

SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE – PART A
Final Evaluation of Food Security and Nutrition in Lao PDR
FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT 4 - Human Development and safety net
EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi
OPSYS reference number: SIEA-2018-6272

CONTRACTING AUTHORITY: THE EUROPEAN UNION DELEGATION TO LAO PDR

1	BACKGROUND	2
1.1	RELEVANT COUNTRY / REGION / SECTOR BACKGROUND.....	2
1.2	THE INTERVENTION TO BE EVALUATED	3
1.3	STAKEHOLDERS OF THE INTERVENTION	4
1.4	OTHER AVAILABLE INFORMATION	4
2	DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT	5
2.1	OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION	5
2.2	REQUESTED SERVICES.....	6
2.3	PHASES OF THE EVALUATION AND REQUIRED OUTPUTS.....	6
2.4	SPECIFIC CONTRACT ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY (TECHNICAL OFFER)	10
2.5	MANAGEMENT AND STEERING OF THE EVALUATION	11
3	LOGISTICS AND TIMING	12
3.1	PLANNING, INCLUDING THE PERIOD FOR NOTIFICATION FOR PLACEMENT OF THE STAFF	12
4	REQUIREMENTS.....	12
5	REPORTING	12
5.1	USE OF THE EVAL MODULE BY THE EVALUATORS.....	12
5.2	NUMBER OF REPORT COPIES.....	13
5.3	FORMATTING OF REPORTS.....	13
6	MONITORING AND EVALUATION	13
6.1	CONTENT, TIMING AND SUBMISSION	13
6.2	COMMENTS ON THE OUTPUTS	13
6.3	ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	13
7	PRACTICAL INFORMATION	13
	ANNEX I: SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	14
	ANNEX II: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM.....	15
	ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	16
	ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE	18
	ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID.....	19
	ANNEX VI: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED ACTION(S)	23
	ANNEX VII: THE EVALUATION CRITERIA	25
	GUIDANCE TO THE PART B.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

1 BACKGROUND

Over the years, the EU approach to nutrition has become more comprehensive going beyond the rural development and food and nutrition security. Indeed the emphasis under the EU Multi-Indicative-

Planning 2014-2020 is on the improvement of nutrition in Lao PDR focusing on the nutrition governance, nutrition specific interventions, and nutrition sensitive support including increased food production, food diversification, gender, WASH. Furthermore the priorities are also to promote a sustainable food security system resilient to increasing climate change-related challenges.

1.1 Relevant country and sector background

Lao PDR is a lower middle-income country with a GDP per capita of US\$2,460 (2018). The country has a population of about 7 million of whom over a third (36.7 per cent) are under 15 years and only 3.7 per cent are 65 or over. The economy has seen significant growth with GDP growth averaging 7.7 per cent over the last decade, however, the impact of COVID has declined growth rate. From the assessment of the impact of COVID on children and adolescent, the economy is projected to shrink to less than 3% or in the worst case -1.3%. The Government is seeking to maintain macroeconomic stability by taking actions to improve domestic revenue collection, controlling expenditure, and strengthening public debt management, including fiscal consolidation leading to a reduction in the annual budget deficit. The current limited revenues being collected by the Government, combined with the tenure of loan commitments and debt service payments will place adverse strains on the public finance in the short to medium term.

Lao PDR has made positive progress in improving the food and nutrition security in last decade, mainly driven by rapid economic growth and many successful social, food and nutrition policies and programmes.

The production and supply of food in society, especially rice, during 2015-2020 was enough to guarantee national food security, and to provide a basis for improved livelihoods and poverty reduction of the people; however, an attention should be paid to other production such as crops, vegetables, livestock... to ensure the variety of diets of population. The progress on food and nutrition has been made that the stunting and underweight rates declined from 44.2% and 26.6% in 2011 to 33% and 21.1% in 2017. At province level, stunting and underweight prevalence remains high. Some provinces those rates are more than 40% and 25% respectively (LSIS II). Children in rural areas without roads, those whose mothers have no education and from ethnic minorities and poorest quintile are 2-3 times more likely to suffer from stunting than children in urban settings, with educated mothers, and those from the richest quintile.¹ While the total number of stunted children fell to 257,000 in 2017, a further reduction to 173,000 cases is required within next five years if the World Health Assembly Global Target of 40% reduction in the number of stunted children is to be achieved.³ Currently, the achievement of the target is under serious threat from potential increase in stunting as a result of food insecurity and declining access to services caused by the on-going covid-19 pandemic.

Although the government legal framework¹ developments in place and the favourable momentum towards nutrition, the actual implementation is still facing challenges, which are mainly related to the need of nutrition governance with a complex multi sectorial response. Indeed fragmentation among the different nutrition sensitive sectors is still an issue such as the multi-sectoral coordination at all level, sector policy linkages, and M&E framework, public investment and tracking the expenses on nutrition.

¹ the National Plan of Action for Nutrition 2016-2020

1.2 The Intervention to be evaluated²

Title of the Intervention to be evaluated	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Food Security and Nutrition in Lao PDR
Budget of the Intervention to be evaluated	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 3 290 000
CRIS and / or OPSYS number of the Intervention to be evaluated	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• n° DCI-FOOD/2013/023-724
Dates of the Intervention to be evaluated	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Start: 26/12/2014• End: 26/09/2023

The Food Security and Nutrition programme was designed to assist the Government to achieve its commitments to the global and national agenda in combating the challenges of Food and Nutrition Security. The programme contributes to achieving the Millennium Development Goals and the National Strategy and Plan of Action for Nutrition in Lao PDR. Under this programme, one grant contract was awarded to the NGO consortium to implement the action in Khammouane Province. The grant was rewarded through a call proposal with a reference number EuropeAid/153320/DD/ACT/LA, which was composed of the two programmes namely Food Security and Nutrition and Partnership for Improved Nutrition in Lao PDR.

The specific focus of the programme is to improve the Food and nutrition security of the poor population in target villages and households of ethnic groups to be able to access to nutritious food, hygiene and sanitation, particularly women and children under five years old. The strengthening capacity of government counterparts, stakeholders and communities involved was also the crucial part of the programme to ensure the technology transfer, knowhow and the sustainability.

The programme implements the government strategies including the 8th National Social Economic Development Plan, National Nutrition Strategy and Plan of Action 2016-2020 as well as the Plans of Sectors concerned, particularly Agriculture and Health to enhance the food and nutrition security, to eradicate the poverty, and to improve the access to the social services by the ethnic communities in remote and isolated areas as well as the communities at risk in natural disasters.

The Food Security and Nutrition in Lao PDR falls under the strategic priority 3 – addressing food security for the poor and vulnerable in fragile situations - of the Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP) Multi-Indicative Programme 2011-2013; and is in line with the EU policy framework to assist developing countries in addressing food security challenges³. The project fits well into both the 2007-2013 Country Strategic Programming (CSP) and the EC Multiannual Indicative Programme (MIP) for 2011-2013 for the Lao PDR.

The "*Food Security and Nutrition in Lao PDR under AAP 2013*" tackles the Food and Nutrition challenges, which is one of the government priorities. The Financing Agreement between the Government of Lao PDR and the EU was signed in December 2014. The programme aims at improving the food and nutrition security of the poor population in target villages and households in Central Lao PDR through the support of communities with food and nutrition security activities based on an approach linking relief with

² The term 'Action' is used throughout the report as a synonym of 'project and programme'.

³ COM(2010) 127 final

rehabilitation and development (LRRD). Action is in line with Government strategies in particular, the national multi-sectoral food and nutrition security action plan.

Action promotes pro-poor approaches, equality with regard to gender equality, rights of indigenous people and other ethnic groups, bottom-up participation and planning (community participation). The action intends to achieve three main expected results namely (1) Vulnerable communities are better prepared, capable and resilient to cope with recurring 'lean' seasons and external shocks, (2) Nutrition status is improved in vulnerable communities through linking nutrition security improvements to food security related improvements, and (3) Enhanced capacity of the Government at sub-national level to address food and nutrition insecurity.

The reduction in prevalence of stunting and the increase of average MUAC in children under-5 year olds are the key target groups. Furthermore, the increase of women between 15 and 40 years of age with adequate BMI is the key targets. The increase of average number of food items in daily diet, the increase of consuming three meals a day in the hungry season, increase in ownership of productive assets at household level are the priority groups.

During the implementation of the action, gender equality activities have been sensitised over the project areas. Many ethnic communities reported that their husbands help household work, while some communities faced the challenge of the women workloads.

1.3 Stakeholders of the Intervention

The main target groups and final beneficiaries of the overall Programme are children under 5 years old, pregnant and lactating women and adolescent girls (aged 15-40) from poor households from the target districts in Khammuane Province.

Government at provincial, district and village level from the agricultural, health and education sector are direct beneficiaries of the proposed action. Non-profit making organisations are also the main partners to implement the interventions at province, district and village level. Non-profit making organisations are instrumental in supporting the government and contribute to those areas, where the government capacity may appear insufficient. Their role in capacity building of the government may enable government to increase their role and input regarding food security and nutrition.

The private sector may be a target group for instance related to value chain development, post harvesting techniques and food processing. Good results have been achieved for instance with small rice mills at community level to decrease rice milling losses. The implementers should encourage any hydropower, mining, or agribusiness entity that operates in the target area to contribute financially to the project as the project may potentially support farmers who have suffered (been resettled or had land taken away from them) from the creation of the business entity

1.4 Other available information

A ROM mission took place in March 2021 for the level of contract/project. Main conclusions and recommendations are in annex VIII.

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

Type of evaluation	Final evaluation
Coverage	Food Security and Nutrition in Lao PDR
Geographic scope	Lao PDR: Khammouane Province
Period to be evaluated	26/12/2014 – 31/08/2021

2.1 Objectives of the evaluation

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority⁴ of the European Commission⁵. The focus of evaluations is on the **assessment of achievements**, the **quality** and the **results**⁶ of Interventions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy with an increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the implementation of the SDGs**.⁷

From this perspective, evaluations should **look for evidence of why, whether or how these results are linked to the EU intervention** and seek **to identify the factors driving or hindering progress**.

Evaluations should provide an understanding of the **cause and effect links** among: inputs and activities, and outputs, outcomes and impacts. Evaluations should serve accountability, decision making, learning and management purposes.

The main objectives of this evaluation are to provide the relevant services of the European Union, and the interested stakeholders with:

- an overall independent assessment of the past performance of the Food Security and Nutrition in Lao PDR, paying particular attention to its results measured against its expected objectives; and the reasons underpinning such results;
- key lessons learned, conclusions and related recommendations in order to improve future Interventions.

In particular, this final evaluation will find out the concrete best practices, challenges, and coordination among the members of consortium and the coordination between the consortium and the government counterparts at sub-national level and other government stakeholders involved in the Action. The evaluation will assess the enabling factors that hamper a proper delivery of results.

⁴ COM(2013) 686 final "Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation – improving evaluation" - http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf; EU Financial regulation (art 27); Regulation (EC) No 1905/2000; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008

⁵ SEC (2007)213 "Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation", https://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf; SWD (2015)111 "Better Regulation Guidelines", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf; COM(2017) 651 final 'Completing the Better Regulation Agenda: Better solutions for better results', https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/completing-the-better-regulation-agenda-better-solutions-for-better-results_en.pdf

⁶ Reference is made to the entire results chain, covering outputs, outcomes and impacts. Cfr. Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 "Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action" - https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014_cir.pdf

⁷ The New European Consensus on Development 'Our World, Our Dignity, Our Future', Official Journal 30th of June 2017. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2017:210:TOC>

The main users of this evaluation will be the EU Delegation to Lao PDR, and other stakeholders (the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, the Ministry of Health, among others) that are involved in the implementation of the Action to be evaluated.

2.2 Requested services

2.2.1 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will assess the Intervention using the six standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. In addition, the evaluation will assess one EU specific evaluation criterion, which is:

- the EU added value (the extent to which the Intervention brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only);

The definition of the 6 DAC + 1 EU evaluation criteria is contained for reference in the Annex VII.

The evaluation team shall furthermore consider whether gender, environment and climate change were mainstreamed; the relevant SDGs and their interlinkages were identified; the principle of Leave No-One Behind and the rights-based approach methodology was followed in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the Intervention, its governance and monitoring.

2.2.2 Issues to be addressed

The specific issues to be addressed as formulated below are indicative. Based on the latter and following initial consultations and document analysis, the evaluation team will discuss them with the Evaluation Manager⁸ and propose in their Inception Report a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions with indication of specific Judgement Criteria and Indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

Once agreed through the approval of the Inception Report, the Evaluation Questions will become contractually binding.

The main concerns are the delays in the start of the physical implementation of the action, the modality of implementation for the consortium, the synergy with other EU funded projects and other donors' initiatives. Other fears are the implementation of the recommendations issued by ROM mission and the preliminary indications about achievement of results and key factors impacting (positively or negatively) their likelihood to deliver what expected by the end of their life. The gender mainstreaming in the design, execution, and management of action is also the priority to be look at during the assessment.

2.3 Phases of the evaluation and required outputs

The evaluation process will be carried out in three phases:

- Inception
- Field
- Synthesis

The outputs of each phase are to be submitted at the end of the corresponding phases as specified in the synoptic table in section 2.3.1.

The translation/interpretation services will be required for all phases.

⁸ The Evaluation Manager is the staff of the Contracting Authority managing the evaluation contract. In most cases this person will be the Operational manager of the Action(s) under evaluation.

2.3.1 Synoptic table

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted within each phase and lists the outputs to be produced by the team as well as the key meetings with the Contracting Authority and the Reference Group. The main content of each output is described in Chapter 5

Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Outputs and <i>meetings</i>
<u>Inception Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial document/data collection • In-depth document analysis (focused on the Evaluation Questions) • Background analysis • Inception interviews • Stakeholder analysis • Reconstruction of the Intervention Logic, and description of the Theory of Change (based upon available documentation and interviews) • Identification of information gaps and of hypotheses to be tested in the field phase • Methodological design of the evaluation (Evaluation Questions with judgement criteria, indicators and methods of data collection and analysis) and evaluation matrix 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Kick-off meeting with the Contracting Authority and the Reference Group</i> face-to-face with expert in country (Laos) and via remote conference with expert outside the country. • Inception report • Slide presentation of the Inception Report
<u>Field Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gathering of primary evidence with the use of interviews, focus groups, and any other relevant tool • Data collection and analysis (linked to the hypotheses to be tested in the field and in view of filling the gaps) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Initial meetings at country level with the contracting authority, project team, implementing partners, stakeholders such as government counterparts at all levels, communities, etc.</i> • Intermediary Note. • Slide Presentation of key findings of the field phase • <i>Debriefing with the Reference Group: the EU Delegation face-to-face for the expert in country and via remote conference for the expert outside the Laos</i>

Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Outputs and <i>meetings</i>
<u>Synthesis phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final analysis of findings (with focus on the Evaluation Questions) • Formulation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations • Reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Final Report • Executive Summary according to the standard template published in the EVAL module • Final Report • Slide presentation • <i>Meeting with Reference Group: with the EU Delegation face-to-face for the expert in country and via remote conference for the expert outside Laos.</i> • Brochure/brief: 4 pages of the key achievements, lessons learned, challenges of the actions and recommendations and way forwards for similar initiatives, particularly for the Ministry of Health, and Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.

2.3.2 Inception Phase

This phase aims at structuring the evaluation and clarifying the key issues to be addressed.

The phase will start with a kick-off session in Vientiane between the EU Delegation to Lao PDR and the evaluators. The expert, who is not in country, may remotely join the exercise. Half-day presence of the whole team (if possible) is required. The meeting aims at arriving at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility. It also serves to clarify expectations regarding evaluation outputs, the methodology to be used and, where necessary, to pass on additional or latest relevant information.

In the Inception phase, the relevant documents will be reviewed (see annex II)

Further to a first desk review of the technical/cooperation framework of EU support to Food and Nutrition Security in Lao PDR, the evaluation team, in consultation with the Evaluation Manager, will reconstruct the Intervention Logic of the Intervention to be evaluated.

Furthermore, based on the Intervention Logic, the evaluators will develop a narrative explanation of the logic of the Intervention that describes how change is expected to happen within the Intervention, all along its results chain, i.e. Theory of Change. This explanation includes an assessment of the evidence underpinning this logic (especially between outputs and outcomes, and between outcomes and impact), and articulates the assumptions that must hold for the Intervention to work, as well as identification of the factors most likely to inhibit the change from happening.

Based on the Intervention Logic and the Theory of Change the evaluators will finalise i) the Evaluation Questions with the definition of judgement criteria and indicators, the selection of data collection tools and sources, ii) the evaluation methodology, and iii) the planning of the following phases.

The methodological approach will be represented in an Evaluation Design Matrix⁹, which will be included in the Inception Report. The **methodology of the evaluation should be gender sensitive, contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and demonstrate how actions have contributed to progress on gender equality.**

The limitations faced or to be faced during the evaluation exercise will be discussed and mitigation measures described in the Inception Report. Finally, the work plan for the overall evaluation process will be presented and agreed in this phase; this work plan shall be in line with that proposed in the present ToR. Any modifications shall be justified and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.

The kick-off meeting with stakeholders should be organized in both in-person and online, with visual IT support along with simultaneous translation during the meeting. The evaluation experts should coordinate with the National Nutrition Committee Secretariat to facilitate in organising the kick-off meeting and ensure the key stakeholders participate in the meeting.

On the basis of the information collected, the evaluation team should prepare an **Inception Report**; its content is described in Chapter 5 **Error! Reference source not found.**

2.3.3 Field Phase

The Field Phase starts after approval of the Inception Report by the Evaluation Manager.

In the first days of the field phase, the evaluation team shall hold a briefing meeting with the programme manager of the EU Delegation and the EU management prior to conducting the meeting with other relevant stakeholders such as project team, government authorities at national and sub-national level, etc.

During the field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; with the relevant government (such as provincial and district agriculture offices, provincial and district health offices - the list will be provided in due time) authorities and agencies. Throughout the mission the evaluation team will use the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respect the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments.

At the end of the field phase, the evaluation team will summarise its work, analyse the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present preliminary findings in a meeting with the EU Delegation.

At the end of the Field Phase an **Intermediary Note** a Slide Presentation will be prepared; its content is described in Chapter 5.

2.3.4 Synthesis Phase

This phase is devoted to the preparation by the contractor of **two distinct documents**: the **Executive Summary** and the **Final Report**, whose structures are described in the Annex III; it entails the analysis of the data collected during the desk and field phases to answer the Evaluation Questions and preparation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

The evaluation team will present, in a single Report with Annexes, their findings, conclusions and recommendations in accordance with the structure in Annex III; a separate Executive Summary will be produced as well, following the compulsory format given in the EVAL module (see Annex III).

The evaluation team will make sure that:

⁹ *The Evaluation Matrix is a tool to structure the evaluation analysis (by defining judgement criteria and indicators for each evaluation question). It helps also to consider the most appropriate and feasible data collection method for each of the questions,*

- Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic and clearly targeted.
- When drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.
- The wording, inclusive of the abbreviations used, takes into account the audience as identified in art. 2.1 above.

The evaluation team will deliver and then present in Vientiane for the expert that is based in country and via teleconference for the expert is outside Laos the **Draft Final Report** to the Reference Group to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations. Half day of presence of whole team is required. The half-day workshop will be conducted on both presence and online approaches for all the relevant stakeholders (max. 50 persons + interpreters). The relevant visual support and simultaneous translation during the meeting will be prepared by the evaluation experts. The costs of organising the workshop (venue, lunch, refreshments; materials, translation and other logistics) should be part of the offer. The copies of the presentations, and necessary documents have to be produced and delivered to the participants.

The Evaluation Manager consolidates the comments expressed by the Reference Group members and sends them to the evaluation team for the report revision, together with a first version of the Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) assessing the quality of the Draft Final Report. The content of the QAG will be discussed with the evaluation team to verify if further improvements are required, and the evaluation team will be invited to comment on the conclusions formulated in the QAG (through the EVAL Module).

The evaluation team will then finalise the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary** by addressing the relevant comments. While potential quality issues, factual errors or methodological problems should be corrected, comments linked to diverging judgements may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluation team must explain the reasons in writing. After approval of the final report, the QAG will be updated and sent to the evaluators via EVAL Module.

All documents will be written in English. The length of the final main report should not exceed 50 pages including the Executive summary. Additional information should be included in the annexes.

The final evaluation report will be provided only on a non-editable digital version (USB key support), and will include the report the executive summary in English and translation into Lao and all annexes, in 5 units.

A production of a brief should also be made to compose the results of evaluation, which includes but not limits to the key achievements, lessons learned, challenges of the action and way forwards to implement a similar initiative for the Ministry of Health and Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. The leaflet/brochure to be produced for dissemination purposes shall be no longer than four pages, including any relevant visual/graphic support (the offer must be based on 1000 units printed).

2.4 Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology (Technical offer)

The invited Framework Contractors will submit their specific Contract Organisation and Methodology by using the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i and its annexes 1 and 2 (B-VII-d-ii).

The evaluation methodology proposed to undertake the assignment will be described in the Chapter 3 (Strategy and timetable of work) of the template B-VII-d-i. Contractors will describe how their proposed methodology will address the cross-cutting issues mentioned in these Terms of Reference and notably gender equality and the empowerment of women. This will include (if applicable) the communication action messages, materials and management structures.

By derogation of what is specified in the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i, the maximum length of the specific Contract Organisation and Methodology is 7 pages, written in Times New Roman 12 or Arial size 11, single interline, excluding the framework contractor's own annexes (maximum length of such annexes: 3 pages), additional to the Annexes foreseen as part of the present Specific ToRs. The timetable is not accounted and may be presented on an A3 page

A methodology that includes a field verification component:

The final evaluation requires a physical verification on the ground. A consultant has to conduct the field work at the project site to assess the results and achievements of the action. At least two target districts and four communities should be visited to collect the primary information on the programme progress, achievements, challenges, etc.

The translation/interpretation services will be required for the mission. The interpretation would be needed for both physical field visit at sub-national and at meetings and interview on the offline and online modalities.

A methodology adaptive to travel restrictions:

An administrative arrangement/approval of the international and in-country traveling may also be required during the assignment. A consultant may require to have an evidence of complete vaccination against Covid-19 along with them while travelling on the mission.

A methodology adapted to Covid-19:

Due to the Covid pandemic and the compliance with the travelling restrictions for an expert, who may be based outside the country of assignment, would remotely conduct the final evaluation exercise. The following weblinks provides some guidance for the methodological adaptation: <https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/devco-ess> and https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/theme/MandE_technology_insecure_settings

The experts are required to fully complete the quarantine for 14 days when entering in the country of assignment before conducting the field work. The detailed Lao Government's travelling restrictions can be found: <https://www.covid19.gov.la/index.php>

2.5 Management and Steering of the evaluation

2.5.1 At the EU level

The evaluation is managed by the Evaluation Manager of the EUD; the progress of the evaluation will be followed closely with the assistance of a Reference Group consisting of members of EU Services with the government bodies concerned including the Ministry of Health and Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.

The main functions of the Reference Group are:

- To define and validate the Evaluation Questions.
- To facilitate contacts between the evaluation team and the EU services and external stakeholders.
- To ensure that the evaluation team has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the Intervention.

- To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team. Comments by individual group members are compiled into a single document by the Evaluation Manager and subsequently transmitted to the evaluation team.
- To assist in feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation.
- To support the development of a proper follow-up action plan after completion of the evaluation.

2.5.2 At the Contractor level

Further to the Requirements set in the art. 6 of the Global Terms of Reference and in the Global Organisation and Methodology, respectively annexes II and III of the Framework contract SIEA 2018, the contractor is responsible for the quality of: the process; the evaluation design; the inputs and the outputs of the evaluation. In particular, it will:

- Support the Team Leader in its role, mainly from a team management perspective. In this regard, the contractor should make sure that, for each evaluation phase, specific tasks and outputs for each team member are clearly defined and understood.
- Provide backstopping and quality control of the evaluation team's work throughout the assignment.
- Ensure that the evaluators are adequately resourced to perform all required tasks within the time framework of the contract.

3 LOGISTICS AND TIMING

Please refer to Part B of the Terms of Reference.

3.1 Planning, including the period for notification for placement of the staff¹⁰

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill in the timetable in the Annex IV (to be finalised in the Inception Report). The 'Indicative dates' are not to be formulated as fixed dates but rather as days (or weeks, or months) from the beginning of the assignment (to be referenced as '0').

Sufficient forward planning is to be taken into account in order to ensure the active participation and consultation with government representatives, national / local or other stakeholders.

4 REQUIREMENTS

Please refer to Part B of the Terms of Reference.

5 REPORTS

For the list of reports, please refer to Part B of the Terms of Reference.

5.1 Use of the EVAL module by the evaluators

It is strongly recommended that the **submission of deliverables** by the selected contractor **be performed through their uploading in the EVAL Module**, an evaluation process management tool and repository of the European Commission. The selected contractor will receive access to online and offline guidance in order to operate with the module during the related Specific contract validity.

¹⁰ As per art 16.4 a) of the General Conditions of the Framework Contract SIEA

5.2 Number of report copies

Apart from their submission -preferably via the EVAL Module-, the approved version of the Final Report will be also provided in one (1) paper copy and in electronic versions (pdf and word) at no extra cost.

5.3 Formatting of reports

All reports will be produced using Font Arial or Times New Roman minimum letter size 11 and 12 respectively, single spacing, double sided. They will be sent in Word and PDF formats.

6 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

6.1 Content of reporting

The outputs must match quality standards. The text of the reports should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables; a map of the area(s) of Intervention is required (to be attached as Annex).

6.2 Comments on the outputs

For each report, the Evaluation Manager will send to the Contractor consolidated comments received from the Reference Group or the approval of the report within 10 calendar days. The revised reports addressing the comments shall be submitted within 10 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for not integrating certain comments, if this is the case.

6.3 Assessment of the quality of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

The quality of the draft versions of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager using the online Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) in the EVAL Module (text provided in Annex V). The Contractor is given – through the EVAL module - the possibility to comment on the assessments formulated by the Evaluation Manager. The QAG will then be reviewed following the submission of the final version of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary.

The compilation of the QAG will support/inform the compilation by the Evaluation Manager of the FWC SIEA's Specific Contract Performance Evaluation.

7 PRACTICAL INFORMATION

Please address any request for clarification and other communication to the following address(es):
DELEGATION LAOS FCS delegation-laos-fcs@eeas.europa.eu

ANNEXES TO TOR - PART A

ANNEX I: SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Request for Services n. SIEA-2018-6272

FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT 4 - Human Development and safety net

EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi

1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Contracting Authority selects the offer with the best value for money using an 80/20 weighting between technical quality and price¹¹.

Technical quality is evaluated on the basis of the following grid:

Criteria	Maximum
<i>Total score for Organisation and Methodology</i>	50
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Understanding of ToR and the aim of the services to be provided	10
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, appropriate mix of tools and estimate of difficulties and challenges	25
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Technical added value, backstopping and role of the involved members of the consortium	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Organisation of tasks including timetable	10
<i>Score for the expertise of the proposed team</i>	50
<i>OVERALL TOTAL SCORE</i>	100

2. TECHNICAL THRESHOLD

Any offer falling short of the technical threshold of 75 out of 100 points, is automatically rejected.

3. INTERVIEWS DURING THE EVALUATION OF THE OFFERS

During the evaluation process of the offers received the Contracting Authority reserves the right to interview by phone one or several members of the proposed evaluation teams.

Phone interviews will be tentatively carried out during the period of offers evaluation, tentatively on the second half of September 2021.

¹¹ For more details about the 80/20 rule, please see the PRAG, chapter 3.3.10.5 - https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/funding/about-funding-and-procedures/procedures-and-practical-guide-prag_en

ANNEX II: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM

- Legal texts and political commitments pertaining to the Intervention(s) to be evaluated
- Country Strategy Paper for Lao PDR and Indicative Programmes (and equivalent) for the periods covered
- Relevant national / sector policies and plans from National and Local partners and other donors
- Intervention identification studies
- Intervention feasibility / formulation studies
- Intervention financing agreement and addenda
- Intervention's quarterly and annual progress reports, and technical reports
- European Commission's Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Reports, and other external and internal monitoring reports of the Intervention
- Intervention's mid-term evaluation report and other relevant evaluations, audit, reports
- Relevant documentation from National/Local partners and other donors
- Guidance for Gender sensitive evaluations
- Calendar and minutes of all the meeting of the Steering Committee of the Intervention(s)
- Any other relevant document

Note: The evaluation team has to identify and obtain any other document worth analysing, through independent research and during interviews with relevant informed parties and stakeholders of the Intervention.

ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The contractor will deliver – **preferably through their uploading in the EVAL Module - two distinct documents**: the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary**. They must be consistent, concise and clear and free of linguistic errors both in the original version and in their translation – if foreseen.

The Final Report should not be longer than the number of pages indicated in Chapter 6. Additional information on the overall context of the Intervention, description of methodology and analysis of findings should be reported in an Annex to the main text.

The presentation must be properly spaced and the use of clear graphs, tables and short paragraphs is strongly recommended.

The cover page of the Final Report shall carry the following text:

"This evaluation is supported and guided by the European Commission and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the European Commission".

Executive Summary

A short, tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations. It is to be prepared by using the specific format foreseen in the EVAL Module.

The main sections of the evaluation report shall be as follows:

1. Introduction

A description of the Intervention, of the relevant country/region/sector background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant.

2. Answered questions / Findings

A chapter presenting the answers to the Evaluation Questions, supported by evidence and reasoning.

3. Overall assessment (*optional*)

A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the Intervention. The detailed structure of the overall assessment should be refined during the evaluation process. The relevant chapter has to articulate all the findings, conclusions and lessons in a way that reflects their importance and facilitates the reading. The structure should not follow the Evaluation Questions, the logical framework or the evaluation criteria.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.3 Lessons learnt

Lessons learnt generalise findings and translate past experience into relevant knowledge that should support decision making, improve performance and promote the achievement of better results. Ideally, they should support the work of both the relevant European and partner institutions.

4.1 Conclusions

This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.

In order to allow better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission, a table organising the conclusions by order of importance can be presented, or a paragraph or sub-chapter emphasizing the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.

4.2 Recommendations

They are intended to improve or reform the Intervention in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new Intervention for the next cycle.

Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, and carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure.

5. Annexes to the report

The report should include the following annexes:

- The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
- The names of the evaluators (CVs can be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
- Detailed evaluation methodology including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations; detail of tools and analyses.
- Evaluation Matrix
- Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated)
- Relevant geographic map(s) where the Intervention took place
- List of persons/organisations consulted
- Literature and documentation consulted
- Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures, matrix of evidence, databases) as relevant
- Detailed answer to the Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators

ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE

This annex must be included by Framework Contractors in their Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology and forms an integral part of it. Framework Contractors can add as many rows and columns as needed.

The phases of the evaluation shall reflect those indicated in the present Terms of Reference.

		Indicative Duration in working days ¹²		
Activity	Location	Team Leader	Evaluator ...	Indicative Dates
Inception phase: total days				
•				
•				
•				
•				
Field phase: total days				
•				
•				
Synthesis phase: total days				
•				
•				
•				
•				
TOTAL working days (maximum)				

¹² Add one column per each evaluator

ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

The quality of the Final Report will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager (since the submission of the draft Report and Executive Summary) using the following quality assessment grid, which is included **in the EVAL Module**; the grid will be shared with the evaluation team, which will have the possibility to include their comments.

Intervention (Project/Programme) evaluation – Quality Assessment Grid Final Report

Evaluation data			
Evaluation title			
Evaluation managed by		Type of evaluation	
Ref. of the evaluation contract		EVAL ref.	
Evaluation budget			
EUD/Unit in charge		Evaluation Manager	
Evaluation dates	Start:		End:
Date of draft final report		Date of Response of the Services	
Comments			
Project data			
Main project evaluated			
CRIS/OPSYS # of evaluated project(s)			
DAC Sector			
Contractor's details			
Evaluation Team Leader		Evaluation Contractor	
Evaluation expert(s)			

Legend: scores and their meaning

Very satisfactory: criterion entirely fulfilled in a clear and appropriate way

Satisfactory: criterion fulfilled

Unsatisfactory: criterion partly fulfilled

Very unsatisfactory: criterion mostly not fulfilled or absent

The evaluation report is assessed as follows

1. Clarity of the report

This criterion analyses the extent to which both the Executive Summary and the Final Report:

- Are easily readable, understandable and accessible to the relevant target readers
- Highlight the key messages
- The length of the various chapters and annexes of the Report are well balanced
- Contain relevant graphs, tables and charts facilitating understanding
- Contain a list of acronyms (only the Report)
- Avoid unnecessary duplications
- Have been language checked for unclear formulations, misspelling and grammar errors
- The Executive Summary is an appropriate summary of the full report and is a free-standing document



Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

2. Reliability of data and robustness of evidence

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Data/evidence was gathered as defined in the methodology
- The report considers, when relevant, evidence from EU and/or other partners' relevant studies, monitoring reports and/or evaluations
- The report contains a clear description of the limitations of the evidence, the risks of bias and the mitigating measures



Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

3. Validity of Findings

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Findings derive from the evidence gathered
- Findings address all selected evaluation criteria
- Findings result from an appropriate triangulation of different, clearly identified sources



- When assessing the effect of the EU intervention, the findings describe and explain the most relevant cause/effect links between outputs, outcomes and impacts
- The analysis of evidence is comprehensive and takes into consideration contextual and external factors

Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

4. Validity of conclusions

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Conclusions are logically linked to the findings, and go beyond them to provide a comprehensive analysis
- Conclusions appropriately address the selected evaluation criteria and all the evaluation questions, including the relevant cross-cutting dimensions
- Conclusions take into consideration the various stakeholder groups of the evaluation
- Conclusions are coherent and balanced (i.e. they present a credible picture of both strengths and weaknesses), and are free of personal or partisan considerations
- (If relevant) whether the report indicates when there are not sufficient findings to conclude on specific issues



Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

5. Usefulness of recommendations

This criterion analyses the extent to which the recommendations:

- Are clearly linked to and derive from the conclusions
- Are concrete, achievable and realistic
- Are targeted to specific addressees
- Are clustered (if relevant), prioritised, and possibly time-bound
- (If relevant) provide advice for the Intervention's exit strategy, post-Intervention sustainability or for adjusting Intervention's design or plans



Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

6. Appropriateness of lessons learnt analysis (if requested by the ToR or included by the evaluators)

This criterion is to be assessed only when requested by the ToR or included by evaluators and is not to be scored. It analyses the extent to which:



- Lessons are identified
- When relevant, they are generalised in terms of wider relevance for the institution(s)

Strengths	Weaknesses	
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
Final comments on the overall quality of the report		Overall score

ANNEX VI: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED ACTION

1. DCI-FOOD/2013/023-724 Indicative Result Matrix

Appendix I .INDICATIVE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROJECT				
	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable Indicators of achievement (targets will be determined by the baseline survey)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
Overall objective	Contribute to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 1 in Lao PDR	Progress in achieving MDG1 in the target province by 2015 and prolongation of the trend after 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MDG Reports • LECS Surveys • MICS Surveys 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuous commitment of government
Specific objective	Food and nutrition security of the poor population in target villages and households in central Lao PDR improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of reduction of prevalence in child stunting under 5 years old in target villages by the end of the implementation phase • % increase average number of food items in daily diet in targeted households by the end of the project implementation phase • % of increase of households in target villages consuming three meals a day in the hungry season by the end of the project implementation phase • % of women between 15 and 40 years of age with adequate BMI in target villages by the end of the project implementation phase • % of increase of average MUAC in under-5 year olds in target villages by the end of the project implementation phase • % of increase in ownership of productive assets at household level in target villages by the end of the implementation phase 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LECS/LSIS Surveys • Surveys from development partners • Project baseline and impact survey • Data from village health centres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic and social stability in the target province • Absence of natural or man-made disasters
Expected results	1. Vulnerable communities are better prepared, capable and resilient to cope with recurring 'lean' seasons and external shocks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % increase of farmers from targeted villages having diversified crop production with at least X new agricultural production activity(ies) by the end of the project implementation period • % of target group villagers who are able to sell excess produce by the end of the project implementation period • % of target group villagers who are able to buy necessary food items to complete healthy diet by the end of the project implementation period • % of villagers have increased their productive household assets by at least ...% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project progress reports • Baseline and impact study • Needs assessment report • Other studies in the area • Field visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Villages and communities have sufficient land access • Government at district level supports project activities • Communities take on responsibility for shared production • No major disasters like flooding, drought, typhoons or rodent infestation

<p>2. Nutrition status is improved in vulnerable communities through linking nutrition security improvements to food security related improvements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of target villagers demonstrate improved WASH and hygiene practices by the end of the project implementation phase • % of target villagers having increased on average the number of consumed food group items per day by at least X throughout the year by the end of the project implementation phase (dietary diversity score) • % of children between 1 and 5 having increased on average their consumption of food group items per day by at least X throughout the year by the end of the project implementation period (dietary diversity score) • % of pregnant and breastfeeding mothers having increased on average their consumption of food group items per day by at least X throughout the year by the end of the project implementation period (dietary diversity score) • % of target villagers display increased knowledge on healthy nutrition (measured through KAP survey) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline and impact study • Project progress reports • Other studies in the area • Field visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient and diversified food available from improved agricultural production • Villagers are willing and able to attend nutrition education training
<p>3. Enhanced capacity of the Government at sub-national level to address food and nutrition insecurity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of coordination activities between agricultural and nutrition sector at provincial and district level • Number of documents at provincial level reflecting prioritisation of the link between food security and nutrition • Number of inter-institutional cooperation fora reflecting baseline and impact survey data, project results and lessons learned • Number of line ministries and mass organisations attending meeting reflecting the project results and lessons learned • % of agriculture, health and education staff at province and district level is using knowledge from trainings, guidelines and manuals (including WASH and health issues) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy documents from various ministries • Action plans from government at national and province level • Distribution list survey report • Meeting minutes with government and other development partners • Project progress reports • Other studies in the area • Training reports and training evaluations (before and after) • Field visits • Government reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food security policies and strategies of government and other development partners remain focused on nutrition • Government staff willing, committed and able to participate in nutrition and food security related activities • Limited staff turnover at district and village level

ANNEX VII: THE EVALUATION CRITERIA

The definition and the number of the DAC evaluation criteria has changed following the release (10 December 2019) of the document “Evaluation Criteria: Adapted Definitions and Principles for Use” (DCD/DAC(2019)58/FINAL).

The evaluators will ensure that their analysis will respect the new definitions of these criteria and their explanatory notes. Reference and guidance documents are being developed and can be found here: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

Unless otherwise specified in the chapter 2.2.1, the evaluation will assess the Intervention using the six standard DAC evaluation criteria and the EU added value, which is a specific EU evaluation criterion. Their definitions are reported below:

DAC CRITERIA

- **Relevance:** the “extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries’, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.”
- **Coherence:** the “compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.”
- **Effectiveness:** the “extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.”
- **Efficiency:** the “extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.”
- **Impact:** the “extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.”
- **Sustainability:** the “extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.”

EU-SPECIFIC CRITERION

- **EU added value:** the extent to which the Intervention brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only in the partner country. It directly stems from the principle of subsidiarity defined in the Article 5 of the Treaty on European Union (<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/7/the-principle-of-subsidiarity>).

ANNEX VIII: THE ROM REPORT OF CONTRACT/PROJECT

Conclusions	
N°	Conclusion
C1	Relevance: The intervention is highly relevant to the needs of target groups and beneficiaries. The presence of numerous other international stakeholders acting in similar thematic areas in the targeted province is a favourable factor for the relevance of the intervention, from a geographical and social perspective. The highly participatory approach adopted by the intervention has resulted in a visible high level of ownership among all beneficiaries and stakeholders. Local capacities have been utilised to maximise efficiency and effectiveness as well as to address the knowledge gaps that needed to be tackled.
C2	Coordination, complementarity and EU Added value: Complementarities and synergies with key governmental stakeholders and their development partners have been fully explored by the intervention. It has permitted the intervention to broaden its scope, maximise its resources as well as those of the EUD, as the interventions in its portfolio complement each other. Similarly, all possibilities to avoid duplication have been adequately explored and whenever possible, turned into opportunities for collaboration.
C3	Intervention logic, Monitoring & Learning: The success of the intervention relies mostly on its monitoring system. It is one of the intervention's key strengths that allows to compile a multitude of data for complex indicators. The intervention will not have problems demonstrating its success rate at the end of the execution period and justifying its adopted methodology. The use of a widely implemented formula for nutrition related interventions has contributed to this success. It is a proven recipe as long as from the very start of the intervention all stakeholders are made aware and are willing to participate in systematic regular data collection, from the final beneficiaries, intermediaries, to the regular analysis of the compounded data.
C4	Efficiency: The project has demonstrated to be highly efficient in spite of the initial long delays. Its cost efficiency can be rated high as it has also reached most of its indicators' targets within the foreseen timelines and sometimes earlier. It has made good progress and it is very likely that all planned activities will end on time. Nevertheless, the management set up, having virtually two operation managers, one for Outputs 2 and 3 and one for Output 1, is found to be unusual. Coordination is appropriate and satisfactory, but administrative accountability between Outputs does not happen at the field level. This has not hampered the implementation or affected the intervention's efficiency in any visible way. At 75% of expenditure with 83% of time elapsed, as of December 2020, it remains slightly behind in this area but it has continued to make advances since then and it is expected to catch up in the remaining months.
C5	Effectiveness: Progress towards outputs delivery and outcomes achievement is quite encouraging. Intervention monitoring data demonstrates the accomplishment of many of its targets, including those that have been revised. The intervention is on the way to reach the impact indicators' target, as preliminary data has already shown.
C6	Sustainability: As a consequence of its participatory approach from its design to the constant feedback from its stakeholders, sustainability prospects are likely to lead to enhanced resilience for target beneficiaries. Most of the inputs necessary to continue operating after the end of the intervention already exist in terms of knowledge, physical inputs, and the incentive by all parties to continue experiencing a higher quality of life. Necessary awareness levels that will enable WASH practices to continue to be applied, seem to be robust enough to allow the HHs to carry on with higher hygiene standards. Nevertheless, some of the delays occurred might affect the sustainability of the relevant outcomes, as the respective activities will be implemented at the very end of the execution period of the intervention. It is likely that there will not be sufficient time to make adjustments or to consolidate them and leave adequate time to promote ownership.
C7	Cross-cutting Issues: While the intervention targets women, young women and girls, there are no provisions at design level to include a gender strategy or to employ a gender specialist who could have provided a gender focus and perspective to most areas of intervention, including areas where gender might not seem relevant. Steps have been taken to address environmental issues as farmers are provided with the knowledge and encouraged to adhere to sustainable agricultural production systems involving the use of sustainable fertilizers and water saving techniques. Its participative approach to decision-making and equal access to its benefits qualifies it as a rights based approach intervention. It also contributes to EU climate change by adopting measures to reduce forest degradation and greenhouse emissions by providing alternatives to non-sustainable practices of non-timber food products extraction.
C8	Communication and Visibility: Central government authorities are well informed about the intervention's objectives and general strategy. Still, they do not seem to be as informed about the achievements and advances accomplished by the intervention. Provincial and district authorities are well informed about all aspects of the intervention. The intervention has made sound progress and has achieved many objectives that the central authorities would appreciate to acknowledge. This is particularly important, not only for the reputation of the Implementing Partners, but also for the visibility and positioning of the EU in the country's context.

Recommendations					
#	Linked to	Recommendation	To whom	Priority	Importance
R1	6	Consider shifting approach to increase communal ownership and a sense of individual responsibility to the direct beneficiaries of the activities which are planned to be implemented at the very end of the implementation period (Seedbanks and Producers' groups). Suggest Social handover ceremonies and/or other public display formats that could have the effect of self-policing. Assign accountability roles and self-monitoring systems that might increase the sustainability levels of these actions. Officialise "transfer of ownership" with relevant groups or relevant local authorities.	Implementing partners, PAFO	Short term	High
R2	7	For the remaining execution period, consider seeking expertise from a gender specialist who can bring a gender approach to some of the remaining activities and to help report through a gender perspective. It is considered important that for the final evaluation, gender is dealt with as a transversal theme, as much as possible. The intervention could consider preparing for this in advance.	Implementing partners	Short term	High
R3	8	Enhance efforts to communicate directly and more regularly with key central government authorities in Vientiane. Consider elaborating small hardcopy and yet informative briefs to relevant central government ministries like the Ministry of Health, Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, and others, for the few remaining months. Widen the visibility through the promotion of the achievements already accomplished, as soon as possible and not waiting until the very end of the execution period. Ponder providing short informative capsules addressed to key central government stakeholders. Coordinate the communication efforts with the EUD.	Country Directors in Vientiane, HPA and FPP, EUD	Short term	High

TERMS OF REFERENCE – PART B

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Benefitting Zone

Laos

2. Contracting authority

The European Union, represented by the European Commission, B-1049 Brussels, Belgium.

3. Contract language

English

LOCATION AND DURATION

4. Location

- **Key Expert 1: Team Leader:**
 - Normal place of posting of the specific assignment: Home-based
 - Mission(s) outside the normal place of posting and duration(s): N/A
- **Key Expert 2: Expert in country of assignment:**
 - Normal place of posting of the specific assignment: Vientiane Capital, Lao PDR
 - Mission(s) outside the normal place of posting and duration(s): Khammouane Province

5. Start date and period of implementation

The indicative start date is 01/11/2021 and the period of implementation of the contract will be 181 days from this date (indicative end date: 01/05/2022).

REQUIREMENTS

6. Expertise

For this assignment, one individual expert must be proposed for each position.

The expertise required for the implementation of the specific contract is detailed below.

- **Key Expert 1: Team Leader:**
 - General description of the position: The Team Leader leads the final evaluation of the Food Security and Nutrition Programme and ensure all required deliverables
 - Expert category: Cat. I (>12 years of experience)
 - Qualifications and skills required: • Graduate university degree (Master's degree or

equivalent qualification) in domain related to food security and nutrition, sustainable agriculture, social sciences, development economics or equivalent relevant, directly related area. • 12 years of experience in evaluation of programmes and projects (ex-ante, mid-term or ex-post) in the fields related to the ToRs; with at least 5 evaluations as Team Leader and at least 3 evaluations in South Asia. • Experience in food and/or nutrition public policy, and institutional capacity building at central and local levels.

- General professional experience: See above
 - Specific professional experience: See above
 - Language skills: Fluent in English - C2 level
 - Minimum number of working days: **29** days
 - Additional information: • The expert should have 6 years of experience in projects related to the TORs at grass-root level; • The expert shall have cumulatively done 6 evaluations in the fields related to the ToRs.
- **Key Expert 2: Expert in country of assignment:**
 - General description of the position: The expert has to be conducted the evaluation in the country of assignment
 - Expert category: Cat. II (>6 years of experience)
 - Qualifications and skills required: • University degree (minimum Bachelor degree or equivalent qualification) in domain related to food security and nutrition, agriculture, development studies or equivalent relevant. • At least 6 years of experience in Food and Nutrition Security with focus in the fields related to the ToRs; experience with EU funded projects will be an asset; • At least 6 years of experience in Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) systems with experience in the Logical Framework Approach.
 - General professional experience: See above
 - Specific professional experience: See above
 - Language skills: Fluent in English - C2 level
 - Minimum number of working days: **28** days
 - Additional information: The expert shall have cumulatively done 6 evaluations in the fields related to the ToRs.

7. Incidental expenditure

No incidental expenditure provided for in this contract.

8. Lump sums

No lump sums provided for in this contract.

9. Expenditure verification

No expenditure verification report is required.

10. Other details

No other details provided for in this contract.

REPORTS AND DELIVERABLES

11. Reports and deliverables requirements