TERMS OF REFERENCES (TOR)

MID-TERM EVALUATION-SOM 1068

Country:	Somaliland
Project title:	Systemic climate-change resilience for food, fodder and water security for vulnerable communities in Burao, Somaliland
Project no:	SOM 1068
Project holder:	Welthungerhilfe, Candlelight and Acted
Co-financer (line):	European Union
Project period:	18.11.2023- 17.05.2026
Location	Burco, Somaliland

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1. About Welthungerhilfe

Welthungerhilfe (WHH) is one of Germany's largest private humanitarian and development organizations, dedicated to eradicating hunger and poverty. Established in 1962 as the German section of the global "Freedom from Hunger Campaign," WHH envisions a world where all people can lead self-determined lives in dignity and justice, free from hunger. Since 2001, WHH has been actively working in Somaliland, maintaining a country office in Hargeisa and sub-offices in Borama and Burco.

WHH's work in Somaliland focuses on strengthening food and nutrition security, enhancing WASH systems, and promoting sustainable agricultural and livestock production. The organization also supports climate resilience through innovations in landscape restoration and natural resource management. WHH applies a Humanitarian-Development-Peace (HDP) Nexus approach, emphasizing localization through strategic partnerships, active engagement in coordination forums, and commitment to gender-responsive programming.

1.2. Project background

The project aims to enhance systemic climate-change resilience while ensuring food, fodder, and water security for vulnerable communities in Burao. This will be achieved through two key outcomes. First, the project supports targeted Somali communities in implementing dryland-specific reforestation, afforestation, and sustainable rangeland and agricultural land management practices. Second, the project focuses on strengthening climate-smart agro-pastoral and pastoral production systems, along with improving the water supply system

Under **Outcome 1**, the project focuses on sustainable dryland management to strengthen climate resilience. By partnering with communities and authorities, it seeks to establish sustainable rangeland management systems through awareness-raising, capacity-building, and the creation of protected and rotational grazing areas. Continuous training and community engagement ensure that pastoralists and agro-pastoralists adopt effective land restoration and regeneration techniques. To further protect degraded lands from erosion, flooding, and water loss, the project incorporates soil and water conservation structures, along with road-managed water flood-irrigation systems. Additionally, in collaboration with the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MoECC) and the National Disaster Preparedness and Food Reserve Authority (NADFOR), the project has established Community Disaster Management

Committees (CDMCs) and supports the development and implementation of climate security action plans to enhance disaster preparedness.

Outcome 2 focuses on improving food security through climate-smart agro-pastoral production and strengthening water supply systems. The project enhances communities' capacity to adopt climate-adaptive crop production techniques while also investing in diversified livelihood opportunities to increase income for women, men, and youth. A key component of this outcome is the control and utilization of invasive species, particularly Prosopis, for income generation while simultaneously restoring rangelands. Recognizing the fundamental role of water in agriculture, livestock production, and household well-being, the project also prioritizes the establishment and strengthening of sustainable water supply systems to ensure long-term access to water resources.

The project is implemented as a consortium, with Welthungerhilfe (WHH) as the lead organization, and Candlelight and ACTED as consortium members

Table 1: Project summary

Impact	Contribute to systemic climate-change resilience for food, fodder and water security for vulnerable communities in Burao, Somaliland.
Outcomes	**Outcome 1:** Targeted vulnerable Somali communities apply dryland specific reforestation, afforestation and sustainable rangeland/ agricultural land management practices. **Outcome 2:** Targeted vulnerable Somali communities apply climate smart agro-pastoral and pastoral production and water supply practices.
Outputs	Output 1.1: Sustainable rangeland management systems identified and established in a participatory and inclusive manner. Output 1.2: Methods of land restoration and regeneration are imparted in a collaborative manner and practised. Output 1.3: Pastoral and agricultural lands are protected from erosion and flooding. Output 1.4: 30 regional and community climate security action plans developed and implemented. Output 2.1: Enhanced communities' capacities to apply climate adaptive crop production practices, including water saving techniques. Output 2.2: Increased income for women, men, and youth participants through diversified and sustainable livelihood sources. Output 2.3: Increased control and use of invasive species for environmental protection and income generation. Output 2.4: Sustainable water supply systems are established/strengthened in Burao District.
Project Target (as per project proposal and plan)	**Target Group** 1: Pastoralists and Agropastoralists (3,338 persons). **Target Group 2**: Community Members (81,900 persons). **Target Group 3**: Community Committees (539 persons). **Target Group 4**: Ministries and Local Authorities (88 persons). **Target Group 5**: Civil Society Organizations (30 persons).

	Target Group 6: Private Sector (1 company)
	Final beneficiary group 1: 40 communities (around 120,000 persons)
	Final beneficiary group 2: 20 neighbouring communities (60,000 persons)
	Final beneficiary group 3: Somaliland public (estimated 10,000 persons)
Project Locations	Burco, Somaliland

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE

The overall purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to assess the continued relevance of the action, progress made towards achieving planned objectives and the sustainability of the interventions beyond the term of this action; systemic climate-change resilience for food, fodder and water security for vulnerable communities in Burao, Somaliland.

More specifically, the evaluator is expected to:

1)   Determine, as systematically and objectively as possible, the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of the expected project outcomes.

2)   Explore any delays in project implementation, their causes, and draw lessons from the delays and provide suggestions for improved implementation to avoid further delays going forward and to ensure achievement of the project objectives.

3)   Assess the achievements of the project so far, against its stated outcomes, and identify significant factors that are facilitating or impeding the delivery of outcomes.

4)   Document challenges, programmatic lessons learned, and key recommendations for project improvement. It will also provide an opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and propose the necessary adjustments needed to refocus the project.

3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The scope of this evaluation will be on a single project (SOM 1068) and will cover the area where WHH implements its project activities in Burco, Somaliland. The evaluation will look at the project in terms of the strengths and limitations of the support it provides to Contribute to systemic climate-change resilience for food, fodder and water security for vulnerable communities through cross-sectoral measures.

4. USERS OF THE EVALUATION

The primary users of this evaluation will be the Head of Project together with the project team, Head of Programmes, and the donor EU. The findings will inform the appropriate measures and recommendations to be taken to improve the project performance. The project participants will also be informed about the evaluation findings.

5. EVALUATION QUESTIONS (AND CRITERIA)

The evaluation will be guided by the widely used and agreed OECD/DAC criteria for evaluating development assistance of **Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability**[1].Given this is a mid-term evaluation, sustainability and impact will not be a key focus, but their inclusion is to allow assessment of the factors that are likely

---

[1] For More Details see: https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm

to affect impact and sustainability and how the chances of the project having intended impact and being sustainable can be increased.

Table 2: Criteria and evaluation questions

Criteria	Evaluation Questions
Relevance: The project relevance will be assessed by looking into whether the funding and support are consistent with local needs, priorities, and possibilities, including the needs, and priorities.	1) To what extent was the SOM project set up in line with actual needs and gaps of the target groups, the target locations, and the context? 2) To what extent the project builds local capacities and works towards improving the resilience of communities and people affected by crisis? 3) Were all groups within the affected communities aware of and how to give feedback on the activities, and did they feel safe using these feedback channels? 4) To what extent have communities been actively engaged and involved in the implementation of the project, has it contributed to their sense of ownership, and in what ways is this reflected?
Effectiveness: To what extent did the intervention achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differences across groups thus far. This can be done, for instance, by emphasizing tangible improvements for the target population	5) To what extent have the intended outcomes (and use of output) been achieved or are likely to be achieved by the end of the project? 6) What indications are there that the achieved outcomes can be attributed to the interventions of the project? 7) How did external factors positively or negatively influence the achievement of the outcomes? 8) To what extent have participants adopted/implemented the training provided, and if adoption is limited, what barriers or challenges are hindering their adoption or implementation?
Efficiency: This will assess the project outputs, both qualitative and quantitative, in relation to the inputs i,e To what extent is the intervention delivering or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way?	9) To what extent has the use of project resources been appropriate with regard to the achieved outputs / outcomes? 10) Were the Project activities implemented on time as planned? 11) Provide arguments for the rating of project efficiency as high, medium or low.
Coherence: Will assess the alignment and coordination of activities within the project and with other similar initiatives in the same area, ensuring that efforts are complementary, non-redundant, and contribute to shared goals to maximize the overall effectiveness and impact	12) To what extent have there been complementarities, harmonization, and coordination between the SOM 1068 project and other similar initiatives implemented by different actors in the same area? 13) How has this collaboration (or lack thereof) impacted the overall effectiveness and outcomes of the project?" 14) To what extent has the SOM 1068 project collaborated with local authorities, and how has this collaboration contributed to the success of the project?
Sustainability: The project sustainability will be assessed by establishing to what extent the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue?	15) What is the probability of the continuation of positive project outcomes beyond the end of the project (both by project participants and possibly others)? 16) Are there any factors threatening the sustainability of project outcomes? How does the project seek to mitigate these risks?

	17) Are there any factors that might strengthen community ownership and sustainability? Is there any action the project should take to promote these factors?
Impact: The project impact will be assessed by establishing to which extent the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects?	18) To what extent has the project contributed to enhancing climate-change resilience among vulnerable communities in Burco, Somaliland? 19) What impact has the project had on food security, fodder availability and the water supply system for the targeted communities in Burco, and how sustainable are these improvements? 20) Has the SOM 1068 project led to any unintended positive or negative impacts? If negative impacts, how have these impacts been managed or mitigated?
Lessons Learnt: The evaluator will document challenges, programmatic lessons learnt and key recommendation for PALS project improvement.	21) What are the recommendations for improvement the project or for other similar programs elsewhere in Somaliland? 22) What best practices are to be adopted for such projects/programs in future? 23) What mistakes should be avoided if the project were to be replicated?

6. EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will use both qualitative and quantitative methods, using both primary and secondary data sources. This should involve interviews with project beneficiaries, partners, stakeholders, field visits, project documents, and data review. A range of existing information will be made available to the evaluator upon notification of the award. This would include (but is not limited to): The original proposal, M&E plan, Indicator performance tracking table (IPTT) or similar tool, work plans, monitoring data, PDM & interim reports, and any other relevant documents.

As part of this assignment, the successful evaluator will apply different methodologies, including primary data collection and a review of existing resources. The primary data collection will include Key Informant Interviews (KII) with key project staff and local stakeholders; Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with beneficiaries; a Most Significant Change tool (MSC); a beneficiary survey; and substantiating photos. The evaluation will incorporate various sampling methods to ensure robust and credible results. Quantitative surveys will use random or stratified sampling to ensure a representative sample of beneficiaries, while qualitative methods like KIIs and FGDs will use purposive sampling to select key stakeholders and beneficiaries with relevant experiences.

It is a requirement that the evaluation should be conducted in compliance with the data protection regulations. The consultant is expected to sign an understanding to ensure protection of personal data collected during this assignment. The consultant in the (inception report) need to elaborate on how beneficiary data will be collected and protected; what tools/ IT equipment will be used to store the data, how long this data will be stored.

Translation staff, if needed, must be organized by the evaluator and should strictly comply with the above measures. It is the role of the evaluator to ensure that interviewers are trained in confidentiality procedures. Interviewers need to be trained in obtaining verbal consent for interview participation. Staff should have experience in program monitoring, surveying, and data collection and effectively use technology-based analysis software to collect and analyze data. The evaluator will for preparing all manuals, guides, and training material used to train data collectors.

All tools will be designed in English and approved in collaboration with WHH. The evaluator will be expected to translate all tools into relevant languages in case needed. The main language of reports and tools will be English.

7. MANAGERIAL ARRANGEMENTS / ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The MEAL Expert and the Head of Projects (or designates) will be the main contact points for the evaluation process.

WHH Hargeisa Office (Supply chain management) will manage the contract and provide funding directly to the evaluator(s) according to the terms specified in the contract. The evaluator should make the necessary arrangements and coordinate with WHH staff before fieldwork to ensure no issues arise during field data collection. Relevant contacts will be shared with the evaluator.

The summary of roles and responsibilities are outlined in the table below.

Role	Responsibility	Name/Title
Evaluation Commissioner	Commissions/authorizes the evaluation study, Main user of the evaluation results	HoP
Evaluation Manager	Overall management of evaluation and technical support if needed	MEAL Expert supported by Project MEAL officer/ assistant
Evaluator	Responsible for carrying out the evaluation as agreed upon in the ToR (and the inception report).	External Evaluator
Logistical support	Make sure that the evaluation administration with regard to the finances and procurement is compliant with the existing donor / organisation's regulations.	Supply chain management
Other field support	Day-to-day coordination and communication with the evaluator during field data collection	MEAL Assistant

8. DELIVERABLES AND REPORTING DEADLINES

The following deliverables are expected to be produced by the evaluator(s). All the Deliverables will be submitted to WHH soft copy (unless otherwise noted below).

	Expected Deliverable	Description
1	**Inception Report**	The inception report should set out the planned design and methodology to meet the above-mentioned objectives and to answer the evaluation questions. Furthermore, the overarching evaluation questions should be specified further in the inception report It should also reflect the limits of the suggested design and methodology and could explore the feasibility for answering the evaluation questions and reflect on the ToR, describe the overall approach of the evaluation and how data will be collected by providing an evaluation matrix, drafts of suggested data collection tools such as questionnaires and interview guidelines as well as a tentative evaluation schedule. The inception report follows a standard outline which will be provided to the evaluator(s) after contracting and needs the approval of the contracting party. **Deadline: 6 days after the briefing meeting**
2	**Data collection tools:**	The evaluator shall develop the data collection tools and have them approved by WHH before data collection, analysis, interpretation. This should be shared together with the Inception report. **Deadline: 6 days after the briefing meeting**

3	**Validation meeting:**	A meeting, either online or face to face, discussing the main findings of the draft report, including project and program staff, WHH MEAL staff, once data collection has ended. **Deadline: 3 days after the field data collection**
4	**Draft Midterm Evaluation Report:**	The evaluator will prepare a draft evaluation report with details of findings, recommendations and lessons learnt for review by WHH and partners **Deadline: 6 days after the field data collection**
	Final Dissemination workshop	A **workshop/meeting** discussing the main findings of the draft report, incl. project staff and WHH MEAL staff
5	**Final Midterm Evaluation Report:**	The evaluator will share a final evaluation report after incorporating the comments from WHH and project partners. **Deadline: Latest 6 days after feedback on the draft report**
6	**Evaluation Management Response Matrix**	The evaluator, as part of their assignment, will elaborate a management response matrix, listing the recommendations and the addressee for each recommendation. They will further determine a priority level, stating how important and urgent they consider the recommendation. A standard Evaluation Management Response Matrix template will be provided by WHH **Deadline: To be submitted together with the final evaluation**

9. TIME FRAME / SCHEDULE

The duration of the assignment will be 30 working days. preliminary works may begin earlier, such as developing the tools and reviewing, the final study design. Below is a tentative schedule prepared to guide the evaluator in developing the evaluation workplan.

	Activity	**Duration**
1	Review documents and draft inception report by the evaluator(s)	3 working days
2	WHH meeting to discuss the inception report, project details and answer any questions the evaluator(s) have	0.5 working day
3	Finalize inception report and detailed work plan, including sampling methodology	1 working day
4	Development of tools	2 working days
5	Setting up and training of enumerators on the tools using mobile data collection	2 working day
6	Data collection/interviews	14 working days
7	Validation workshop/meeting to discuss the preliminary findings	0.5 working day
8	Draft Final Report **Note:** *WHH will be responsible for reviewing the first draft report and will provide feedback to the evaluator(s).*	4.5 WDs
9	Final Dissemination workshop	0.5 WD
10	Finalizing Final Report	2 WDs

10. CONFIDENTIALITY

All documents and data acquired from documents during interviews and meetings are confidential and used solely for the evaluation. The deliverables and all material linked to the evaluation (produced by the evaluators or the organization itself) are always confidential and remain the property of the contracting party.

11. EXPERTISE OF THE EVALUATORS

This evaluation assignment is open to evaluators with sound experience in the services outlined above. To be considered for the services described herein, the consultants must meet the following criteria:

1) Post-graduate qualifications in environmental studies, development studies, agriculture, or related fields
2) Proven experience of carrying out baseline, end-line, and project implementation of Climate resilience /Agriculture/Livelihood/WASH interventions in village setting or the Horn of Africa region.
3) Experience in project Monitoring and Evaluation in Somalia or Somaliland
4) Strong experience and training in relevant evaluation methods (participatory methods, qualitative methods, and surveys).
5) Minimum of 3 to 5 years of experience evaluating development and/or humanitarian programs implemented by international aid organizations; experience of evaluating European union and German-funded programs is an advantage.
6) Knowledge of Somaliland political and cultural contexts
7) Expertise in climate change and environmental sciences, along with knowledge of sustainable land management and disaster risk reduction (DRR), would be an added advantage.

12. TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL OFFER

Applicants have to provide:

- A technical and financial offer
- The technical part of the offer should include a reference to the perceived feasibility of the ToR. (If required, including suggestions for specific evaluation questions.)
- It should also include a brief description of the overall design and methodology of the evaluation and a workplan/adaptations to the workplan at hand (maximum four pages).
- The financial part includes a proposed budget for complete evaluation. It should state the fees per working day (plus the respective VAT, if applicable), the number of working days proposed, and other costs (e.g., visa costs).
- Proof of professional registration and taxation is also required (e.g., by providing the evaluator(s) tax number).
- CV with references.
- Evaluation report sample

13. SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

The evaluator(s) should submit a detailed technical and financial proposal in English online through ……….. not later than the xxxx 2025, 10:00 am CET.