coherence).
Efficiency	Reasonable adjustment of the costs incurred in order to achieve the results. The correct use of resources to implement the activities (in terms of quality, quantity, and timely delivery) and the quality of results achieved.
Effectiveness	The extent that the results and external factors will contribute to the achievement of the objective of the ProACT project. A concrete evaluation of the benefits noticed by the targeted groups will be included.

<sup>6</sup> Adapted from the European Commission (March 2004), Aid Delivery Methods: Volume 1 Project Cycle Management Guidelines, p. 49.

Impact	Assessment of the effects of the interventions on the broader context. Forecast of ability of the project to reach the desired impact based on the achievements to date. Possibility of identifying effects that were not intended resulting from the interventions undertaken.
Sustainability	The probability that the current and future gains of the ProACT project are sustained once the external funding has concluded, especially regarding policies, economic and financial aspects sociocultural aspects, gender fairness/equality, appropriate technology, environmental aspects and institutional capacity and management.

The key questions that will be considered for each criterion are the following:

CRITERIA	KEY ASPECTS
Pertinence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coherence of the ProACT project with the national and local development policies and with relevant sectoral policies.</li> <li>• Clarity in the identification of sectorial vulnerable groups.</li> <li>• Is the program pertinent according to the needs, resources and demands of final beneficiaries?</li> <li>• Correct assessment of institutional capacities and support for institutional capacity-building.</li> <li>• Clarity and specification in the identification and definition of the problems.</li> <li>• Are the main processes of the ProACT project suitable for the achievement of the expected inputs? In terms of efforts, which processes should the ProACT project mainly focus on / redesign, in order to better achieve expected impacts?</li> <li>• Suitable analysis of the lessons learned in previous experiences (in the PAC and complementarity with other ongoing initiatives.</li> <li>• Regarding the design: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Clarity in the analysis of the options and justification of the chosen strategy.</li> <li>○ Clarity and logical coherence of the objectives of the planning matrix as far as objectives, results, and activities to obtain each result.</li> <li>○ Definition and adjustment of the indicators.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• This intervention implemented by several local counterparts with different background experience in the area as well as with the different components of the ProACT project; in two different Regions, has an added value? What are the difficulties?</li> <li>• Are the management and coordination systems of the ProACT project (general coordination, teams of each organization, etc.) adequate?</li> <li>• Are there adequate monitoring and systematization systems created and implemented?</li> <li>• Recommendations on IB – DRR design</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the quality of the ProACT project management: (a) budgetary and financial management; (b) management of personnel, information and resources; (c) risk management; (d) relation/coordination with local authorities and other</li> </ul>

CRITERIA	KEY ASPECTS
	<p>partners; (e) time used for management; adequate to the requirements of the ProACT project?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have local synergies and interchange of experiences being promoted?</li> <li>• To what extent are the collaboration between the different actors and the management mechanisms established contributing to achieve the results of the intervention?</li> <li>• Are there significant cost deviations?</li> <li>• Are there delays in implementation? What are the causes of these delays?</li> <li>• Are the human and material resources sufficient and adequate?</li> <li>• Considering the total financial amount of the ProACT project and its expected impacts, is the financial structure of the project adequate in order to achieve them? What kind of strategies could be implemented in order to catalyze complementary contributions or generate scale economies that could improve impact achievement?</li> <li>• Are the monitoring systems established by InteRed appropriate to the implementation and coordination of the ProACT project?</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have social, productive, and political structures that support local development been promoted?</li> <li>• Are the different beneficiary groups acquiring the necessary and sufficient capabilities/skills for the management of these structures?</li> <li>• Are the identified and implemented strategies of intervention addressing the communities' problems?</li> <li>• Are the results obtained to date in accordance with the execution calendar, and resources allocated?</li> <li>• According to expected outputs, what kind of alliances could be fostered in order to achieve them in a satisfactory way?</li> </ul>
Impact Forecasts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it foreseen that if the mechanisms established are maintained the general objective will be achieved and to what extend is this attributable to the ProACT project?</li> <li>• Are there any entry barriers into the program that the beneficiaries face? What kind of strategies could guarantee a wider coverage of the ProACT project?</li> <li>• Are there indicators that will allow for measuring the impact in the long run? Is it necessary to adjust the indicators?</li> <li>• Are there any other effects (especially undesired) resulting from the intervention?</li> <li>• Is there complementation and coordination with other organizations which help in attaining the general purpose of the project?</li> <li>• In which way final beneficiaries' vulnerability to disasters (particularly typhoons and flooding) is expected to be reduced by the ProACT project? Which strategies could be implemented in order to reduce vulnerability at a deep level?</li> <li>• In which way gender empowerment will be fostered by the ProACT project? Which strategies could be implemented in order to achieve it at a deep level?</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do the beneficiaries have the possibility to apply the capabilities (knowledge and skills) developed through the various interventions so that it will not be forgotten?</li> </ul>

CRITERIA	KEY ASPECTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which strategies could guarantee public budget allocation for DRR once the project has ended?</li> <li>• Is there a socio-cultural adequacy of the strategy of the ProACT project that allow the target beneficiaries to accept and appropriate the ProACT project?</li> <li>• Which economic incentives exist for the different actors of livelihoods component of the ProACT project, in order to reply the productive and commercial processes involved in it?</li> <li>• Are local capabilities being strengthened?</li> <li>• At an institutional level, which institution is foreseen not to last once the project has ended, and which strategy should be implemented in order to avoid it?</li> <li>• Is there a phase out strategy that guarantees the sustainability of the results once external support ends?</li> <li>• Promotion of the ownership of the ProACT project by the beneficiaries.</li> <li>• In terms of impacts, which impacts are more endangered to disappear once the ProACT project has ended, and which strategy should be implemented in order to avoid it?</li> </ul>
COVID19 management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the identified needs, priorities and implementation of modified / new activities have support beneficiaries in contingency and resilience due to the pandemic?</li> <li>• Are the changes made because of the COVID-19 sufficient to meet the needs that the pandemic has generated in the population?</li> <li>• Are there any unmet needs of the population caused by COVID-19 that the ProACT project should address?</li> <li>• How did the ProACT COVID 19 response impacted/supported the needs of the beneficiaries brought about by the pandemic</li> </ul>
Gender approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How has been women participation in the activities of the ProACT project?</li> <li>• Based on women beneficiaries' perspective; have they noticed any changes/improvements in their participation/rights on the economic, political, or social field as the result of the ProACT project?</li> <li>• How many women have benefited from public risk reduction and disaster recovery initiatives?</li> <li>• How many women have gained access to productive inputs (seeds, credit and/or low-cost technology) to improve their income levels?</li> </ul>

### 3.4 METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION AND PLANNING

The evaluating team will present a methodological proposal to the ProACT management team. Once the proposal has the approval of the management team, it will be submitted to AECID for final approval.

As it is a mid-term evaluation, and due to the characteristics of the intervention, the study can be carried out based on the methodology oriented to the analysis of processes and structural elements (evaluation oriented by the Theory of Change) and completing it with the methodology oriented to results (Evaluation by Criteria).

The proposal will have to consider and detail the quantitative and qualitative techniques of data gathering and analyses of the information that will be used. The evaluation team will also have to propose sample study of the beneficiaries considering communities from each NGO, with easier access or more difficult to access as well as those with better and lower results up to the date.

*\*Due to COVID-19 there could be limitations and restrictions that may affect the collection of information necessary to carry out a correct mid-term evaluation. Consultants are requested to be aware of these possible limitations and anticipate them, so that they have alternative proposals and plans on how to collect the necessary information. If the need of adapt the methodology due to COVID-19 limitation and restrictions in force arises, it must be presented and approved by the ProACT management team before their implementation.*

The following are the phases of the evaluation and the time frame for each phase. The evaluation team will adopt their methodologic proposal to this timeframe.

- Phase I: Previous analysis/Study of documents
- Phase II: Field Work.
- Phase III: Report draft and presentation of preliminary results.
- Phase IV: Final report

**Phase I:** Previous analysis/Study of documents: In this phase following will be done:

- Exhaustive analysis of the documentation available of the ProACT project (formulation, baseline, the PAC, monitoring reports, etc.)
- Validation of the methodology proposed by the evaluating team (Theory of change agreed and Agreed evaluation Matrix) together with the design of data gathering tools.
- Definition of the definitive work plan for the evaluation.
- Consultants must submit an inception report that includes the briefing and meeting with CODESPA, Action Against Hunger, OTC, HQ etc.

Time frame: 3 weeks.

**Phase II:** Field Work<sup>7</sup>: the following will be done in each Region of intervention:

- Local briefing with representatives of CODESPA, Action Against Hunger and counterparts.
- Visits to the communities.
- Meetings with local actors involved in the development processes of the communities

Time frame: 3 weeks (one in Agusan del Sur, one in Surigao del Sur and one in Davao de Oro).

**Phase III:** Report draft and presentation of preliminary results:

- Meeting for feedback with representatives of CODESPA and Action Against

---

<sup>7</sup> Field Work should anticipate COVID-19 situation and adapt the methodology and sampling taking into account the possible limitations and restrictions.

- Hunger, local counterparts and OTC, discussion of first conclusions.
- Elaboration of evaluation draft report and presentation to those in charge of the monitoring of the evaluation of the ProACT project (including OTC).

Time frame: 2 weeks.

**Phase IV:** Final report:

- Elaboration of the final report after the reception of the comments to the draft.
- Approval of the final report.
- The report will be delivered in English and Spanish

Time frame: 3 weeks.

In the methodological proposal presented by the evaluating team it will be stated if it is relevant for representatives of the NGO or their counterparts to be present during the evaluation activities, since in some cases it could support the accomplishment of the same, facilitate the relation with the beneficiaries, but in others it could condition the answers and the results of the evaluation.

### **3.5 OUTLINE AND SUBMISSION EVALUATION REPORT**

The proposed content of the Evaluation Report is presented below. The Evaluating Team may modify the content if required by the methodological proposal. Any modification however will require the approval by the Management Unit of the Evaluation:

- I. Executive Summary
- II. Introduction
  - a. Background/Rationale and Objective of the evaluation
  - b. Main questions and assessment criteria: definition
- III. Brief description of the evaluated intervention, with special reference to the expectations of accomplishment at midterm in which the evaluation is conducted; summary of the background, the organization, management, and actors involved, and context in which the intervention is developed
- IV. Methodology used in the evaluation
  - a. Applied methodology and techniques
  - b. Limitations of the study
- V. Analysis of the compiled information and evidences in reference to the questions established previously. Interpretation of the evidences in relation to the enunciated questions of evaluation
- VI. Conclusions of the evaluation in relation to the established evaluation criteria

- VII. Lessons learned that come from the general conclusions which indicate good practices and that can be extrapolated and to feed back into the actions of the intervention currently at execution
- VIII. The recommendations derived from the evaluation classified by intervention zone
- IX. Annexes in which there will be included: The ToR. Proposed methodology, List of secondary sources used (documentary revision); List of key informants, Models of information collection (scripts of interviews, etc.), Information compiled through primary sources (transcription of interviews, questionnaires, etc.), statements and commentaries of different actors from the draft if there are disagreements, Summary of the evaluation.

The maximum extension of the final evaluation report will be of forty (40) pages (A4 paper size), in letter Verdana 10, single spaced.

As Annex always enclose a card-summary of the evaluation following the format established by the CAD of the OECD for the inventory of evaluations of this institution.

The evaluating team will give to the NGOD the final evaluation report, once the draft has been discussed by all the parties, in soft paper (three copies) and in electronic copy format.

**Final report deadline: 1 June 2021**

#### **4. EVALUATION TEAM**

An Evaluators Team constituted by local professionals will be prioritized, with experience in the area of Governances and Disaster Risk Reduction as well as in evaluation.

In case an in-country evaluating team cannot be found that can undertake the evaluation that responds to the objectives of the evaluation, the approval of the OTC will be obtained to resort to the external hiring of evaluators.

If the evaluating team is a group of local individuals proposed by the Management Unit for the Evaluation, a coordinator of the team will be designated. The coordinator will have overall responsibility for the conduct of the evaluation and communication with the Management Unit and Committee of Monitoring. In any case it will always be named a coordinator of the evaluating Team.

Those who have worked for the Spanish Consortium NGOD and/or the local counterparts in the last three years (from the period of identification of the ProACT project to evaluate at least) will be excluded as possible evaluators. The independence of the evaluating team with respect to the evaluated intervention must be guaranteed.

#### **5. TIMEFRAME AND BUDGET FOR THE EVALUATION**

The date of beginning of the evaluation will be after February 1st 2021, moment at which half of the period of execution of the ProACT project is fulfilled.

The term for the accomplishment of the evaluation is of 11 weeks, with the following distribution:



- Phase I: Previous analysis/Study of documents. 3 weeks.
- Phase II: Field Work. 3 weeks (1 Agusan del Sur, 1 Surigao del Sur, 1 Davao de Oro).
- Phase III: Report draft and presentation of preliminary results. 2 weeks.
- Phase IV: Final report. 3 weeks.

Final report deadline: **1 June 2021**

This calendar can vary slightly after negotiation with the contracted evaluation team.

The budget for this evaluation is of 20,000 Euros, taxes included where all the expenses related to the evaluation are included: travels, accommodation, per diems, issuance of reports, fees of the evaluation team members, etc.

This amount is an estimation and will be finalized with the evaluating team.

## **6. PRESENTATION OF THE PROPOSAL AND CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT/ SELECTION**

The evaluating team will have to present a technical and financial proposal that includes the methodological proposal, the curriculum vitae of each team member and the financial proposal.

The financial proposal cannot exceed 20,000 Euros, taxes included. The evaluation team will present an Official Receipt for the total amount of evaluation (this OR will include the expenses of fees, trips, allowances, materials etc.).

Criteria for the assessment of the proposal's quality:

- a) Methodological proposal: Maximum 5 credits of the 10 credits for the whole proposal (necessary to reach a minimum of 3)
- b) Profile of the evaluating team: Maximum 4 credits of the 10 credits for the whole proposal (necessary to reach a minimum of 2).
- c) Financial proposal: Maximum 1 credit of the 10 credits for the whole proposal.

Criteria	Assessment	Credits
Methodological proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coherence of the methodology with the aim and objectives of the evaluation.</li> <li>• Methodology: explanation of methods to gather and analyze information, reliability of data gathering, triangulation of the information.</li> <li>• Analysis of evaluation criteria and indicators.</li> <li>• Coherence between the activities of evaluation proposed with the available resources and objectives to be achieved.</li> <li>• Adequacy to the terms/periods established in the TORs</li> <li>• Flexibility to adjust to the unexpected conditions.</li> <li>• Activities for the presentation of expected results.</li> <li>• Days of presentation and validation of results.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Innovation in the Methodological approach.</li> </ul>	
Profile of evaluating team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum 2 experts.</li> <li>• Specific academic degree on the work area to develop.</li> <li>• Years of experience in the sector evaluation's objective.</li> <li>• Level of performance of the professional activity suitable to the needs of the ToR.</li> <li>• Experience in the geographic area which is subject of evaluation (local experts will be prioritized).</li> <li>• Experience in similar previous works</li> <li>• Exclusivity contract regarding the subject of the evaluation</li> </ul>	
Economic proposal:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Break down in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Professional fees</li> <li>○ Field work</li> <li>○ Administrative expenses</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Adjustment of cost to market prices</li> </ul>	

For the assessment of the Evaluation proposal will be considered the quality and the cost of the proposal for the final decision.

The technical and financial proposal must be submitted before **November 15, 2020** to the following email address: [cjgajardo@codespa.org](mailto:cjgajardo@codespa.org).