



Humanitarian Aid
and Civil Protection



**REQUEST FOR EXPRESSION OF INTEREST FOR EXTERNAL END OF PROJECT EVALUATION
TERMS OF REFERENCE**

Title of the Action	SOMALI PASTORAL DAIRY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT II(SPDDP II)
Area of intervention	Burao and Garowe, Somaliland and Puntland states, respectively
Project Reference Number	FED/2010/244-446
Length of Project (Months)	42 months (includes extensions)
Start date of the Action	14 th July 2010
End date of the Action	14 th January 2014

1. Introduction

VSF Germany is an international Non Governmental Organization, providing humanitarian aid and development assistance to pastoralists and vulnerable communities in areas where livestock is of importance. In the region, VSF Germany implements activities in South Sudan, the Sudan, Kenya, Somalia, Tanzania and Ethiopia. With support in animal health, agriculture, marketing, food safety but also with developing the capacity of communities and governmental institutions or initiating peace and conflict resolution we work towards food security and strengthened livelihoods of pastoralist communities.

Milk production, processing and trading is a key livelihoods strategy for pastoralists and urban milk traders in Somaliland and Puntland to earn income. The Somali milk value chain is growing as more actors get involved in the milk business at different levels of the milk chain and specialized small scale milk enterprises (milk traders collecting milk from villages with their dedicated transport systems and distributing to retailers) continue to emerge. The highly perishable nature of milk, poor milk handling practices and poor cooling facilities at production, during transportation and at selling points drastically affect the milk quality, shelf life and in turn reduce the net profit that accrues to milk producers, milk collectors/bulkers and milk traders.

Recognising the losses incurred by actors in the milk chain and the need to establish a system that would improve milk quality and overall income VSF-G designed a project to address the identified needs which was funded by European Union. Since July 2010, VSF-G has been implementing a dairy development project in Somaliland and Puntland in which milk producers, collectors and traders have been involved.

The overall objective of this project is to increase incomes and reduce food insecurity through private-led economic growth. The project focuses on three results: enhancing capacity for the regulation of the dairy sector, improving milk quality assurance and investing in infrastructure and facilities for improved milk marketing and processing.

2. Purpose of this Evaluation

To assess, quantify and document the contributions of the action towards the principle objective of the SPDDP II, which is to increase incomes and reduce food insecurity through private-sector led economic growth and specific objective to improve livestock based incomes through support to the dairy sector development.

3. Overall Objective of the evaluation

This external end of project evaluation aims at assessing achievement of the stated objectives, outcomes and outputs, impacts of the action, best practices and lessons learnt from the implementation process. The performance is judged against the project indicators compared with baseline information and monitoring data. Besides, the evaluation serves to gather objective information on how the project has adapted to the evolving humanitarian situation in target areas, the effectiveness of dairy improvement approaches, effectiveness of implementation approaches, security of aid workers, respect for human rights, gender, environment, and donor visibility.

3.1 The specific objectives of this evaluation

To assess (i) the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the action(s) towards meeting the specific objectives and (ii) the contributions of the action to food security through private –sector led economic growth.

Specifically this evaluation will:

1. Assess whether or not this action, in design and implementation strategies, is consistent with the overall goal of EU, national priorities, policies and action plans for the dairy sector in Somaliland and Puntland states of Somalia i.e. the extent to which the various actions have contributed to priorities set under each of the above.
4. Assess to what extent dairy development programming (and activities undertaken under this action) has effectively contributed to increase milk quality and reduced losses of the milk producers, collectors and traders.
5. Assess to what extent the result key result areas (Capacity of public and private sector institutions to regulate the dairy sector enhanced, Quality assurance systems for the dairy sector established and Dairy product marketing & processing sustained and improved) has been achieved and good practice principles have been applied and implemented.
6. Analyse and verify the achievement of intended results as described in the operational framework for each action i.e. logical framework
7. Assess the impact of the project on improving the livelihoods of milk producers, collectors and traders in target communities, systemization of public dairy sector and draw out key lessons learnt and opportunities for future programming in the dairy sector in Somalia.

4. Scope of this evaluation

The evaluation will sample representatives of milk producers, collectors, traders and relevant government departments from each target area based on the theme and food security strategies. It will assess the actions collectively at principle objective level taking into account the uniqueness and innovative contributions of this project.

5. Evaluation methodology and plan:

In designing the evaluation methodology, reference is to be made to the EU guidance (DAC), to the existing Dairy Policies of Somaliland and Puntland specific for milk value chain addition and food security. The consultant(s) shall prepare comprehensive participatory methodology for undertaking this evaluation. The methodology must include among others, programme literature reviews, plans for meeting and interviewing project staff, officials in the ministries of livestock and local municipalities, site visits/Village Milk centres, milk testing laboratories, and stakeholder consultations. The consultant

External Evaluation of Somali pastoral Dairy Development Project II

is expected to develop and use data collection tools (questionnaires, key informant and semi-structured interview schedules, focus group discussion guides, etc.) as appropriate to the sampling process employed.

The field visits and contact sessions with communities and groups must attempt to reach/meet 60 % of the targeted groups including government officials in the two states. VSFG will take responsibility for logistics and mobilization and facilitations in the field.

5.1 Indicative plan or scheduling of activities.

Assessment and awarding of contract	Nov 27th -28th, 2013
Meeting with Somali team, Nairobi	Nov 29th, 2013
Field work*	Dec 2nd -16th 2013
Report writing and presentations	Dec 17th -19th, 2013
Consultations and preliminary findings	Dec 19th, 2013
Final report	Dec 30th, 2013

*Detailed itinerary and route maps for the field work will be jointly developed during contractual stage.

6 . Key tasks of the consultant

- Collect relevant data / information on the project implementation, outputs and outcomes from relevant sources.
- Develop methodology and tools for the data collection and analysis process. Such tools should be shared with VSFG before starting field work for any comments.
- Develop a practical work plan for the work
- Visit project sites and carry out evaluation through meetings with all relevant stakeholders.
- Consult with relevant stake holders for views on the project in Nairobi as necessary ,including EU
- Debrief VSF Germany after completing the assignment and validate the findings prior to submitting final report
- Prepare and submit final evaluation report to VSF Germany in time frame set in the ToR.

7. Consultant profile

A multi-disciplinary person(s) with experience covering the key result areas of this action (building Capacity of public and private sector institutions to regulate the dairy sector, Quality assurance systems for the dairy sector and Dairy product marketing & processing) is recommended for this evaluation. The Consultant should have appropriate qualifications and experience in evaluation, sound knowledge of the Somalia context and the geographical area of the operation and demonstrated ability to manage the available time and resources and to work to tight deadlines. The Consultants should be independent from the parties involved.

The Consultant should also have demonstrated experience in evaluating impacts of income based on value chain addition for small traders. The Consultant should have good understanding of participatory methodologies and must be fluent in spoken and written English. The consultant should be able to analyse and collected data using appropriate statistical packages.

He/she should have:

- Demonstrated understanding of the pastoralists/agro-pastoralists livelihood systems
- Experience in Humanitarian and development contexts.
- At least 5 years working experience in the dry lands of the Horn of Africa
- Firsthand knowledge of the socio-cultural, economic, political situation in Somalia will be an added advantage
- An in-depth knowledge and experience of carrying out the project evaluations in food security and livelihoods and particularly in livestock value chain addition.
- Relevant qualification, competences and experiences fitting with the scope and geography of this assignment

External Evaluation of Somali pastoral Dairy Development Project II

- g) Strong analytical and writing skills and the ability to clearly present findings and drawing practical conclusions and recommendations.
- h) Experience in dairy development is an advantage
- i) Knowledge of Puntland and Somaliland institutional and local context is an asset

8. Expression of Interest

Any person/firm interested in carrying out this evaluation, should send an expression of interest to include:

- a) Technical proposal; (maximum 3 pages) including the methodology and work plan to comply with the requirements of the evaluation
- b) Financial proposal: consultant fees per day. VSFG will pay for transport, food and accommodation in the field.
- c) CV of the person to carry out the evaluation.

9. Issues to study:

The consultant should assess evidence of relevance and quality of design, efficiency of implementation, effectiveness, impact to date and analyse potential sustainability of the achievements. The issues to be studied are:

a. Relevance

Relevance is the extent to which the objectives and design of the action being evaluated fit with: current global/regional policies, challenges and concerns; the needs, policies and priorities of intended beneficiary; EU operational guidance and the good practices principles developed by relevant ministries and other, the specific objectives, role and comparative advantages of the NGO.

Questions on relevance may cover the following areas. It is critical that evaluation looks especially at the adoption of the good practices principles (question v).

Is the action consistent with the main goals of EU food security as stated in the operational guidance?

- i) Was the design appropriate for the geographic area?
- ii) Was the intervention logic coherent and accurate?
- iii) Were any lessons learned from previous pilot projects in the area?
- iv) Were the indicators of progress and of impact in the design of good quality?
- v) How was the quality of the outputs going to be determined?
- vi) Were the outputs achievable or overly ambitious?
- vii) Does the action build on recommendations from evaluations of previous actions and comparative advantages of the NGO? Does it compete with or substitute for activities that other development agencies could do more appropriately or efficiently?
- viii) Is there evidence of continuing demand for the program from intended beneficiaries?

External Evaluation of Somali pastoral Dairy Development Project II

- ix) Were potential values for money, opportunity costs and trade-offs considered in the action's development?
- x) How much the good practice principles developed by VSFG under SPDDPII have been implemented?
- xi) Are the specific objectives of the program still valid given changing circumstances?
- xii) Was the design appropriate for the geographic area?
- xiii) Is the action's organisational structure and choice of partnerships (still) appropriate to achieve its aims?
- xiv) Have appropriate incentives been built in for partners?

b. Effectiveness

Effectiveness is the extent to which the action has achieved, or is expected to achieve, its outputs and outcomes.

Questions on effectiveness may cover the following areas (as appropriate):

1. To what extent were the implemented activities result in achievement of planned outputs and outcomes and specific objectives / are they likely to be achieved?.

Note 1: *In most cases, information on outputs and immediate outcomes will be available from the monitoring system, so the main role of the evaluators will be to intelligently synthesise, critically analyse and selectively verify the results recorded. Where the monitoring system is deficient, evaluators will be expected to make recommendations for its improvement.*

Note 2: *Evaluators should carefully verify the validity and robustness of any indicators used as measures for judging action success or benchmarking an action against others.*

2. What unplanned outputs and outcomes have been achieved? Were they good or bad? What changes have been made in the original plans? How have 'failures' been handled and documented? How did they affect overall project achievement?
3. What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the planned and unplanned outputs and outcomes? Areas to consider may include, but not limited to:
 - o Quantity, quality and timeliness of inputs (including external funding).
 - o Quality and timeliness of support to complementary actions and other contributions (such as high-level policy dialogue) expected from other partners.
 - o Quality of management and governance, including effective use of monitoring.
 - o Quality of partnerships and communication.
 - o Mechanisms for and quality of feedback from intended users of the outputs and end beneficiaries.
 - o Time frame: were plans realistic?
 - o The external environment. If external factors are identified as a major constraint, it should be investigated how this has been handled in the impact pathway: as an assumption, or as an issue to be tackled?
4. Was coordination with other development actors effective?

5. Where the effects of the project felt equally across the project area or were some areas neglected?

6. Were technical designs effective and appropriate for that environment?

c. Efficiency

Efficiency is “the extent to which an action has converted or is expected to convert its resources and inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) economically into results in order to achieve the maximum possible outputs, outcomes, and impacts with the minimum possible inputs”.

Questions on efficiency may cover the following areas (as appropriate):

1. Timeliness of commencement of project implementation.
2. Was a no cost extension applied for and granted?
3. Were all inputs delivered on time? Were inputs of acceptable quality?
4. Was the methodology of implementation the right one under the circumstances?
5. Did the implementing agency get good cooperation from relevant government partners/authorities?
6. What was relevant governments and local leaders' assessment of this intervention?
7. Was access to project areas acceptable?
8. Were most of the outputs achieved to an acceptable standard?
9. Was co-financing a success? Did other donors deliver on time?
10. Did the community contribute in cash and in kind according to the proposal?
11. Was the budget spent according to the proposed budget lines? Was the rate of spending acceptable?
12. To what extent did the NGO/agency take on board the recommendations from EC's field visits and feedback on progress reports provided by the EC?
13. How do actual costs compare with planned costs? What are the main reasons for any differences?
14. Are there any obvious areas of inefficiency?
15. Were financial and human resources available in the quantity and time planned and maintained through project life? If not, what were the effects?
16. How do the costs of producing outputs and other processes (for example consultation of stakeholders) compare to those of similar actions? This question is usually best approached by looking at whether management systems are regularly checking on costs and benchmarking appropriately.
17. Coordination: Is the level of collaboration and coordination with partners, including capacity building, appropriate and efficient? Is there any crowding out effect (reduction in efforts by others)? What are the views of different partners?

External Evaluation of Somali pastoral Dairy Development Project II

18. What would be the probable implications of scaling the action [up or down (if relevant)] in terms of costs, cost-effectiveness, or efficiency?

d. Impact

The word impact can be used in different ways. We use here the OECD-DAC definition: “Impacts are positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by *an action*, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended”. Impacts can be at the macro (sector) or micro (household or individual) level, for example effects on poverty, health, nutrition, the environment, communities and institutions.

We do recommend here a very practical approach and expect that the actions’ evaluations will systematically refer to some of the impact/ outcome indicators for the specific approach taken by the action, e.g.: Capacity of public and private sector institutions to regulate dairy sector enhanced, Quality assurance systems for the dairy sector, Dairy product marketing & processing, improved and establish specific indicators of success/ changes.

This is a critical element to strengthen the evidence base of the approaches for future advocacy and good practice promotion.

Evaluators should also check what actions taken outside EU SPDDP II need to happen for the planned impacts to be achieved (for example, by the private sector or changes in policy), and whether those actions are underway, or their probability of taking place.

Evaluations should also document (and where relevant/possible, quantify) apparent unintended or unexpected effects and risks of the project. These may include for example: Positive spill-overs, e.g. adoption of SPDDP II good practices, concepts, models, approaches or methods by those outside the immediate EU SPDDP II partners, institutional changes in partners, both positive and negative, effects on nutrition, effects on the environment, effects on gender relations or other social relations.

e. Sustainability

Sustainability is the continuation of benefits from an action after work has been completed, or the probability of continued long-term benefits. It may be political, financial, institutional, economic, social and/or environmental.

Questions on sustainability will vary considerably with the objectives and stage of action being evaluated and may cover the following (as appropriate):

1. To what extent have the benefits of the action continued, or are expected to continue? Why or why not?
2. Can financing be sustained?
3. Is there an appropriate exit/hand over strategy, for example in partnerships? Are partners prepared and incentivised to take on any necessary responsibilities?
4. Have partners or other key stakeholders benefited indirectly (e.g. in knowledge, attitudes, power) as a result of

External Evaluation of Somali pastoral Dairy Development Project II the action?

5. Is there any risk that the project is crowding out other initiatives?
6. How sensitive are the benefits to future changes in the operating environment?
7. To what extent is the action likely to have affected environmental sustainability, in a positive or negative way?
8. To what extent the action has strengthened milk value chain and income capabilities? (of community members and any actors that form part of the milk supply system(s), i.e.: relevant government agencies, community-based and grass root organisations, media, national and local dairy management agencies.
9. To what extent the action has supported the development and dissemination of a national legislative framework that details dairy sector improvement roles, responsibilities and funding mechanisms? etc.

10. Reporting:

The evaluator will write and produce a precise final report (maximum 20 pages) written in simple and understandable English. The draft report is to be shared with field teams and discussed with the VSFG in Nairobi during debriefing time. Comments and inputs from the VSFG will be included in the final report.

The following report format to include:

1. Cover page: (Title of the evaluation with the title of the Action, names and logos of the donor and implementing partner, Consultants'/firms name and address, Dates of the evaluation and the report)
2. Table of contents, Executive summary (a maximum of 3 pages), main report including the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations.
3. Annexes
 - Terms of Reference;
 - List of persons / organizations consulted;
 - List of literature and documents consulted;
 - List of sites visited;
 - Examples of case studies
 - List of abbreviations.

Further works or revisions of the report may be required if it is considered that the report does not meet the requirements of the TOR, if there are factual errors, including incomplete reports, or if the report is not of acceptable standards. The final report must be drawn up in 5 hard copies and 5 soft copies.

Necessary skills and Experience of the consultant:

1. Background of 3- 4 years in food security/livelihood interventions
2. Evidence of 3 to 4 food security survey work in vulnerable environment (such as pastoralist areas)
3. Lead consultant must have masters in social sciences, Dairy production or any other relevant discipline
4. Knowledge and experience in rural finance/Value chain
5. Knowledge and experience of local government and NGO capacity building including conflict issues
6. Good understanding of social-economic situation in Somalia.

How to apply:

Interested and qualified candidates should submit technical and financial proposals clearly stating their day rates, Consultants profiles and the Consultancy profile together with all the related standard application documents addressed to Head of Administration & HR via email address admin_hr@vsfg.org before the close of business on the **29th November, 2013**. Due to the urgency of the position, assessment of the proposals received will be on going. The advert closes as soon as the qualified proposal is confirmed.