**ANNEX B - TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**PROJECT EVALUATION**

**Project Title: Climate-Smart Agriculture and Market Development for Enhancing Livelihoods of Refugees and their Host Communities in Rwanda**

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation key information** |
| Title of the evaluation: | Project Evaluation of “Climate-Smart Agriculture and Market Development for Enhancing Livelihoods of Refugees and their Host Communities in Rwanda” |
| Project Implementation Locations  | 1.Nyamagabe District (Mushishito marshland covering Kigeme Refugee Camp), and2.Gatsibo District (Nyabicwamba marshland covering Nyabiheke Refugee Camp). |
| Overall Objective of the project | To improve the food security and self-reliance of 728 refugee and 1,155 host community households (over 7,500 individuals) through climate-smart agricultural practices and a market development approach. |
| Type of evaluation exercise: | Project Performance and Intermediate Impact Evaluation  |
| Evaluation commissioned by: | UNHCR Rwanda  |
| Date | 20th July 2023 |

# I. Introduction

## **Background and Context**

1. As of March 2023, Rwanda hosts 126,429 refugees (91% based in camps and 9% in urban areas). Most of the refugees are from the Democratic Republic of Congo (59,35%) and Burundi (40,02%). The Government of Rwanda (GoR) provides a favorable policy and protection environment for the refugees, allowing them the right to work, freedom of movement, access documentation, access to finance and register formally their businesses or properties
2. The Government of Rwanda (GoR) and UNHCR are committed to advancing the agenda of promoting refugees’ access to economic opportunities to improve self-reliance and reduce dependency on humanitarian assistance. In 2016, the GoR announced commitments including the promotion of economic opportunities for refugees. In addition, the GoR made pledges to the Global Refugee Forum (GRF) in Dec 2019, including promotion of joint agricultural projects between refugees and communities.
3. The Ministry in charge of Emergency Management (MINEMA) and UNHCR developed [a joint strategy[[1]](#footnote-2)](https://www.minema.gov.rw/fileadmin/user_upload/Minema/Publications/Ministry_Projects_Documents/JOINT_STRATEGY_ON_ECONOMIC_INCLUSION_OF_REFUGEES_AND_HOST_COMMUNITIES_2021-2024.pdf) (2021-2024) to enhance refugee self-reliance and economic inclusion. The strategy envisions that by 2030, refugees and host communities would be able to fulfill their productive potential as self-reliant members of the Rwandan society who contribute to the economic development of their host districts.
4. In line with the GoR commitment to promote self-reliance through the joint agricultural projects between refugees and host communities, a pilot joint agriculture project was initiated in 2018 on Misizi marshland of 55 hectares (ha) availed by Gisagara District that hosts Mugombwa refugee camp. The Misizi Marshland joint agriculture project model proved to be successful in enabling refugees and host communities to work together for improved income, food security and peaceful coexistence. The success of Misizi project was an incentive for other refugee hosting districts to avail of the marshlands for replication of the similar joint agriculture project on two publicly owned marshlands (measuring about 93ha), namely, Mushishito marshland (70ha) in Nyamagabe District covering Kigeme refugee camp and Nyabicwamba marshland (23ha) in Gatsibo District covering Nyabiheke refugee camp.
5. Following the establishment of availability of additional marshlands in Mushishito and Nyabicwamba, UNHCR Rwanda received funding support from the Government of Denmark for the implementation of a three-year (September 2020-August 2023) joint agriculture project between refugees and the host community farmers entitled **“Climate–smart agriculture and market development project for enhancing livelihood of refugees and their host communities in Rwanda”.**
6. The project aims to improve food security and self-reliance of 728 refugee and 1,155 host community households (benefiting over 7,500 indirect beneficiaries including family members), through climate-smart agricultural practices[[2]](#footnote-3) and market development approach. During implementation, the number of direct households’ beneficiaries increased to 2,036 as all members of the Rwandan host community who had traditionally been working on the marshlands were included.
7. The main project activities implemented include agricultural value chain analysis; environmental impact assessment; marshland rehabilitation and development of irrigation infrastructures; provision of agriculture inputs (seeds , fertilisers and tools); trainings of farmers on climate smart agricultural practices and market-based approaches; construction of post-harvest infrastructures; support in the start-up of the joint cooperatives and trainings on their sustainable management; market linkage.
8. The project was expected to achieve the following outcomes:
* Increased agricultural productivity.
* Increased household income.
* Reduced reliance on humanitarian food/cash assistance.

The expected outputs of the project are identified in the Results Framework in Annex 1

1. The key partners involved in the project include Nyamagabe and Gisagara Districts that availed the marshlands for the project and took the lead at the local level. They jointly worked with UNHCR Field Offices to support the project development from design phase, planning and implementation. Rwanda Agriculture Board (RAB) also provided technical support throughout the project cycle. MINEMA as the counterpart ministry to UNHCR Rwanda, played a crucial role in facilitating the planning process, the implementation, and the monitoring of the project. Other stakeholders include refugees, host communities and the cooperative leadership. It is envisaged that primary stakeholders will be engaged in the evaluation process through establishment of an Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) that will review the main evaluation deliverables presented during the Inception, Data Collection and Reporting phases. Findings from the evaluation will also be shared with cooperative members.

# II. Justification of the Evaluation

1. The evaluation was planned during project design to serve a dual purpose of learning and accountability. The evaluation will assess the performance and intermediate impact of the project, as the project is coming to an end by the 31st August 2023. A baseline and benchmarks of the project outputs and outcomes indicators were established at the beginning of the project, and this evaluation will serve as the endline. It will seek to measure the outputs’ results against the baseline data while determining whether the intermediate outcomes were achieved at the end of the project
2. Findings from this endline evaluation will allow to draw recommendations and lessons learned to be used in similar projects. It will also document opportunities for sustainability and/or scale-up of similar projects. In this context, similar projects refer to joint refugee-host community agricultural projects implemented in the Nyamagabe and/or Gatsibo districts, or other locations of the country. Ultimately, the evaluation should help optimize UNHCR and partners’ contribution to improving refugee self-reliance and socio-economic inclusion in similar future projects

# III. Objectives

1. Based on the project baseline data, the evaluation will assess further the performance and intermediate impact of the project, the underlying drivers, constraints as well as opportunities for sustainability, scale-up and optimization of performance and impact.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are to:

* Evaluate the project performance in alignment with the project’ output targets
* Evaluate the intermediate impact of the project on the people UNHCR serves under the project, i.e., refugees and the refugee hosting community at project locations[[3]](#footnote-4)
* Document lessons-learned and good practices, and recommend sustainability and scale-up strategies and opportunities for future programming

# IV. The Performance Evaluation Approach

## **Scope**

1. The evaluation should be an in-depth, external, independent performance and intermediate outcome evaluation focusing on the beneficiaries (refugees and the host community) of the project in both locations of Mushishito marshland/Nyamagabe District and Nyabicwamba marshland/Gatsibo District. In addition to refugees and host communities who benefitted from the project in targeted project locations, the study will also evaluate the control group comprising of refugees and host communities who did not directly benefit from project interventions but who had similar socio-economic characteristics. The baseline study had established a control group that will be followed-up as part of this evaluation research. The evaluation will cover the project implementation period, i.e., from 1st September 2020 to 31st August 2023, and it will consider all project outputs and intermediate outcomes.

## **Target audience**

1. The target audience for this evaluation is primarily the Government of Rwanda (GoR) represented by MINEMA and UNHCR Rwanda (Livelihood’s programming, the Executive Team and Field Offices), and the district authorities that hosted the projects. For accountability purpose, the second target audience for this study is the donor of the project, the Kingdom of Denmark through the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs that invested in this project, as well as the beneficiaries of the project. The evaluation will inform the beneficiaries on the gains of the project with the view to invite them to be more engaged in agriculture projects and propose improvements on similar projects looking ahead for scale-up. Furthermore, the results of the evaluation will also benefit implementing and operational partners involved in livelihoods programming in Rwanda, as well as wider stakeholders including UNHCR’ country level and regional livelihoods sector working group members, humanitarian-development partners, other UN agencies, private sector partners, bi-lateral development partner agencies and multi-lateral financial institutions, e.g., the WB.
2. The evaluation is expected to guide them on the best practices to design, implement, sustain and scale-up agricultural livelihoods projects in refugee contexts. The results of the evaluation will be of particular interest for MINEMA and the GoR as it has committed, through the Global Refugee Forum (GRF), to support refugee self-reliance and socio-economic inclusion as well as the promotion of joint agricultural projects between refugees and host communities. Finally, the results of the evaluation will be available to all interested in refugee self-reliance through agriculture projects, in addition to increasing the limited body of literature on refugee self-reliance.

## **Key Evaluation Questions (KEQs)**

1. The evaluation will address the key questions listed below that reflect UNHCR’s ongoing dialogues with the GoR and other stakeholders and wider Livelihoods Sector working group members. During the Inception Phase, the evaluation team is expected to finetune all questions and sub-questions after engagement with UNHCR team on their relevancy.

**KEQ 1 Effectiveness: Has the project managed to achieve its planned short-term outputs and intermediate outcomes?**

**This KEQ 1 will seek to answer the following sub-questions:**

1.1. Has the project achieved all its outputs’ targets at the end of the project?

1.2 Has beneficiaries’ income increased due to the project and to what extent?

1.3. Has agriculture productivity in the project’ marshlands increased during the project period, and to what extent?

1.4. Has reliance to humanitarian assistance reduced for project beneficiaries due to the project and to what extent?

**KEQ2 Relevance: Was the project design, implementation, and monitoring in alignment with beneficiaries’ needs, country’ priorities and policies, as well as global priorities in terms of achieving refugee self- reliance and socio-economic inclusion?**

2.1 To what extent did the project address the actual needs of the beneficiaries (refugees and hosts) in relation to building self-reliance and socio-economic inclusion?

2.2. To what extent did the project design, implementation and monitoring processes incorporate considerations of age, gender and diversity amongst the beneficiaries?

**KEQ 3 Efficiency: Timeliness of the project: Was the project activities’ timeframe (from design, implementation and monitoring) realistic and appropriate to achieve the intended objectives (at output and outcome level)?**

3.1. To what extent was the project achieved its objectives within the allocated timeframe?

3.2. Were there any challenges faced by UNHCR programming team in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the project within the allocated timeframe? How were the challenges addressed ?

**KEQ 4 Sustainability: How are the achieved results and gains of the project going to be sustained once the project ends?**

4.1 What are the sustainability mechanisms in place to ensure the project’ gains are maintained over the years?

4.2 Are the beneficiaries of the project able to sustain the outcomes (the KPIs) of the project once it ends?

4.3 Have the cooperatives attained self-sustainability once the project ends, and to what extent?

4.4 Has beneficiaries’ access to formal agriculture markets improved, and to what extent access is sustainable in the long run?

**KEQ5 Impact: Did the project create change that matters to the beneficiaries?**

5.1. Have the project’ interventions caused a significant change in the lives of the intended beneficiaries in comparison to those who did not participate in the project?

5.2 Have the project’ interventions catalyzed or led to changes in beneficiaries’ behavior towards self-reliance?

## **Approach and Methodology**

1. This evaluation is expected to take place right at the end of the project funding (i.e.in End of August 2023) and thus should be considered as a summative evaluation. The evaluation will investigate the actual results of the projects in comparison to baseline data and targets for end of project
2. Based on the above, the evaluation should deploy a mixed method approach combining quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis techniques to answer the key evaluation questions and sub-questions.

The evaluation will include at a minimum:

I) **A desk review and content analysis** of relevant background documents including but not limited to policy level documents and partnership LOUs; programmatic results and monitoring data, assessment and studies conducted during implementation and programmatic strategy documents.

II) **Primary data generation methods** will seek to answer all KEQs and sub-questions to the extent possible.

Bidders may suggest approaches to collection of primary data that will best answer the KEQs, but will include, at a minimum:

1. **Focus group discussions** with project beneficiaries and the control group(refugees and host communities)
2. **In-depth Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)** with community leaders of the project; UNHCR staff involved in the project; district authorities; MINEMA; and other key stakeholders directly involved in the project at the local and national level
3. **A quantitative survey** administered to a representative sample of the project’ beneficiaries disaggregated by location (i.e., Nyamagabe and Gatsibo districts separately, each with a representative sample), and by population group ( i.e refugees and host communities sepa. The survey will also be administered to a representative control group sample (beneficiaries who did not participate in the project, for the 2 camps and 2 host sectors, separately). The survey design is expected to follow-up on the baseline survey design for most indicators

Below table summarizes beneficiaries’ population disaggregated by location and population group, as well as the proposed sample size displaying representativeness by population group in each location

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Location/Category** | **Refugee households** | **Host Community households** | **Total households** |
|  | **Population** | **Proposed sample** | **Population** | **Proposed sample** | **Population** | **Proposed Sample** |
| Gatsibo District (Nyabicwamba) | 232 | 145 | 235 | 147 | 467 | 292 |
| Nyamagabe District (Mushishito) | 500 | 218 | 1069 | 283 | 1569 | 501 |
| **Total Households**  | **732** | **363** | **1304** | **430** | **2036** | **793** |

An appropriate sampling framework shall be submitted in the proposal, including data collection among the control group with separate focus on refugees and host communities, and further disaggregation by locations, i.e., by the two sites (Mushishito and Nyabicwamba). The minimum sample size of the control group in the two sites is expected to be at least 10% of the population In the inception phase, this sample size may be reviewed further to reflect the current context of the field exercise without compromising the issue of statistical significance .

III) Deployed sampling strategies for qualitative and quantitative data shall seek to integrate the AGD policy to the maximum possible

IV) In terms of data analysis, descriptive analysis combined with inferential analysis for possible correlation is expected to be used where relevant

The evaluation is open to the use of diverse, participatory, and innovative evaluation methods. The detailed methodology with identification of relevant benchmarks – including details on the data collection and analytical approach(es) used to answer the evaluation questions will be submitted by bidders in the technical offer and will be finalised by the evaluation team during the inception phase. The selected consulting firm will be invited to present realistic, effective, and efficient options to collect data in the inception report.

1. The evaluation team is responsible for finalizing the elaboration of the key questions and sub-questions based on prior interviews with UNHCR Rwanda Livelihoods Team during the inception phase. The evaluation team will also be responsible for gathering, analyzing, and triangulating data (e.g., across types, sources, and analysis modality) to demonstrate impartiality of the analysis, minimize bias, and ensure the credibility of evaluation findings and conclusions.

## **Evaluability: Risks and Assumptions**

21. This performance evaluation should not be confused with a full impact evaluation. This evaluation will cover the performance of the project as well as the intermediate outcomes of the project that could be collected. Indeed, a three-year project timeframe is not enough to capture the full impact of the project. As such, communication on the purpose of the study and its results should be carefully designed and follow-up to avoid potential confusions. The GoR as the counterpart and other partners should be clearly informed on the objectives of the study. The GoR (through MINEMA)’ endorsement is also critical in the evaluation design and implementation.

22. The processes for receiving any GoR approval for the evaluation (including methods) and camp access may be delayed and/or constrained due to methodological delimitations or other reasons including bureaucratic complexities to obtain the authorization on time. In such cases, timeline may need to be adjusted (to be agreed with UNHCR Rwanda by the consulting firm)

23. During the baseline study, challenges to produce high quality baseline data were identified specifically on baseline data for the indicator of “land productivity”. Collected baseline data revealed some inconsistencies in the quantity of crop production in kilograms (Kg) per square meter (m2), in the marshlands, before the project started. The above data will be collected and rectified during the endline evaluation phase. In terms of mitigation measures, the contracting firm will be informed on the gap and a methodology to capture the missing data will be established and used in the endline evaluation

# V. Evaluation Quality Assurance

1. The evaluation firm is required to sign UNHCR Code of Conduct and UNHCR data protection agreement. It will also complete UNHCR’s introductory protection training module.
2. In line with established standards for evaluation in the UN system (the UNEG Norms and Standards), the UN Ethical Guidelines for evaluations and UNHCR’s Data Protection Policy, evaluation in UNHCR is founded on the inter-connected principles of independence, impartiality, credibility and utility and it calls for protecting sources and data; systematically seeking informed consent; respecting dignity and diversity; minimising risk, harm and burden upon those who are the subject of, or participating in the evaluation, while at the same time not compromising the integrity of the exercise.
3. Interested bidders will include a section in their proposal on ethics and safeguarding that will clearly identify how proposals will conform to the UNEG norms and standards on Ethics, UN ethical principles around evaluations and data collection, as well as UNHCR Data Protection Policy
4. The evaluation is also expected to adhere with pilot ‘Evaluation Quality Assurance’ (EQA) guidance, which clarifies the quality requirements expected for UNHCR evaluation processes and products.

UNHCR Evaluation Manager will share and provide an orientation session of the EQA at the start of the evaluation. Adherence to the EQA will be overseen by the Evaluation Manager with support from the UNHCR Evaluation Service at Regional Bureau.

Concomitantly, UNHCR Protection Unit will provide an orientation session on the code of conduct for the selected firm staff (especially enumerators in direct contact with respondents)

# VI. Data and information sources

1. This project, the GoR-UNHCR Joint Strategy on Livelihoods and Socio-Economic of Refugees and Host Communities (2021-2024) and other related interventions in Rwanda Operations have generated data and documentation that will be reviewed.

Below is an overview on some data and documentation available. The list is not exhaustive, and the evaluation team will be expected to source any other relevant and available data or documentation

* The project documents and reports
* The GoR National Strategic Plan for Refugee Inclusion (2019-2024)
* The Past Joint MIDIMAR – UNHCR Livelihoods Strategy for refugees (2016-2020)
* The new MINEMA-UNHCR Joint Strategy on Livelihoods and Economic Inclusion of Refugees and Host Communities in Rwanda (2021-2024)
* The joint UNHCR-WFP Post Distribution Monitoring reports (2021, 2022, 2023) that embeds a vulnerability analysis of the PoCs in all the camps, and in the Nyabiheke and Kigeme camps in particular
* UNHCR participatory Assessment 2021-2022
* UNHCR-GoR Livelihoods Assessment (Dec 2019)
* WFP/UNHCR Joint Assessment Mission (JAM) Report (Dec 2019)
* UN Report on Socio-Economic Impact of COVID-19 in Rwanda (June 2020)
* Planning, budget and spending information.
* Baseline survey data conducted at the beginning of the Project
* Program-related background documents
* NISR and other official statistics reports and development documents at national and district levels

# VII. Organisation, management and conduct of the evaluation

1. The programme monitoring officer in Rwanda Country Office is the **Evaluation Manager** with support from the Livelihoods and Economic Inclusion Officer for the component pertaining to Livelihoods programme technicalities. The Evaluation Manager will be responsible for overall management of the evaluation work and coordination with all stakeholders involved including government, the Donor, RB and HQ evaluation services. He/she will alsobe responsible for reviewing the interim deliverables and final reports to ensure quality – with support from the UNHCR Livelihoods team and Guidance from RB Evaluation Service. UNHCR Evaluation Services through the Evaluation Lead of the Regional Bureau will provide additional quality assurance services on all evaluation deliverables, i.e., the inception and draft reports, alongside technical peer review inputs from RB Livelihoods team to improve the evaluation reports and support learning within the organization. The Livelihoods Team in UNHCR country office in Kigali will be responsible for: **(i)** managing the day to-day aspects of the evaluation process pertaining to logistics especially in the camps; **(ii)** providing the evaluators with available secondary documentation and assessing whether the information was interpreted correctly in the exercise and reports. The team will also facilitate communication with relevant stakeholders
2. The **Evaluation team** is expected to produce high quality deliverables. Specifically, Inception and Final reports will be assessed as per UNHCR Quality Assurance Standards, informed by evidence and triangulated data and analysis, copy-edited, and free from errors.

The language of work of this evaluation and its deliverables is English.

## **VIII. Expected deliverables and evaluation timeline**

1. The evaluation will be carried out between the beginning of September 2023 and February 2024, under a service agreement to be contracted after a competitive bidding process whereby local, regional, and international firms will be invited to submit their proposals.
2. The key evaluation deliverables are:
* **An Inception report** specifying the evaluation methodology and the refined focus and scope of the evaluation. It will include an assessment of the overall evaluability, and it will clarify strategies for overcoming any limitations observed. If relevant, it will propose adjustments to evaluation questions, present analytical and benchmarking frameworks, and, importantly, an Evaluation Matrix detailing evaluation questions, sub-questions, indicators developed and evidence identified to answer to each question, analysis strategies and stakeholders engaged to answer each question. The evaluation team is also expected to clarify sampling criteria, size and strategies related to all primary data generation. The evaluation team is expected, furthermore, to clarify strategies for conducting data analysis and disaggregation of data with a view to assess UNHCR’s contribution to diverse right holder groups. In the Inception Report, the team will also explain its approach to triangulation and quality assurance of all evaluation deliverables, The division of labour between the evaluation team members will be clearly identified. A detailed workplan with corresponding deliverables shall also be included in the report. Finally, it will clarify its operationalization of the UN Ethical Standards, the data protection- and Age Gender and Diversity policy.
* **A Data collection toolkit** (including survey guide, KII guide, focus group discussion guides) and details on the data analysis plan developed for / used in the evaluation. This should be submitted together with the Inception report.
* **Raw data** – Anonymised quantitative and qualitative datasets provided in structured formats such as CSV format, as well as a “do file” of analysed data, preferably in Stata.
* **Validation of findings and recommendations workshop**.
* **Drafts and Final evaluation** **report** including recommendations (Not more than 30-50 pages excluding executive summary and annexes).
* **An Executive summary** at the beginning of the report (3-5pages max)[[4]](#footnote-5).
* **Three dissemination activities** (to be convened on the form) of findings and recommendations as follow. One will be a national dissemination for UNHCR Rwanda, MINEMA, the Donor, the Evaluation Reference Group, main partners, and relevant stakeholders. The second will be at the regional level and will include UNHCR RB teams. The third dissemination activity will target the beneficiaries of the project in the camps as well as the local authorities
* **Two digital dissemination brochures** (both in Kinyarwanda and English). One brochure will have a customized content for local audience (local authorities and beneficiaries). The second brochure will have content customized for technical and Senior Management teams at UNHCR (national and regional levels), MINEMA, Donor and other stakeholders

**Below table summarizes the expected activities, the deliverables and indicative timeline**

| **Activity** | **Deliverables**  | **Indicative timeline** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Inception phase** including: * Initial desk review and key informant interviews.
* Discussion with Donor and MINEMA on broad framework/approach
* Draft Inception report circulated; UNHCR Rwanda share collated comments (including from MINEMA, field offices, District, WFP, FAO Rwanda) and RB Livelihoods and Economic Inclusion unit; External QA review on the draft Inception Report done by the UNHCR Evaluation Service
* Incorporation of comments on the inception report and production of a final report.
 | Draft reports ( 1 and 2) and Final inception report – including methodology, data collection tools ( survey questionnaire, FGDs guide, KIIs guide) and evaluation matrix submitted | 30 working days |
| **Field work: Data collection and cleaning conducted** | 1. Primary data collection and cleaning finalized
2. A debrief on data collection conducted with UNHCR CO office team
 | 23 working days  |
| **Report writing phase**  | 1. Draft report 1 (for circulation and comments internally) Internal Presentation of preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations to UNHCR Rwanda
2. Draft report 2 that includes UNHCR internal comments is submitted
 | 25 working days |
| **Draft report 2 submitted for External QA and comments from the CO; ERG group; and the RB**  | Final feedback from all stakeholders received | 22 working days |
| **Revision of Draft report 2 and integrations of external feedback**  | Draft report 3 submitted by contractor  | 10 working days |
| **3 Dissemination sessions conducted, PPT presentation and incorporation of feedback in final report** | 1. 3 Dissemination sessions conducted (including PPT presentations)
2. Stakeholder feedback and validation of evaluation findings, conclusions, and proposed recommendations conducted
3. 2 brochures produced
 | 12 working days  |
| **Finalisation** of Evaluation Report and executive summary,  | Final Evaluation Report No1 (including recommendations and executive summary) submitted  | 4 working days |
| **Last feedback on** Final Evaluation Report No 1 received and integrated  | Final Evaluation Report No2 submitted | 3 working days  |

**IX. Qualifications of the Consultancy firm and Evaluation of Offers**

**9.1. Technical evaluation**

**9.1.1. Formal evaluation (mandatory requirement)**

Tender responses will be subject to an initial review at the start of the evaluation process. Any tender responses not meeting all mandatory requirements or constraints (if any) will be rejected in full at this point and will not be assessed or scored further. Mandatory criteria are:

* Proof of registration of firm in Rwanda. Qualified foreign consultancy firms wishing to participate must partner with local firms
* Submission of Tax clearance certificate
* Submission of a bid security of USD 2,000 or equivalent in other currency. Bid security must be in the form of a bank certified check, bank guarantee or call deposit. The bid security should be valid for a minimum of three months. The awarded firm shall submit a performance guarantee of 10% of the contract price before withdrawing their bid security. Performance guarantee covers the quality of reports in terms of format, content and organisation, language, coherence, technical analysis, and respect of timeline.
* Submission of deed of joint venture if applying as a joint venture (partnership)

**9.1.2. Performance Evaluation (scoring 70/100 marks)**

Tender responses not so rejected under 8.1.1. above will be scored by an evaluation panel appointed by UNHCR for the following criteria.

* Quality of proposal and its responsiveness in terms of methodology and approach to meeting the requirements of the TORs (20 marks)
* Firms’ financial capacity (10 marks)
* Firms’ experience in the provision of similar services (20 marks). Bidders must submit past contracts from contactable clients, with their corresponding reference letters and copies of final reports
* Quality and expertise of staff to be assigned to the project (20 marks)

NB proposed staff must not be changed during contract delivery and by submitting a bid, bidder agrees that UNHCR shall have the right without obstruction to visit and inspect the work of the staff at any stage of the project.

**Required staff include.**

**4 evaluation experts**, fluent in spoken and written English with the following qualifications

***Minimum team requirements***

1. **Evaluation team leader**
* Minimum master’s degree in economics or econometrics, statistics, social science, agriculture or food security plus a minimum of 10 years of relevant professional experience in livelihoods-related areas.
* Minimum of 7 years of evaluation experience in quantitative and qualitative analysis and synthesis of livelihoods and socio-economic interventions in development and humanitarian settings
* Proven experience in successfully leading an evaluation team and managing fieldwork in complex environments. Demonstrated team leader role for a minimum of five accepted studies
* Technical expertise in market-based livelihoods programming, particularly climate smart agriculture and ultra-poor graduation approach. Experience in evaluating big development and humanitarian programmes commissioned by international development or humanitarian organisations including UNDP, FAO, WFP, UNHCR, World Bank or other humanitarian or international developmental organisations
* Experience in generating useful and action-oriented recommendations to management and programming staff.
1. **Evaluation Team Member (research expert)**
* Bachelor’s degree in the areas of economics or econometrics, statistics, social science, agriculture and food-security or the equivalent plus, a minimum, of 5 years of relevant professional experience
* Proven experience (minimum 5 years) in supporting quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis for evaluation purposes (preferable) or socio-economic studies and operational research.
* Proven experience in survey design, development, testing and implementation of quantitative and qualitative surveys and analysis, including conducting Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), participatory assessments etc.
1. **Evaluation Team Member – Statistician/Quantitative Expert**
* Bachelor’s degree in statistics or econometrics, data and information management, or mathematics with a minimum of 10 years of relevant experience in data analysis for socio-economic programme and evaluation.
* Proven experiences in statical systems and statistical software including STATA, R software Deep understanding and experience of quantitative survey design methodologies, sampling design procedures, sampling size calculations, variance estimation, compound weights, and simulation studies.
* Experience with data quality assurance protocols and data collection in the domains of sampling and measurement error, nonresponse, and coverage bias to ensure reliable data collection.
1. **Evaluation Team Member –Qualitative Expert**
* Advanced degree in sociology/anthropology, development studies, agriculture or relevant discipline with a minimum of 5 years of relevant experience to livelihoods research/evaluation.
* Proven experience with qualitative methods, development, testing, implementation and analysis of qualitative surveys and interviews, including FGDs, KIIs, participatory assessments etc.
* Experience with integrating qualitative data with quantitative findings

**9.1.3. Commercial/financial aspects. (30/100 marks)**

**Results Framework**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Project title |  | Climate-Smart Agriculture and Market Development for Enhancing Livelihoods of |
|  |  | Refugees and their Host Communities in Rwanda |
| Project objective | To improve the food security and self-reliance of 728 refugee and 1,155 host |
|  |  | community households (over 7,500 individuals) through climate-smart agricultural |
|  |  | practices and market development approach. |
|  |  | *This project shall take due consideration to embed AGD (Age- Gender – Diversity)* |
|  |  | *indicators* |  |
| Impact Indicator |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **Indicator I -** Extreme Poverty Rates (Rural) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baseline | Year | 18.1 % |  | The headcount poverty rates are obtained by comparing real annual |
|  | 2017 |  |  |  | consumption per adult, equivalent to the extreme poverty line of RWF |
|  |  |  |  |  | 105,064 (2014 prices, monthly 8,755 RWF) (after inflation adjustment |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2020 extreme poverty line is estimated as approx. 10,112 RWF/per |
|  |  |  |  |  | month/per person; approx. 10.8 USD; annual per family 452 USD) |
|  |  |  |  |  | *Source: The Fifth Integrated Household Living Conditions Survey, EICV5* |
|  |  |  |  |  | *(2016/17), National Institute of Statistics Rwanda (NISR)* |
| Target | Year | TBC |  | TBC ; Poverty Assessment in the Refugee Camps; EICV6/EICV 7 |
|  | 2023 |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Income |   |  I. Increased household income II. Reduced reliance on humanitarian food/cash assistance III. Increased Agricultural productivity |
|  |
| Outcome indicator |  | I. | **Indicator I:** % of targeted persons of concern (POC who self-report |
|  |  |  |  | increased income (at hh level)3 |
|  |  |  | II. | **Indicator II:** % of targeted persons of concern (POC) who do not need |
|  |  |  |  | food/cash assistance at the end of project support (at hh level) |
|  |  |  | III. **Indicator III:** Land productivity (yield in kg/hectare) per crop |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baseline | Year | 0/TBC |  | **Indicator I**: Some host communities have income from |
|  |  |  |  |  | agriculture but most refugees are not involved in the |
|  | 2019 |  |  |  | agricultural sector. With this project, we assume there is zero |
|  |  |  |  |  | income from “Climate Smart Agriculture”**.** A Baseline survey |
|  |  |  |  |  | will be conducted among the targeted beneficiaries. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 % |  | **Indicator II:** % of targeted persons of concern (POC |
|  |  |  |  |  | /beneficiaries at hh level) who do not need food/cash |
|  |  |  |  |  | assistance at the end of project support |
|  |  | Maize 1525 | **Indicator III:** National level Yield: Maize 1525 Kg/Ha; Bean 801 |
|  |  | Kg/Ha; |  | Kg/Ha; Red Chilli: TBC– The selection of crops will determine |
|  |  | Bean | 801 | the baseline land productivity in the area. |
|  |  | Kg/Ha; Red |  |
|  |  | Chilli: TBC |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target | Year | 50 % |  | **Indicator I:** By Aug 2023, at least 50 % of targeted PoC |
|  |  |  |  |  | households increase households income by 50 % (to allow |
|  | 2023 |  |  |  | them to graduate out of extreme poverty i.e. from current $400 |
|  |  |  |  |  | to $ 600/year/household (hh size 3.5 for refugees and 4.3 for |
|  |  |  |  |  | Host Community) |
|  |  | 50 % |  | **Indicator II:** By Aug 2023, at least 50 % of targeted PoC |
|  |  |  |  |  | households do not need food/cash assistance at the end of |
|  |  |  |  |  | project support |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | TBC |  | **Indicator III:** To be confirmed upon final selection of crops and |
|  |  |  |  |  | baseline |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Output I |  | **1.** Access to agricultural production enabled (crop/livestock/fisheries) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Output indicator | 1.1 # and % of households with access to arable land or other productive |
|  |  | natural resources |
|  |  | 1.2 # | and | % PoC receiving production kits or inputs for |
|  |  | agriculture/livestock/fisheries activities |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Baseline | Year | 0 | PoC/ | - Irrigation facilities (including solar based) alongside |
|  |  |  | 0% | land development based on feasibility/environmental |
|  |  |  |  | assessments. |
|  |  |  |  | - Access to land at baseline maybe applicable to some |
|  |  |  |  | host communities that owns arable land. However, for |
|  |  |  |  | refugees, the assumption is that they do not have |
|  |  |  |  | access to land at baseline. |
|  |  |  |  | - The assumption is that no targeted PoC owns |
|  |  |  |  | production kits or inputs to use for this project. |
| Annual | Year 1 | 1883 | PoC | Inception Phase |
| target | **(Sep-Dec** | or 100 % |  |
|  | **2020)** |  |  | 1.1 By end of year 2020, all 1,883 hhs have been identified |
|  |  |  |  | 1.2 By end of year 2020, 2 assessments (Environmental |
|  |  |  |  | assessment, Value Chain assessment) are completed |
|  |  |  |  |
| Annual | Year 2 | 1,883 PoC | 1.1 By end of year 2021, rehabilitation/construction of |
| target | **(Year 2021)** | or 100 % | drainage-irrigation infrastructures are completed |
|  |  |  |  | 1.2 By end of year 2021, 100 % of households with access to |
|  |  |  |  | arable land |
|  |  |  |  | 1.3 By end of year 2021, 100 % of targeted POC will receive |
|  |  |  |  | production kits or inputs for agriculture activities for 1st |
|  |  |  |  | cycle, 2 seasons (Season B/C and Season A) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Annual | Year 3 **(Year** | 1883 PoC | 1.1 By end of year 2022, 100 % of households with access to |
| target | **2022)** | or 100 % | arable land |
|  |  |  |  | 1.2 By end of year 2022, 100 % of targeted POC will receive |
|  |  |  |  | production kits or inputs for agriculture activities for 2nd |
|  |  |  |  | cycle 2 Seasons (Season B/C and Season A) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual | Year 4 |  |  | No Direct support/production kits; Follow up activities, market |
| target |  |  |  | linkages, capacity building support, results documentation and |
|  | (Jan-Aug |  |  | evaluation etc. |
|  | 2023) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Output II |  | **2.** Access to training and learning enabled (for enhancing agricultural |
|  |  | production, farm income and self-employment in agriculture as business) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Output indicator | 2.1 # and % of PoC who have completed training related to agricultural |
|  |  | production with/without a nationally recognized certificate |
|  |  | 2.2 # of PoC provided with financial literacy training for livelihood purposes |
|  |  | 2.3 # of PoC provided with entrepreneurship/business training, value chain |
|  |  | and cooperative management |
|  |  | 2.4 # and % of targeted PoC who are members of a cooperative association, |
|  |  | network or social group |
|  |  |  |  |
| Baseline | Year | 0 | 1. Training in modern agronomical practices with focus |
|  |  |  | on “Climate Smart and conservation Agriculture |
|  |  |  | techniques “will be an innovative and new intervention |
|  |  |  | in the targeted areas; |
|  |  |  | 2. Assumption is ‘acceptable’ financial literacy is |
|  |  |  | minimum/zero |
|  |  |  | 3. Assumption is business and value chain training is |
|  |  |  | minimum/zero to support sustainable income and self- |
|  |  |  | employment in agriculture through participating in |
|  |  |  | market |
|  |  |  | 4. Some targeted PoC may be members of other |
|  |  |  | cooperatives, however this project will strengthen or |
|  |  |  | build/create more cooperatives/ TBC |
| Annual | Year 1 (**July-** | 188 PoC or | 2.1 By end of year 2020, 10 % of targeted lead farmers PoC (i.e. |
| target | **Dec 2020)** | 10 % | 188) will be trained through in-house project staff as ToT in |
|  |  |  | basic agricultural production with focus on “Climate |
|  |  |  | Smart/conservation Agricultural techniques” |
|  |  |  |  |
| Annual | Year 2 **(Year** | 1412 PoC | 2.1 By end of year 2021, 75 % of targeted PoC (i.e. 1412) will |
| target | **2021)** | or 75 % | be trained in advanced/refresher agricultural production |
|  |  |  | with focus on “Climate Smart/conservation Agricultural |
|  |  |  | techniques” |
|  |  |  | 2.2 By end of year 2021, 75 % of targeted PoC will receive basic |
|  |  |  | financial literacy training |
|  |  |  | 2.3 By end of year 2021, 75 % of targeted PoC will be trained |
|  |  |  | on basic business entrepreneurship/value chain/ |
|  |  |  | cooperative management |
|  |  |  | 2.4 By end of year 2020, 75 % of targeted PoC (i.e. 1,412) will |
|  |  |  | become members of cooperatives |
| Annual | Year 3 | 1,883 PoC | 2.1 By end of year 2021, 100 % of targeted PoC (i.e. 1,883) will |
| target | **(Year 2022)** | or 100 % | be trained in advanced/refresher agricultural production |
|  |  |  | with focus on “Climate Smart/conservation Agricultural |
|  |  |  | techniques” |
|  |  |  | 2.2 By end of year 2021, 100 % of targeted PoC will receive |
|  |  |  | financial literacy training |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | 2.3 By end of year 2021, 100 % of targeted PoC will be trained |
|  |  |  | on business entrepreneurship/value chain/ cooperative |
|  |  |  | management |
|  |  |  | 2.4 By end of year 2020, 100 % of targeted PoC (i.e. 1883) will |
|  |  |  | become members of agricultural cooperatives |
| Annual | Year 4 | - | No training activities except follow-up sessions by in-house |
| target | **(Jan-Aug** |  | project staff/peer-learning on cooperatives sustainability, |
|  | **2023)** |  | market linkage etc. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Output III |  | **III.** Assessment and analysis undertaken |
|  |  |  |  |
| Output indicator | 3.1 Market survey /value chain analysis conducted or available (yes/no) |
|  |  | 3.2 Socio economic profile and livelihood capacities of PoC defined and |
|  |  | monitored /baseline established (yes/no) |
|  |  | 3.3 Environmental Assessment of land use conducted or available |
|  |  | (yes/no) |
| Baseline | Year | 2020 | Not Available/NO |
| Annual | Year 1 **(July-** | 1-2 Value | 3.1 Market survey /value chain analysis conducted |
| target | **Dec 2020)** | Chain |  |
|  |  | analysis |  |
|  |  |  | 3.2 Environmental Assessment of land use conducted or |
|  |  | Environme | available |
|  |  | ntal |  |
|  |  | assessment |  |
|  |  | conducted |  |
| Annual | Year 2 **(Year** | Baseline | 3.1 Socio economic profile and livelihood capacities of PoC |
| target | **2021)** | Conducted | defined and monitored /baseline established |
|  |  | 2 Value |  |
|  |  | Chain | 3.2 Market linkage/value chain analysis reviewed (light touch, |
|  |  | Analysis | UNHCR Team with Value Chain Partners/UN partners subject |
|  |  | (reviewed) | to availability of their staff) |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Year 3 **(Year** | Joint | Participatory Assessment/Livelihoods Assessment Conducted |
| Annual | **2022)** | Assessment | (In-house/UNHCR MFT jointly with other partners subject to |
| target |  | Completed | availability of Government and UN partner staff ) |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Year 4 (Jan- | Project | End of Project Evaluation/Assessment Conducted |
|  | Aug 2023) | Evaluation |  |
|  |  | Completed |  |

1. <https://www.minema.gov.rw/fileadmin/user_upload/Minema/Publications/Ministry_Projects_Documents/JOINT_STRATEGY_ON_ECONOMIC_INCLUSION_OF_REFUGEES_AND_HOST_COMMUNITIES_2021-2024.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Climate-smart agriculture (CSA) is an integrated approach to managing landscapes—cropland, livestock, forests and fisheries--that address the interlinked challenges of food security and climate change. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Evaluate the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the project to support refugees achieve self-reliance and other [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. The evaluation ToR, final report with annexes, and formal management response will be made public and posted on the evaluation section of the [UNHCR website](http://www.unhcr.org/evaluation-and-research.html). All other evaluation products (e.g., Inception Report) will be kept internal. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)