



TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)
END-OF-THE PROJECT EVALUATION
(Individual Consultancy)

Project Title: **ENHANCING BLUE ECONOMY IN THE IGAD MEMBER STATES FOR BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATIONS AND LIVELIHOOD DIVERSIFICATION**

(Ref No. IGAD/AED-BE/08-2024/01)

GENERAL INFORMATION	
Category of Procurement:	Services-Consultancy
Service Title:	Consultancy Service for end-of-the project evaluation
Division/Unit:	Agriculture and Environment Division/ Sustainable Environment Protection Unit - Blue Economy Section
Type:	Individual Regional Consultant
Number of Consultant:	One (1)
Duty Station:	Home-based with some field missions
Expected Places of Travel:	Field visits to selected IGAD Member States; and briefing and debriefing sessions with the Embassy of Sweden in Addis Ababa and IGAD Secretariat is envisaged
Duration:	44 working days but can be accomplished within two (2) months (60 days) from the date of signature of the contract.
Expected Start Date	Contract signing date of IGAD Secretariat
Language	English

1. Background

In 2021, the Intergovernmental Authority on Development - IGAD, with the support of the Swedish Embassy in Addis Ababa initiated a three-year project to **Enhancing the contribution of Blue Economy for Biodiversity Conservation and Livelihood Diversification**. This project contributes to the following outcome “the capacity of IGAD and its Member States strengthened by structuring and mainstreaming the BE at both national and regional levels while increasing cooperation and regional integration, and strengthening support to the member states to develop their own national BE strategies. It will also contribute to the effective implementation of the Africa Blue Economy Strategy”. It is three years (2021 – 2023) project to start the implementation of the IGAD Blue Economy strategy in selected priority intervention areas at four coastal countries (Djibouti, Kenya, Somalia and Sudan)

of IGAD. *In consultation with the Sweden Embassy, IGAD project team with the same budget expanded the area coverage from 4 coastal states to all 7 IGAD MS including non-coastal countries (Ethiopia, South Sudan and Uganda).*

The project objectives are:

- To establish a functional Blue Economy structure at IGAD to cater for the regional and national needs (selected member states of IGAD),
- To assess the impact of pollution and develop mitigation measures on aquatic biodiversity and ecosystems, and
- To increase research and knowledge management/dissemination on key BE indicators (questions for the IGAD region for learning), policy and practice change among the Member States.

In a nutshell, this project intends to achieve the following three broad results:

- Blue Economy approach in IGAD region harmonized and coordinated to harness the contribution of the different sectors,
- The health of marine aquatic ecosystems is improved and systems for managing, controlling and reducing aquatic pollution and waste are strengthened in IGAD coastal countries, and
- Blue Economy enhancing technologies and innovations promoted, documented and disseminated.

The project assisted IGAD's mandate that extends to policy formulation and implementation, capacity development, research and advocacy, and technological transfer.

2. Purpose of the Evaluation

This end of project evaluation focuses on the entire implementation period. The evaluation is forward looking and will capture effectively lessons learned and provide information on the nature, extent and where possible, the potential impact and sustainability of the project. The evaluation will assess the project design, scope, implementation status and the capacity to achieve the project objectives. It will collate and analyse lessons learned, challenges faced, and best practices obtained during implementation which will inform the programming strategy in the next programming phase 2022-2026 in response to the Embassy of Sweden's priorities.

The emphasis on learning lessons speaks to the issue of understanding what has and what has not worked as a guide for future planning. It will assess the performance of the project against planned results. The evaluation will assess the preliminary indications of potential impact and sustainability of results including the contribution to capacity development and achievement of sustainable development goals. The results of the evaluation will draw lessons that will inform the key stakeholders of this evaluation who are IGAD Member States, the IGAD Secretariat and the Embassy of Sweden in Addis Ababa. The evaluation will generate knowledge from the implementation of the project by the various implementing partners in collaboration with IGAD and reflect on challenges; lessons learnt and propose actionable recommendations for future programming.

3. Scope and focus of the Evaluation

This end of Project evaluation will assess the effectiveness of the implementation strategy and the results. This will include the implementation modalities, roles and responsibilities of implementers including the IGAD Member States, IGAD the interventions, coordination, partnership arrangements, institutional strengthening, beneficiary participation, replication, and sustainability of the programme. The evaluation will include review of the project design and assumptions made at the beginning of the project development process. Project management including the implementation strategies; project activities; it will assess the extent to which the project results have been achieved, partnerships established, capacities built, and how cross cutting issues of mainstreaming gender, human rights and conflict sensitivity have been addressed. It will also assess whether the project implementation strategy has been optimum and recommend areas for improvement and learning. To achieve this, the evaluation will focus on the areas in 3.2 below.

3.2. The Evaluation Questions

The following key questions will guide the end of project evaluation:

- a) Relevance** – (Access design and focus of the project. Is the intervention doing the right things?)
- To what extent were the project intervention's responsiveness to needs and priorities of stakeholders?
 - To what extent were the stakeholder groups engaged throughout design and implementation of the project?
 - Did any changes occur during project implementation and how did the interventions adapt to the changes?
 - To what extent was the design of the budget support programme appropriate and relevant given the political, economic, and social context of the IGAD Region?
 - To what extent did the intervention's design reflect the gender issue?
- b) Coherence** – (The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in the IGAD Member States and IGAD as an institution. How well does the intervention fit in the overall internal and external context of IGAD?)
- To what extent is there synergy and linkages between the project and other IGAD projects and programs? This includes internal coherence and external coherence.
 - To what extent is there synergy and linkages between the project and Member States priorities
 - Was there complementarity, harmonisation, and co-ordination with others, and to what extent did the project interventions add value to other ongoing processes while avoiding duplication of effort?
 - To what extent are the intervention's design, delivery and results coherent with the African Blue Economy Strategy and Agenda 2060?
 - To what extent does the intervention support national strategies and initiatives that aim to enhance the contribution from blue economy? What lessons can be learned?
- c) Effectiveness-** (Describe the management processes and their appropriateness in supporting delivery. Is the intervention achieving its objectives?)
- To what extent did the project achieve its overall objectives?
 - What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project?
 - To what extent were the results (impacts, outcomes, and outputs) achieved? Was the project effective in delivering desired/planned results?
 - Were the inputs and strategies identified, and where they are realistic, appropriate, and adequate to achieve the results? To what extent did the Project's M&E mechanism contribute to meeting project results?
 - How effective were the strategies and tools used in the implementation of the project?
 - How effective has the project been in responding to the needs of the beneficiaries, and what results were achieved?
 - What are the future intervention strategies and issues?
 - Did the intervention achieve its objectives and expected results in ways that contribute to sustainable management of the aquatic resources? If so, how?
- d) Efficiency** – (How well were resources being used in project implementation? The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.) –
- Was the process of achieving results efficient?
 - Specifically did the actual or expected results (outputs and outcomes) justify the costs incurred?
 - Were the resources effectively utilized?
 - What factors contributed to implementation efficiency?

- Did project activities overlap and duplicate other similar interventions (funded nationally/regionally and /or by other donors)?
 - Are there more efficient ways and means of delivering more and better results (outputs and outcomes) with the available inputs? –
 - Could a different approach have produced better results?
 - How was the project’s collaboration with the Embassy of Sweden in Addis Ababa, IGAD Member States, development partners, and the Steering Committee?
 - How efficient were the management and accountability structures of the project?
 - How did the project financial management processes and procedures affect project implementation?
 - What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of the project implementation process?
- e) Impact** (What difference does the intervention make? The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended, or unintended, higher-level effects.)
- Has the intervention caused a significant change in the lives of the intended beneficiaries/target groups?
 - How did the intervention cause higher-level effects (such as changing policy makers attitudes towards the Blue Economy agenda)?
 - Is the intervention transformative – does it create positive changes in structuring the blue economy in IGAD and MS?
 - How the intervention viewed within the wider political, economic, religious, legislative, and socio-cultural environment impact outcomes?
 - Is the intervention leading to other changes, including “scalable” or “replicable” results?
 - How will the intervention contribute for maintaining the health of the aquatic ecosystem?
- f) Sustainability** (Will the benefits last? The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.)
- To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to be sustained after the completion of this project?
 - What is the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of project outcomes and benefits after completion of the project?
 - How effective were the exit strategies, and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints?
 - Will the achievements persist after the conclusion of the intervention? Have processes contributed to sustaining these benefits? Have mechanisms been set up to support the achievement in the longer term?
 - What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability of Project outcomes and the potential for replication of the approach?
 - How were capacities strengthened at the individual and institutional level (including contributing factors and constraints)?
 - Describe the main lessons that have emerged - What are the recommendations for similar support in future? (NB: The recommendations should provide comprehensive proposals for future interventions based on the current evaluation findings).

4. Methodology for Evaluation

The End of Project evaluation will be carried out in accordance with IGAD’s Evaluation Norms and Standards of Evaluation and Ethical Standards as well as OECD/DAC evaluation principles and guidelines and in full compliance with the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards (206). This is a summative evaluation involving qualitative and quantitative methods to evaluate the support to “ENHANCING BLUE ECONOMY IN THE IGAD COASTAL MEMBER STATES FOR BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATIONS AND LIVELIHOOD DIVERSIFICATION” implementation and performance and to make recommendations for the next programming cycle.

4.1. Data Collection

The End of Project Evaluation will be carried out through a wide participation of all relevant stakeholders including the IGAD Member States, Civil Society Organizations, as well as development partners, and right holders. Field visits to selected IGAD Member States; and briefing and debriefing sessions with the Embassy of Sweden in Addis Ababa and IGAD Secretariat is envisaged. Data collected should be disaggregated (by sex, age, and location), where possible. In order to use existing sources/information and avoid duplication, data will be mainly collected from various information sources through a desk review that will include the comprehensive desk review and analysis of relevant documents, information, data/statistics, triangulation of different studies, etc. Data will also be collected from stakeholders' key informants through interviews, discussions, consultative processes, and observations in field missions. This phase will be comprised of:

- Review and analysis of relevant documents including the IGAD Blue Economy documents & reports, recent studies and research reports, developmental and social reports,
- Critical analysis of available data with regards to tools developed and their use.
- The End of Project Evaluation will benefit from and use optimally the data collected through the interviews with project beneficiaries and target groups.

4.2. Basic Documents for Desk Review

The End of Project Evaluation will take cognisance of the IGAD Blue Economy Program Annual Reports, The End of Project Evaluation should also consider the lessons learned from the Member States evaluation in context of

- Response to the national development objectives (project relevance)
- Creating a common, coherent, and results-oriented strategy for the successor project
- Facilitating joint transnational programmes to the extent possible with a view to reducing overall transactions costs

5.0 Implementation timelines

Activity	Deliverable	Time allocated
Evaluation design, methodology and detailed work plan	Inception report	3 days
Inception Meeting Initial briefing		
Documents review and stakeholder consultations	Desk review report	7 days
Field Visits	Draft report	15 days
Data analysis, debriefing, and presentation of draft Evaluation Report		12 days
Validation Workshop	Draft final Report	2 days
Finalization of Evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by all stakeholders and submit to IGAD	Final Report	5 days

6. Expected Deliverables

The following deliverables are expected.

6.1 Inception report

The Evaluator will prepare an inception report which details the evaluators understanding of the evaluation and how the evaluation questions will be addressed. This is to ensure that evaluator, IGAD and the Embassy of Sweden in Addis Ababa have a shared understanding of the evaluation. The inception report will include the evaluation matrix summarizing the evaluation design, methodology,

evaluation questions, data sources and collection analysis tool for each data source and the measure by which each question will be evaluated. The report will include the scope of work, work plan, and time frame. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities, and deliverables, with clear responsibilities for each task or product. The inception report will be discussed and agreed upon with all stakeholders.

6.2 Draft Evaluation report

The Evaluator will prepare an End of Project Evaluation Report, cognizant of the proposed format of the report and checklist used for the assessment of valuation report and the report will be submitted to IGAD review and comments. IGAD will distribute it to a select number of stakeholders for review and comments. Comments from the stakeholders will be provided within 10 days after the reception of the Draft Report. The report will be reviewed to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria. The report should provide options for strategy and policy as well as recommendations. IGAD is responsible for ensuring timely arrangement for a Steering Committee meeting for the review and validation of the evaluation report.

6.3 The final report (30 to 50 pages):

This will be submitted 10 days and will include comments from the validation. The content and the structure of the final analytical report with finding, recommendations and lessons learnt covering the scope of the evaluation should meet the requirements of the IGAD M & E Policy and should include the following:

- Executive summary (1-2 pages)
- Introduction (1 page)
- Description of the evaluation methodology (4 pages)
- Situational analysis about the outcome, outputs, and partnership strategy (7-10 pages)
- Analysis of opportunities to provide guidance for future programming (5 - 7 pages)
- Key findings, including best practices and lessons learned (10 - 15 pages)
- Conclusion and recommendations (4-5 pages)
- Appendices: charts, terms of reference, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed

7. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

The consultant shall be paid the consultancy fee upon completion of the following milestones.

- 30% after adoption of the inception report
- 30% after presentation of the draft report
- 40% after the approval of the final report

The consultancy fee will be paid as Lump Sum Amount (all-inclusive of expenses related to the consultancy). The contract price will be fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

8. Required expertise and qualification

The Evaluator must have the following expertise and qualifications:

- At least a master's degree in Aquatic/Marine Resource Management, Natural Resource Economics, Public Policy, International Development, Development Economics/Planning, Economic, Public Administration, and Management and in any other related university degree.
- Extensive expertise, knowledge, and experience in the field of evaluation of development programmes in Marine/freshwater areas
- At least 10 years of experience in working with international organizations and donors.
- At least 10 years' experience of programme formulation, monitoring, and evaluation.
- Knowledge of ecosystem valuation and assessments projects.
- Fluency in English. Working knowledge in French is an added advantage; and
- Excellent written and verbal communication skills in English.