



## Terms of Reference

Mid Term Evaluation

**Project title:** Farm Promoting Waste for Food and Livelihood Security

**Region:** Tamale, Northern Region, Ghana

**Main Partner:** Wuni Zaligu Development Association (WUZDA)

**Contact Person:** Abdul-Karim Ziblim (Programme Manager)

**E-mail:** wunzalgu2004@yahoo.com

**Mobil:** +233 (0)501389113

### **1. Introduction: WUZDA and Farm promoting Waste for Food and Livelihood Security**

#### **1.1 Partner Profile and project**

WUZDA - Ghana was founded in 1992; the dreams of the founders of this organization were to nurse it from a community based organization to a local Non-governmental organization. Wuni Zaligu Development Association (WUZDA) - Ghana in the local parlance is interpreted to mean what God almighty has ordain cannot be change, meaning to the understanding of founders 'that Gods decree is made to guide human beings to prosperity', meaning 'orders and laws must be consciously observed and followed to ensure promotion of human development.' WUZDA has officially been recognized officially as non-governmental non-profit organization and incorporated into the registration of companies and was given the certificate to commence operations. Since its official registration in July 2004 WUZDA has reached out to over 120 communities in the Tamale metropolitan area, Sagnarigu and Savelugu Municipalities, Nanumba north and Nanumba south districts in the northern region of Ghana WUZDA has its head office located in the Tamale Metropolis while the district office is in Bimbilla to cater for Nanumba north and south districts.

The 'Farm - Promoting Waste for Food and Livelihood Security' is a two (2) year pilot project being implemented in three (3) administrative districts in Ghana, involving six (6) communities. The project started in October 2016 and will be ending in September 2018. Ninety (90) farmers are involved in the project implementation comprising fifty (50) women/female and forty (40) men/male who assist each other in order to produce quality safe/edible organic vegetable for both local consumption and possible for export in the future when the need arises.

One of main factors, which demands this noble intervention is inform by abject poverty among farmers and the low-income levels in the target communities. This is because a

majority of the populace depends on rain fed agriculture. Income levels are lower for women than for men. Gender distribution and access to resources is one factor for the poor income levels of women. The culture of the people posits the male sex at an advantage position in resource ownership such as land for farming and leadership positions. Positions held by women are those that may not command authority. Thus, though income levels are low, the men can be said to be better off than women. Giving that agriculture is the mainstay, less access to land for agricultural purposes is a possible reason for the low level of income among women.

Vegetable farmers in the Tamale metropolis, Sagnarigu and Savelugu districts have mobilized themselves into a formidable household's farmer-based organization to take charge of their chosen livelihoods and to help promote their businesses. Currently ninety (90) households in six (6) deprived communities in these districts will constitute themselves into 6 household farmers based groups to undertake farming of different variety of crops to increase household incomes to reduce social issues ranging from payment of school fee of their children, footing medical bills of their family, being able to supplement general household incomes.

The challenge, however, is that some member of the household vegetable producers are faced with the challenge of water for irrigating their gardens. They resort to using wastewater from homes, institutions and the growing industry of the city for the purpose. This comes with huge implications for hygiene and public health generally. This issue calls for public concern and indeed it is expressed on daily basis on radio and at almost every public platform both by consumers and city authorities possibly for the fact that there is a steady increase in typhoid fever and other filth-borne diseases at the health facilities. Another challenge faced by farmers is that agricultural lands in the urban and peri-urban areas are competing with other uses such as residential and industrial development resulting in over cropping of the small parcels of land available leading to poor soil fertility. The situation is compounded by increasing cost of inputs such as fertilizer. Fortunately, however, the city is generating tons of organic waste that is being used to produce manure for farmers.

Adapting small-scale bucket drip irrigation systems will potentially address the problem of quality of vegetables produced through safe use of wastewater for irrigation as well as ensure efficient water use thereby reducing the use of fresh water for irrigation. Again, adopting compost application produced from city organic waste could potentially reduce the burden of farmers in buying chemical fertilizers and significantly reducing filth in the city and its attendant implication for health. The household Vegetable Farmers which currently has 6 households with a total membership of 90 farmers provides a great opportunity and platform to mobilize their folk for the installation of bucket drip irrigation systems and for engaging in promotional activities to assure the consuming public about the safety of produce by their general membership if their capacity is strengthened.

The project is in it's one (1) year period of implementation and require some assessment to focus as from now it will be require to ensure achievement of project objectives through implementation of the planned activities.

Within the three (3) components listed below some activities have been implemented and have produced some outputs to support achievement of the intended and unintended outcomes.

1. Drip irrigation and compost training.
2. Quality standards for the use of wastewater.
3. Local marketing of vegetable production and upscaling.

Activities implemented, outputs and outcomes are highlighted in the outcome and impact report. The consultants will be provided with information that will help them do diligent work of the external evaluator's reading and understanding the work and content. The draft baseline information is going through its final stages, and will be made available to provide additional information to the external evaluator to carry out the assessment of what has been achieved as a way of output and outcomes.

### **1.2 Project objectives:**

1. Improved method of cultivating and irrigation vegetables all year round (independent from season/ counter season) reducing dependency on rain is implemented in 90 households in Tamale, Sagnarigu and Savelugu districts.
2. Vegetables of high quality are produced from waste water by 2018 in 90 households in Tamale, Sagnarigu and Savelugu districts.
3. The demand for household vegetable farming has increased, farmers can benefit from selling their vegetable products

### **1.3 Project indicators to monitor the extent the project objective have been achieved.**

1. Component: Drip irrigation and compost training
  - 90 households applicate the drip irrigation technology and compost knowledge and respect the security standards.
  - 90 households use the compost technology for vegetable production.
2. Component: Quality standards for the use of waste water  
Security standards for the use and consumption of vegetables, irrigated with waste water are formulated and published.
3. Component: Local marketing of the vegetable production and upscaling  
At least 85% of the vegetables, produced with wastewater are sold locally.

Most of the outcomes expected in the project by 2 year shall be focusing around identifying the following listed below as,

1. Organic vegetable farmers shifting from traditional means of cultivating vegetable to a more sustain efforts by using the bucket drip irrigation technology that reduces/wasting of potable water which it's already scarce in many communities.
2. Organic vegetable farmers adequately prepare to acquire household latrines, use them in their houses and tap the faecal matter and urine for organic manure preparation and application in the vegetable farms.
3. Organic vegetable farmers get more encourage to generate family income to support family needs.
4. Identify efforts around creating sustain production, marketing and consumption of organic vegetables locally and internationally.

5. Creating sustain efforts to engage strongly male, female, physical challenge, aged etc fully benefit from project outcomes.
6. Ensure the participation of the public, private sector and CSOs in order to promote sustainable production, marketing and consumption.

#### **1.4 Target groups and other stakeholders**

Discussions with vegetable farmers, staff and stakeholders involved in this project indicated reasonable fact that they will be present and to participate fully in the interactions. Am assured that it's a good period to engage in project work as major farm work have ended. These are the list of participants in the mid – term evaluation below,

- 1) 90 Organic vegetable farmers (sample)
- 2) Tamale vegetable farmers association
- 3) Bucket drip irrigation technology technician
- 4) Project staff – Programme officer, Training coordinator, Gender officer and Accountant
- 5) Environmental Health and Sanitation Unit – EHSU (DeHOs)
- 6) Ministry for Food and Agriculture – MoFA (Extension officers)
- 7) Local latrine artisans
- 8) Phantom Technology – Local Organic production company
- 9) Local seed company – Seed banks
- 10) VSLAs Trainer – Nuhu and Purple Holding Limited
- 11) Local metal Fabricators
- 12) DeCO – Compost production company
- 13) Private Transport companies
- 14) Local vegetable Vendors

## **2. Purpose, objective and users of the evaluation**

This request to conduct mid-term evaluation come on the back of 1 year and a half of pilot phase of the Programme to enable us identify outputs achieved within this period and to facilitate making adjustments if there is going to be any, in order to prepare full scale pilot implementation of the project.

The mid – term evaluation set to assist stakeholders to determine the state of project implementation assessing what has been achieved as at now in terms of the period, what can be done to ensure the rate at which the project is travelling in achieving the objectives set for the project.

This move will facilitate staff getting additional information from consultant to enable them engage meaningfully with project beneficiaries/clients. Therefore, the outcome of evaluation will provide opportunity for project staff to readjust the project approach.

In addition, it is envisaged that this exercise will further prepare and inform in up-scaling of the next project phase after evidences on the organic farms shows prospects and innovations that will technically equip organic vegetable farmers to engage directly in farming activities and own the gains attained at the end of the pilot phase of this project.

This exercise can further provide innovations and ideas that can be sustained to provide organic vegetable farmers' incomes and livelihoods to support themselves and family needs. Lessons learnt from the exercise will be incorporated into the up scaling of the project after the pilot phase provide grounds on which up scaling can be hinge on to provide sustain outcomes.

Noting from the above list should inform and encourage participants involve in the project acquire adequate knowledge/skills to sustain project gains spreading knowledge/skills widely across districts, regions, nationally and as well internationally, spreading and widening the benefits that comes with the project for up scaling when negotiating and renewing implementation of next project phase.

An evaluation, therefore, helps to strengthen accountability and to increase learning, as well as to shape future WASH projects.

The objectives of the consultancy intervention are:

- To assess the project work/activities of the current Bread for the World financed project in general in relation to the project goals and components.
- to see if prior advice of prior evaluations has led to adjustments
- to assess the sustainability of the project
- to assess cross-cutting issues, gender in particular
- to develop lessons learnt - to be mainstreamed into similar operations of EKHC in order to support organizational learning and knowledge management
- To identify strengths and weaknesses in the project work.
- To make recommendations to improve the implementation and sustainability of the current project phase.

## **2.1 Questions of the evaluation:**

The assignment is to make assessments for each of the following nine aspects:

### **Aspect 1- EFFECTIVENESS**

- Has the project been effective in achieving the intended project objectives?

Evaluation question (Aspect 1)

1. How effective are the drip irrigation systems performing?
2. How is water availability for all year round organic vegetables production in the communities?
3. What is the quality of water used for the vegetables production?
4. What knowledge have beneficiary communities acquired regarding repaired and maintenance of drip irrigation system?
5. How are the target beneficiaries cooperating to manage their drip irrigation systems
6. What types of vegetables are they cultivating?
7. What has been the yields from the drip irrigation systems as compared to the yields of the other prevailing methods of irrigation in the communities?
- 8a. How many times do they cultivate the vegetables in the wet and dry seasons?
- 8b. What is the land size for the drip irrigation per community?
- 8c. How is land available and accessible to the beneficiary groups in the communities?
9. How is the Contribution of outputs to the achievement of the Project goals?
10. How do the beneficiary communities acquired compost for their vegetables production?
11. What level of training has been given to beneficiary communities on compost production for effective organic vegetables production?
12. How do farmers market their vegetables locally?
13. How many kilograms or tones of vegetables have been sold per season by the beneficiary groups of farmers under drip irrigation?
14. How effective are the participation of women and the disables among the groups in the production of the outputs?
15. What challenges affect the effective performance of the drip irrigation systems?
16. What factors motivate the production of the outputs?
17. What challenges influence the achievement/non-achievement of the project objectives?

### **Areas for consideration include:**

- The achievement / Likely achievement of the project outputs;
- The achievement / likely achievement of the project purpose
- The contribution / likely contribution to the project towards the project goal
- The challenges influencing the achievement/non-achievement of the project objectives

### **Aspect 2 – IMPACT**

What positive and negative impact (intended and unintended) has the project had on beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries?

Areas for consideration include:

- The intended and unintended effects ( social& cultural, physical, ecological, economic, spiritual), both positive and negative, of the project on beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries;

- The Major factors influencing the impact of the project on beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.
- 

### **Evaluation question (Aspect 2)**

- 1a. Did drip irrigation increase household income?
- 1b. If yes, what was the contribution of irrigation towards household income increase?
- 2a. Did irrigation access lead to new investments?
- 2b. If yes, what kind of investment?
- 3a. What is the level of achievement in facilitating Organic vegetable farmers to acquire household latrines?
- 3b. How many beneficiary farmers acquired latrines from the project?
- 3c. have they been able to generate faecal sludge for compost from their household latrines?
- 3d. If yes, how many organic vegetable farmers have used compost generated from the faecal matter and urine of their latrines for organic vegetable production?
4. How many beneficiary farmers utilize the knowledge acquired in compost production to produce their own compost?
5. What are the positive and negative impacts of using composts from faecal material on vegetables and the environment?
6. How many non-beneficiary vegetable farmers have adopted organic vegetables production in the communities?
- 7a. Did access to irrigation strengthen water use groups (WUGs)?
- 7b. If yes, in what ways?
- 8a. Are WUGs effective for O&M of drip irrigation system?
- 8b. If yes, in what ways?
- 9a. Did increase in income from irrigated agriculture enable attendance of children in schools?
- 9b. If yes, in what ways?
- 10a. Did increase in income enable household members to seek better health services?
- 10b. If yes, in what ways?
- 11a. Did increase in income contribute to changes in consumption pattern, including food?
- 11b. If yes, in what ways?
- 12a. Did increase in income contribute to changes in household expenditure pattern?
- 12b. If yes, in what ways?
- 13a. Did increase in income contribute to better housing conditions?
- 13b. If yes, in what ways?
- 14a. Did increase in income contribute to other wealth indicators?
- 14b. If yes, in what ways?
15. What level of achievements has been made in creating sustained production, marketing and consumption of organic vegetables locally?
16. What gains or benefits have the male, female, physical challenge and aged made from participating in the project?
17. What negative impacts have you recorded from the implementation of this project?
18. What do you think can be done to make the project achieved more positive outcomes and impacts?

### **Aspect3- RELEVANCE**

How relevant is the project to the priorities and policies of the target group, the WUZDA, the partners? Final Report

### **Evaluation questions (Aspect 3)**

1. How Relevant is the project to the policies of WUZDA?
2. How Relevant is the project to the policies of the Partner Organisation of Doner Country?
3. How relevant is the project design to the project objectives, expected outputs, outcomes and goals?
4. How Relevant is the project to the needs of target beneficiaries?
5. What is the contribution of the project to strengthening the capacity of the partner organisation?
6. What is the contribution of the project to strengthening the capacity of WUZDA in its mission and role to work with local communities?
7. How consistent is the project with the vision , values, strategy and resources of WUZDA?
8. How consistent is the project with the vision , values, strategy and resources of the Partner organisation?
9. Is the project able to enhance the existing skills, knowledge and coping strategies of the target group?
10. which major factors influence the relevance of the project to the priorities and policies of the target group, WUZDA, and the partner?
11. What is the coherence of the project with national and local policies?

### **Aspect 4- EFFICIENCY**

Has the project been efficient in achieving the intended objectives?

Areas for consideration include:

### **Evaluation questions (Aspect 4)**

1. How efficient are the drip irrigation systems performing?
2. How cost-efficient are the project activities being carried out?
3. How efficient is organic vegetables production under drip irrigation technology compared with those produced under alternative methods in terms of water management, crop density and yields?
4. How efficient are the achievements of objectives in terms of timeliness, staff strength, technical know-how of field officers, input availability, farmers efforts and budget allocation and disbursement?
5. What accounted for low or high efficiency in producing project outputs and outcomes?
6. Which major factors influence the efficiency of the project?

### **Aspect 5- SUSTAINABILITY**

Will the benefits of the project be sustained after the end of the project benefits after funding by Bread for the World has ceased;

### **Evaluation questions (Aspect 5)**

1. How is the continuation of project benefits assured after funding by EED has ended?
2. Have beneficiary communities been trained and sensitised to develop sence of ownership for the project? If yes how was it done?
3. What financial sustainability criteria has been developed by WUZDA and Partners for the project beneficiary communities?
4. What technical sustainability criteria has been developed for the beneficiary communities?
5. How is the ability of beneficiary communities to mobilize local resources to manage the project on their own after the end of the funding?

6. How is the ability of the beneficiary groups to access funds and support from other sources (including the private Sector)?
7. Which major factors influence the sustainability of the project?

### **Aspect 6 – MANAGEMENT / COORDINATION AND COHERENCE**

How effectively has the project been managed and coordinated by the partner organization?  
Final Report

How has the project been integrated with the activities and priorities of other agencies and organizations (including local)?

Areas for consideration include:

#### **Evaluation questions (Aspect 6)**

1. What are the linkages and relationships between the target group, the partner, the WUZDA, Bread for the World, and other agencies and organization?
2. What training and orientation have the management team of the project been given regarding the project coordination and management?
3. How regular have the field officers been visiting the field to conduct field monitoring?
4. What factors affect effective coordination of the project?
5. What is the relationship between the Doner Partner and the local Partner (WUZDA) in the coordination and management?
6. How is the capacity of WUZDA to manage multi – purpose partnership?
7. Which major factors influence coordination and coherence of the project with the activities and priorities of other agencies and organizations?

In making assessments for each Aspect, the Evaluation Team should also consider how ‘good practice’ has been incorporated in to this project. The evaluation Team is also encouraged to draw attention to examples of ‘better/‘Best practice’ demonstrated by the project.

### **Aspect 7 –Stakeholder views**

#### **Evaluation questions (Aspect 7)**

1. What do the participants think about the project?
2. Did they feel like they had the ability to provide feedback and input into the project’s implementation and design?
3. How do they feel about the organization?
4. Were there mechanisms in place for presenting complaints if they had any?

### **Aspect 8 –Learning for future projects**

1. What lessons from this project could contribute to making the next phase of this project, or other projects, more effective?
2. What aspects of this project could be replicated elsewhere and what should not be replicated (at least without some modifications)?
3. Is there anything that has learnt from this project that challenges or affirms your views on what is good development practice?

## **Aspect 9 –Environment**

1. To what degree has the environment been considered in the current phase?
2. How successful were any of the environmental protection and enhancement measures taken within the project e.g. Ponds, dugouts/catchment protection?
3. How could these be enhanced in the new phase?
4. Rather than just taking a “do no harm” approach, it would be great to see positive environmental action given greater emphasis in any new phase. Can the evaluator give recommendations for this?

## **2.2 Methodology and process**

It is envisioned that the evaluation will comprise of an **initial review** of relevant literature associated to the project (mainly reports and proposals) and then a period of primary field research. This will comprise of **field visits** to various drip irrigation facilities scheme locations and through the use of interview, surveys, PRA techniques undertake the necessary data gathering.

The process is as follows:

### **Desk study:**

- Telephone interviews with the project officers of Bread for The World / Berlin, reviews of documents, production of the inception report

### **Field study:**

- Dates for field visits: From April - May 2018 around 10 days plus travel days in **TAMALE; GHANA**
- Briefing to WUZDA up to 3 days prior to field research for Team leader (The team leader here is referred to the Lead Consultant) (for briefing, reading and evaluation design ) and up to 2 days for Team members (the evaluation assistants for the consultant) (for briefing and reading / review)
- **kick off** with WUZDA, possibly adapting the inception report,
- **de-briefing/** short presentation of preliminary results to WUZDA

### **Submitting the report:**

- Up to 10 days for consultant team for a draft report writing after the field visit.
- Receive feedback from WUZDA and partners and Bread for The World within 10 days after submission.
- The final report shall be sent within 3 weeks.

### **Presentation and follow up**

- The international consultant will present the findings to Bread for The World in Berlin. WUZDA will attend through a conference call.
- The local consultant will present the findings to WUZDA and its stakeholders. He or she will support WUZDA with drafting an implementation plan of the adopted recommendations

### 2.3 Itinerary of mid-term evaluation -- April to May 2018)

#### 2.4

				Time frame (when) - 2018											
				April				May				June			
No#	Activity/Assignment	Location (where)	Responsibility (who)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
<b>Desk study</b>							X								
1	Reading, telephone interviews and evaluation design, inception report	Germany, Ghana	Consultants, Bread for the World, WUZDA				X								
<b>Field study (10 days plus travel)</b>															
2	Kick off and Briefing	WUZDA's office premises.	WUZDA, Consultants				X								
3	Field visits for consultant	Vegetable farms, Stakeholders'.	Consultant, Team members, WUZDA					X	X						
4	Presentation of preliminary findings	WUZDA's conference hall.	Team members, WUZDA						X	X					
5	Submission of draft report.	WUZDA, Stakeholders', Bread for The World	Consultants, Team members'									X	X	X	
6	Submission of final report to team members and presentation of findings	WUZDA's team, Board of Advisors, Bread for The World	Consultants, Team members												X X
<b>Learning process</b>															X
7	Advising of drafting an implementation plan		Local consultant, WUZDA												X

### 3. PROFILE OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team should consist of at least two evaluators, ideally an international and a local consultant. The evaluation team should have

- extensive knowledge of and experience in the crop production, land, water, climate issues and management in Ghana/ West Africa, with a special focus on (drip) irrigation, ECO SAN and waste water irrigation
- have extensive experience with evaluations (both qualitative and quantitative research methods) esp. household surveys or conducting surveys on income
- Have extensive knowledge in mainstreaming, awareness raising, workshops and lobbying, capacity building, participatory methods,
- Willing to work as a team
- Ability to work in English and in the local language (Dagomba)
- Have experience working with civil society structures in Africa in general and in Ghana in particular.

#### **4. CONFIDENTIALITY:**

The engagement will be carried out in confidentiality. The Consultant will not act in any way which might result in the impairment of independence, or which might lead outsiders to believe that independence and secrecy has been impaired. The Consultant will neither use, nor appear to use, information acquired during the course of this engagement for either personal advantage or the advantage of a third party (see OECD/DAC standards). The consultant has to treat everybody involved in the evaluation in a fair way, and treat all the information acquired confidentially, meaning as well that in the report isn't said who said what. Furthermore, the consultant has to ensure the credibility and the usability of the evaluation.

#### **5. PRODUCTS:**

The evaluation will be carried out in conformity with the OEDC/DAC evaluation criteria and standards and the evaluation manuals by Bread for the World.

The evaluator will prepare the following deliverables:

##### **Inception Report**

An inception report should be prepared by the evaluators before going into the full fledged data collection exercise. The inception report (approx. 3-5 pages) shall provide a feedback on how the objectives, questions and reports as described in the ToR can be achieved within the evaluation. It contains the evaluation design and methodology and exact time frame of the evaluation process. Suggestions can be made to supplement or restrict the ToR. These suggestions, especially when the modifications concerning objectives of the evaluation and crucial questions, have to be approved by the customer in written form as this is an alteration within the original contract. The inception report provides WUZDA, Bread for the World and the evaluators with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset. A structure for the inception report can be given by Bread for the World on demand. The inception report shall be written in English.

##### **2. Draft of Evaluation Report**

WUZDA, its stakeholders and Bread for the World should review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria.

##### **3. Evaluation Report (30 pages max plus Annexe)**

The final report shall be written in English (30 pages + annex) and has – as a minimum – to include the following contents:

- Key data of the evaluation: see above “inception report”
- Executive summary: a tightly drafted, to-the-point, free-standing document (about 5 pages), including the key issues of the evaluation, main analytical points, conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations.
- Introduction: purpose of the evaluation, evaluation scope and key questions. Short description of the projects to be evaluated and relevant frame conditions
- Evaluation design/ methodology
- Key results/findings: with regard to the questions pointed out in the TOR/inception report (including project and context analysis), Assessment of the extent to which issues of equity and gender are incorporated in the projects
- Conclusions based on evidence and analysis

- Recommendations regarding future steps/activities/follow-up – carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, relevant and feasible (if possible for each conclusion a recommendation).
- Lessons learnt (generalizations of conclusions applicable for wider use).
- Annexes (ToR, list of persons/organisations consulted, literature and documentation consulted etc.).

#### **4. Short summary of the evaluation in an anonymous way for the homepage of Bread for the World**

The deliverables are to be prepared in English only.

#### **6. Responsibilities and duties**

Unit of assignment of this evaluation are WUZDA in cooperation with its project officer in the department of Western and Central Africa at Bread for the World in Berlin. The projects evaluated are managed by the project officer for Ghana, department of Western and Central Africa. The country officer of Ghana is responsible for a smooth preparation, operation and communication process with the partner organizations within the field study.

The technical management (contract, general communication, provision of needed documents) and the assurance of quality of the evaluation lie in the responsibility of the unit for internal audit and compliance and result based management.

Both units in line with WUZDA are responsible for the improvement of all products delivered by the consultants and will take part in the final presentation of the results.

## 7. OFFERS

Offers must be handed in to the email address below **until 31st March 2018** and must consist of the following documents:

- A sound CV of all of the participating evaluators
- A short offer detailing the methods and instruments to be used to answer the evaluation questions
- A timetable
- A budget stating precisely the daily fees for the evaluators, costs for transport to the project field and additional costs.

The international and national consultants are expected to hand in an offer together. It is possible for the international consultant to hand in an offer alone and recruit the local consultant at a later time. It is possible to get support in the recruitment process of the local consultant by Bread for the World and WUZDA. Responsibilities and roles have to be specified in the offer already. The sub contraction of the local consultant is the responsibility of WUZDA.

The selection process of the assignment will be taken place the first week of April. The consultant will be informed the 6<sup>th</sup> of April the latest about the selection process.

**Please hand the offer via email to**

Evangelisches Werk für Diakonie und Entwicklung  
Attn. Johanna Dienst  
Department West and Central Africa  
Caroline Michaelis Str. 1  
10115 Berlin, Germany  
Email: johanna.dienst@brot-fuer-die-welt.de