



Mid-term evaluation of outcomes achieved by the Ikigega Iwacu Project (#2924) May-September 2022

Terms of Reference – Evaluation Consultant

Date: May 12, 2022

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Consultancy Services: Technical support to an internal midterm evaluation of the Ikigega Iwacu project (phase II): farming and savings groups for improved food security for rural beneficiaries in three provinces of Burundi:

HCB is seeking the services of a consultant to lead an internal evaluation team to look at the successes and challenges of the Ikigega Iwacu project at the mid-point of the project as well as to advise on adjustments to improve the project going forward. HCB is seeking a consultant with experience in using an outcome harvesting evaluation approach or extensive experience in similar qualitative data collection and evaluation methods to conduct this mid-term evaluation. The role of the consultant (described in detail below) will be to: (1) work with the evaluation management team to refine the key evaluation questions and design a comprehensive outcome harvesting evaluation process for this exercise, (2) based on this design, deliver an outcome harvesting evaluation of the program, (3) develop and compile the mid-term evaluation report, and (4) facilitate the presentation of evaluation findings to different stakeholders during the validation of the evaluation findings.

This Terms of Reference (ToR) is prepared to help interested consultants understand the program and describe our requirements for the evaluation process. It also provides a coherent and concise guide for this evaluation, to ensure that all interested parties (Help Channel Burundi staff, MCC project coordinators, Foodgrains Bank staff) are aligned in their expectations of the activities and deliverables for the review. The ToR provides a brief summary of the program, including the project goals, and outcomes; the purpose of the mid-term evaluation; uses and key evaluation questions; roles and responsibilities of evaluation stakeholders; timelines and expected deliverables; and the expected qualifications for the evaluation consultant.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 INTRODUCTION TO CANADIAN FOODGRAINS BANK, HELP CHANNEL BURUNDI & MENNONITE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

Mennonite Central Committee (MCC) is an Anabaptist organization working globally to demonstrate love and compassion through relief, development, and peace programming. MCC began programing in Iraq in 1991 and has continued programing in the country in the areas of humanitarian assistance, livelihoods and agricultural programming, peacebuilding, and education programming.

The Canadian Foodgrains Bank (CFGB) is a partnership of 15 Canadian churches and church-based agencies working to end hunger in developing countries by: supporting partnerships and activities to improve food security on both an immediate and a sustainable basis; increasing and deepening the involvement of Canadians in efforts to end global hunger; and, influencing changes in Canadian public policies necessary to end global hunger.

To achieve its objectives, CFGB and its member agencies work with a wide range of local, national, and international organizations to implement programs in developing countries. CFGB member

agencies are responsible for initiating and delivering the overseas humanitarian food assistance and development activities supported by the CFGB through their own programs or through the programs of partner agencies. They may request the services of CFGB to assist in the delivery of these programs. However, CFGB does not initiate or implement projects.

Help Channel Burundi (HCB), “an inter-denominational Christian organization working to deliver aid and development programs in rural Burundi”, has been operational in Burundi since 2000. They have an established relationship with the Mennonite Central Committee (MCC), one of the 15 member organizations of CFGB. MCC is an Anabaptist organization working globally to show love and compassion for all through relief, development and peace.

2.2 INTRODUCTION TO THE IKIGEGA IWACU PROJECT

In February 2020, phase II of the Ikigega Iwacu project (#2924) began in partnership with CFGB. Ikigega Iwacu is a 5-year project aimed at addressing food insecurity in the provinces of Rutana, Makamba and Kirundo by engaging households in 12 targeted collines (meaning hills or villages). This program is currently starting year three (2022) of a five-year project cycle, ending in January 2025. At this mid-point in the funding cycle, the Foodgrains Bank requires a mid-term evaluation of the program to: assess the overall impact of the Ikigega Iwacu project and identifying adjustments to improve the project going forward.

Ikigega Iwacu project began in 2016 as a 3-year project that expanded into a second phase in 2020 for an additional 5 years (#2924). Phase I of the project engaged households from 6 collines and phase II has engaged 6 new collines, maintaining the original 6 within the project scope. The project has implemented an extension model that includes training participants in good agricultural practices (GAPs), Conservation Agriculture (CA), post harvest management, Village Savings and Loan Associations (VSLA), and other related topics in order to increase agricultural productivity, household incomes, and as a result, food security. Other major project components include addressing gender empowerment, nutrition, environmental issues, and other community level concerns through promoting kitchen gardens, installing soil conservation systems, contributing to rural road rehabilitation, and assisting with access to community granaries and community-level processing units.

The extension model for training participants consists of *Field Coordinators* who lead of team of *Community Mobilizers* (2 per province) and *Agronomists* (2 per province), as well as volunteer *Farmer Motivators* (12 per province) all serving the Ikigega Iwacu project. Community Mobilizers main work is to facilitate the group formation and training on non-agriculture topics, including VSLA, gender, nutrition and business cooperative development. Agronomists work with groups on agricultural training and provide advice to individual farmers on regular farm visits. Agronomists do the majority of their training through the Farmer Motivators. Each week Agronomists meet with Farmer Motivators to train them on an agriculture topic which they will then extend to their FFS groups, and one other FFS, the next week. Farmer Motivators are members of FFS groups that have been nominated by their fellow members to perform the role of community educator. They are considered community volunteers, but they do receive a non-taxable, small stipend in compensation for their role in the project.

Production in Burundi consists mainly of four crops categories: cereals, pulses, roots and tubers, and bananas and plantains. The main stakeholders within the agricultural sector in Burundi are farmers, the Burundian government, other non-government development organizations and private

agricultural equipment and input suppliers. Unquestionably, the primary stakeholders for this project are the farmer participants. The vast majority of Burundians are involved directly in agriculture for their means of subsistence, and essentially all rural residents, like those of the collines we are targeting, are smallholder farmers. Most of these farmers are still broadcasting seed, using local varieties of maize and other crops, generally not engaging in modern agricultural practices.

Access to modern agriculture inputs in Burundi is a challenge. The Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry is the sole distributor of inorganic fertilizers in Burundi, and the cost of fertilizer is prohibitive for many local farmers. Additionally, while improved seed is available from local markets, the price is higher, and the seed is not always available on schedule and so the reduced cost comes with a risk. Because purchasing improved inputs in advance each season can be a challenge, access to credit is a significant issue in rural communities. Before the project intervention, credit was only available in these collines through predatory lending operations that charged exorbitant interest or *Umurwazo* (a system of selling your immature crop). The project aims to free farmers from these systems through their access to credit through the VSLA. In year 2, the project started organizing FFS groups in old collines to form cooperatives, a model that will be replicated in new collines beginning in year 3. The project plans to form 12 cooperatives, with each Farmer Field School on each colline coming together to form a cooperative. The cooperatives will aim to unite members to increase production, further train members on GAP and CA farming practices, aid in market negotiation of different inputs and marketing products generated by cooperatives and learning transformation processes for value added products to reduce post-harvest losses and market diversification.

Presently roles and responsibilities in Burundian households are very demanding on women and place men in a position of power within the household and community while requiring very little work for the household. Women are largely responsible for reproductive roles (cleaning, cooking, childcare, care of sick and elderly household members) and also expected to manage most of the agricultural work (labor, planting, maintenance, weeding, harvesting). Men are in charge of the productive roles, namely managing the financial part of the household. The men are generally in charge of decision making but are not required to be participating in the domestic or agricultural work, though some men do contribute to work on the farm. Similarly, girls in rural Burundi are usually involved in domestic work, while boys oversee the livestock and other related tasks. Through previous surveys and evaluations HCB has found that food security does not affect men and women equally for reasons such as men having greater control over and access to family resources and stored food, as well as traditions like women eating last in a household. Men also are known to take some meals outside the home, at times at the expense of other household needs.

2.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND OUTCOMES

The Ikigega Iwacu project is focused on improving food security for all members of rural households in 12 targeted collines from 3 provinces in Burundi by 2025 through engaging community-based groups using an extension model in order to increase agricultural productivity, household incomes, and as a result, food security.

Based on the overall goal of the project, the expected outcomes of the project have been developed and are stated in the table below.

Project 2924	
Budget and Timelines	February 2020 – January 2025; \$2,124,140 USD (\$2,822,451.03 CAD)
Project Title	Ikigega Iwacu Phase II
Beneficiary Households	~2000-2500
Ultimate Outcome	All community members—women, men and children—have sufficient, safe and nutritious food, in a well-protected environment, at all times to maintain a healthy and active life.
Intermediate Outcome 1	By 2025, women have improved access to and control of resources within their household and community
Intermediate Outcome 2	By 2025, all members of targeted households—women, men and children—eat a balanced diet and can afford three meals a day throughout the year
Immediate Outcome 2.1	Improved agricultural production
Immediate Outcome 2.2	Improved post-harvest management
Intermediate Outcome 3	By 2025, all households have income to meet their basic needs (food, education, medical, etc.)
Immediate Outcome 3.1	Improved access to credit and income generating activities

2.4 OBJECTIVES

The rationale for this evaluation is to assess the overall impact of the Ikigega Iwacu project and identifying adjustments to improve the project going forward. The main areas of focus are:

1. To evaluate effects of gender-related activities on the beneficiaries
2. To understand how VSLA trainings and activities have impacted food security
3. To evaluate the overall adoption of CA practices among beneficiaries

The results of this evaluation will be used to inform and design the second half of the project cycle. Additionally, this evaluation should ensure accountability to project participants. It is an opportunity to reflect on how CFGB, MCC and HCB are collectively delivering on expectations to those who have participated in project activities and those who will participate in the future.

2.5 Scope of the evaluation This evaluation is for the purpose of exploring what is working in the project to this point and how we can adjust to improve the project going forward in relation to different project components. The scope of the project will be limited to addressing the KEQs laid out below which focus on designing the evaluation, conducting the evaluation and delivering reports and results. The evaluation scope and related KEQs are focused on agricultural production, household income and gender dynamics within the project.

3.0 APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

During this mid-term evaluation, an outcome-harvesting approach is planned to be used in collecting all relative qualitative data that will support the findings of the evaluation. If it is necessary to utilize additional methods to answer evaluation questions or achieve the objectives of the evaluation, additional methods and approaches (including traditional approaches to defining 'research questions' and conducting 'quantitative and/or qualitative' data collection via surveys, interviews, FDCs, etc. to answer research questions) can be utilized alongside an outcome harvesting methodology. The inclusion of additional methods can be discussed with HCB/MCC Burundi during discussions that will feed into the creation of the **Outcome Harvesting Design Document**.

In primary data collection, we expect to focus on qualitative and participatory methods using flexible or semi-structured data collection tools including individual in-depth or key informant interviews, focus groups and through referencing all pertinent project documentation. It is expected that the consultant will engage and consult directly with project participants (beneficiaries) to ensure data reflects views and perspectives of participants and accuracy of information gathered to assess project impact.



Who Are the Main Players in an Outcome Harvest?



Change agent: Individual or organization that influences an outcome.

Social actor: Individual, group, community, organization, or institution that changes as a result of a change agent intervention.

Harvest user: The individual(s) who require the findings of an Outcome Harvest to make decisions or take action. This may be one or more people within the change agent organization or third parties such as a donor.

Harvester: Person responsible for managing the Outcome Harvest, often an evaluator (external or internal).


An Outcome Harvesting method consists of **6 iterative steps** (for further information, please refer to [Outcome Harvesting \(beamexchange.org\)](http://beamexchange.org)). Additional methodology briefs are available upon request as well as easily accessible online:

1. Design the Outcome Harvest:


Harvest users (people/orgs. who will use results, - Help Channel Burundi, MCC and CFGB) and harvesters (people who are involved in implementing mid-point evaluation, in this case, the evaluation committee and the external evaluator) identify useful questions to guide the harvest (this has already been provided in this TOR – see evaluation questions section – however can be revised/refined where necessary through directly working with the evaluation committee). Then both users and harvesters agree on what information is to be collected and included in the outcome

description as well as information to be collected to assess the changes in the social actors (participants/beneficiaries/etc.) and how the change agent (HCB/project) influenced them.

To fulfill this step, the Consultant will work with MCC and HCB to complete an **Outcome Harvest Design Document** where agreement on this will be achieved (see "Deliverables").



Definitions to Help with Design



Useable Questions: Questions that guide the Outcome Harvest because the answers to these questions will be especially useful to the harvest users.

Outcome Description: The formulation of who changed what, when and where it took place, and how the change agent contributed to that outcome are combined in sufficient specificity and measurability to enable the harvest user to take action.

2. Gather data and draft outcome descriptions:

Harvesters glean information about changes that have occurred in social actors (HHs/participants/beneficiaries/etc.) and how the change agent (HCB/project) contributed to these changes. Information about outcomes may be found in documents or collected through interviews, surveys, and other sources (**please note, to achieve good information HCB, MCC and CFGB expect as part of this process to have consultation with participants/beneficiaries to occur**). The harvesters write preliminary outcome descriptions with questions for review and clarification by the change agent.

Outcome descriptions should be sufficiently brief but include enough detail so that those not familiar with the context can appreciate the significance of the achievement and find sufficient evidence of the change agent's contribution to make it credible (please refer to SMART criteria in supporting document for further clarification).

3. Engage change agents in formulating outcome descriptions:

Harvesters engage directly with change agents (see **Outcome Description Review Session/Engagement w/ Change Agents** in 'Deliverables' section of TOR) to review the draft outcome descriptions, identify and formulate additional outcomes, and classify all outcomes. Change agents often consult with well-informed individuals (inside or outside their organization) who can provide information about outcomes.

Step 3 should result in an agreed upon **Draft List of Outcomes/Contributions w/ Substantiation Plan** which will form the basis for the next steps of the evaluation (see "Deliverables").

4. Substantiate:

Harvesters obtain the views of independent individuals knowledgeable about the outcome(s) and how they were achieved; this validates and enhances the credibility of the findings.

5. Analyze and interpret:

Harvesters organize outcome descriptions through a database in order to make sense of them, analyze and interpret the data, and provide evidence-based answers to the useful harvesting questions. This is then written up in an evaluation report.

6. Support use of findings:

Drawing on the evidence-based, actionable answers to the useful questions, harvesters propose points for discussion to harvest users, including how the users might make use of findings. The harvesters also wrap up their contribution by accompanying or facilitating the discussion amongst harvest users.

4.0 USES AND KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation management team has defined the following Uses and Key Evaluation Questions (KEQ) associated with these Uses to guide the evaluation process, given in the table below. The evaluation design process will describe the evidence / data and the data collection method that will be used to answer each KEQ in the evaluation process.

USE I. To assess the progress made in achieving the outcomes.		
KEQ	Evidence / Data	Data Collection
1. To what extent have gender-related activities changed behavior in the HH and HH decision-making?		
2. To what extent have VSLA trainings and activities contributed to change in participants (changes in how they make decisions, what they choose to buy, how they plan for the future, production and income levels, etc.)		
3. To what extent have trainings and activities contributed to increased awareness and behavior/practices of environmental protection?		
4. To what extent are CA practices being adopted by participants?		
5. To what extent are post-harvest practices improving among participants, and how are these changes related to project activities on post-harvest management?		
6. To what extent are environmental improvements being achieved due to the adoption of CA practices?		

USE III. To determining the project needs, gaps, and implementation logic necessary for accomplishing intended project outcomes for the remaining project period		
KEQ	Evidence / Data	Data Collection
1. To what extent have cultural barriers (such as the ideas and understandings that people have/lack which they use/don't use to interpret the world around them, the social norms they follow or are pressured to follow, etc.) hindered the adoption of CA?		
2. What challenges or barriers have hindered the adoption of positive practices related to gender, CA, post-harvest management, VSLA, etc.		
3. What factors have contributed to fluctuations in GAPs usage?		

4.0 DELIVERABLES: 5.0 DELIVERABLES

The consultant will be expected to deliver the following processes and products as part of this consultancy:

5.1 OUTCOME HARVEST DESIGN DOCUMENT:

The key focus of this Outcome Harvest Design Document is to outline the level of detail and sources of information necessary to provide answers to the evaluation questions. In particular, the Consultant will work with MCC Burundi and HCB to determine level of detail to be provided in descriptions of outcomes (changes in target HHs/groups/participants) and change agent (project/HCB) contribution to those outcomes, as well as the sources of information to be used in the process of identifying outcomes and contribution of the project to those outcomes (in identifying sources of information, this must also include direct consultation and data gathering directly from target HHs/groups/participants). (The sources of information list should include an initial *set of ideas* on sources of information to substantiate outcome descriptions that will be created).

The purpose of identifying and substantiating outcomes (changes in target HHs/groups) and contribution of change agent (the project/HCB) to outcomes is to provide useful information to answer the evaluation questions; as such, in the process of creating the Outcome Harvesting Design Document, the Evaluation Questions and Objectives are key reference points around which this document will be focused.



Things to consider in determining level of detail of information: Will a simple description suffice, or should each “dimension” be explained? Will one or two sentences be enough or are several paragraphs required to describe each dimension?

Things to keep in mind when determining the sources of information: Three mechanisms are to be used by the Consultant to establish contribution:

1. **Reported Observation**, such as progress reporting, evaluations, and case studies.
2. **Direct Critical Observations**, for example, what is seen in writing, heard during phone conversations/interviews/focus groups/etc., or directly observed during field visits.
3. **Direct or Simple Inductive Inference** – using direct insider or key informant information/explanations/interpretations of contribution, or not, to help the assess Consultant to draw conclusions about contribution.

****Please note, if the consultant determines that methods and approaches in addition to outcome harvesting is needed to answer the evaluation questions, please discuss this with HCB and MCC Burundi and include those methods and tools in this **Outcome Harvesting Design Document**.**

5.2 CONTRIBUTE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF EVALUATION TOOLS

To gather primary data on outcomes and contributions, as well as substantiate findings, the Consultant will lead the evaluation team to collect primary data. To facilitate this, the Consultant will work with the evaluation team to develop data collection tools/formats for primary data collection.

It is anticipated that the evaluation will primarily implement an outcomes harvesting approach to collect information on the key questions identified in the Terms of Reference. However, it is expected that the consultant will provide input to the team based on their past experience, knowledge and expertise, for tool development to maximize the learning opportunities in this evaluation.

5.3 LEAD AND PARTICIPATE IN FIELD WORK

The consultant will travel with the full evaluation team to rural Burundi (specific locations to be determined and depending on the evaluation design and security situation) to participate in the field activities of the evaluation. During the field work phase, we envision three key roles for the consultant:

- Participate with the evaluation team in data collection activities;
- Facilitate daily debriefing conversations with the evaluation team to draw out key observations and learning from the day’s activities;

- Provide a constructive and unbiased external perspective to data collection and field reflection activities.

Depending on the Work Plan for the evaluation, the evaluation consultant may, if deemed necessary by the evaluation team, spend additional time in the field (up to one week) to conduct additional interviews or follow up to verify data collected by the team.

5.4 OUTCOME DESCRIPTION REVIEW SESSION/ENGAGEMENT W/ CHANGE AGENTS:

To fulfill Step 3 of the Outcome Harvest (see Methodology, Step 3 “Engage change agents in formulating outcome descriptions”), the Consultant will hold an **Outcome Description Review Session/Engagement** to engage directly with the change agents to review information on outcomes and contributions harvested through documents and collected through interviews, surveys, and other sources. The harvester supports the change agent’s review of the draft outcome formulations with guiding questions, and rigorously examines each outcome for specificity and coherence. As well, the consultant will work with the HCB/MCC to determine if there is a need to collect additional information on outcomes

****Please note, if any additional methods and approaches beyond outcome harvesting were utilized to answer evaluation questions, the consultant will include a presentation of the preliminary draft of results from data collection to answer those questions in this Outcome Description Review Session/Engagement w/ Change Agents.**

5.5 DRAFT LIST OF OUTCOME DESCRIPTIONS/CONTRIBUTIONS AND SUBSTANTIATION PLAN:

Using the information harvested in Step 2 “Gather data and draft outcome descriptions” and additional input from Step 3 “Engage change agents in formulating outcome descriptions”, the harvesters update outcome descriptions developed thus far. This updated draft of outcome descriptions will then be submitted to MCC and HCB as a simple but complete **Draft List of Outcome Descriptions and Contributions** arrived at so far.

****Please note, if any additional methods and approaches beyond outcome harvesting were utilized to answer evaluation questions, draft preliminary results/answers to questions - with supporting data formulated to answers those questions – would be provided in this document.**

Included in this document, the Consultant will provide an outline of additional data collection plans to substantiate the Outcomes outlined, as well as discover/harvest for any additional outcomes not yet identified if necessary. This **Substantiation Plan** should outline sources of information (especially informants knowledgeable about outcomes) which are independent of the change agent and should keep in mind the “three mechanisms to be used by the Consultant to establish change agent contribution” outlined previously in this TOR. Where possible, the Consultant to develop plans to

triangulate information on Outcome Descriptions, to increase accuracy and reliability of findings. This plan should be written up as a draft document.

Thus, the **Draft List of Outcome Descriptions/Contributions With Substantiation Plan** should be provided to MCC and HCB as a single document, forming the basis for the rest of the evaluation. *The plan should be seen as a guide and can be changed where necessary depending on new discoveries made through engagement with informants independent of the change agents.*

5.6 ANALYZE DATA AND WRITE THE EVALUATION REPORT

The consultant will take the lead on the final analysis of the data gathered through the harvest, with input from the evaluation team. Results will be shared, discussed, and confirmed with the evaluation team. The consultant will lead the team on discussions of the analysis of the results, to draw conclusions and draft recommendations, based on the results.

The consultant will prepare a draft report, to be shared with the team for feedback and revisions, and then will prepare the final report to HCB and CFGB.

The final report is expected within two weeks after receipt of the comments on the draft report. This report, which should be between 20 - 30 pages, excluding annexes, will include the following:

- Executive Summary (max 3 pages) that also summarizes recommendations
- Evaluation Questions & Objectives
- Background: Includes background information relevant to the evaluation that focuses on the country, regional, and local context. A map of the evaluation area should be included (max 2 pages)
- Evaluation Methodology: Includes a description of the evaluation methodology applied and its limitations (max 2 pages)
- Major Findings w/ Supporting Data (main body of report)
- Conclusions (directly connected to a major finding, and thus explicitly stated)
- Recommendations (directly connected to a major finding, and thus explicitly stated)

Annexes: To include and restricted to

- Final Terms of Reference
- Cited resources or bibliography
- List of sources of data (keeping confidentiality)
- Data collection tools used for primary data collection
- Itinerary

CFGB's preferred reporting language for all reports is English. However, in this case, we are prepared to consider a final report written in French which would then be translated prior to

distribution. Regardless of the final report language, the report is expected to be free of spelling and grammatical errors.

6.0 EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

This work is anticipated to last 4 months between May and August 2022. Below is the tentative timeframe for the planned activities during the period. The planning and reporting phases will be home based. The work will be divided into three broad phases.

- Preparatory Phase (May – June 2022). Planning activities include supporting the development of the work plan, the evaluation tools, and the detailed schedule for the field visits.
- “Field Work” Phase (June 2022). The full evaluation team will be in the field for the data collection in July 2022, exact dates to be discussed.
- Reporting phase (July-September 2022). The evaluation consultant will take the lead in analyzing the data collected during the field mission and writing the evaluation report, in consultation with the evaluation team.

Month	Activity	Estimated No. Days
May	Publication of TOR for application of potential consultants	2 weeks
June	Selection of consultant and signing of contract with qualified candidate	3 weeks
<i>External Consultant and Evaluation Team to undertake together:</i>		
June	Work with team to create design of outcome harvest	1 weeks
July	Gather data (secondary and primary) and draft outcome descriptions	3 weeks
July	Engage change agents in formulating outcome descriptions	1 week
August	Substantiate findings	1 week
August	Final analysis and write report	3 weeks
Total		70 days

7.0 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

As this evaluation is focused on evaluating the HCB project, the HCB Monitoring, and Evaluation Coordinator will be the evaluation manager. The evaluation manager will be the primary point of contact for the evaluation consultant. Weekly communication with the evaluation manager will be expected during the consulting period.

It is expected that the evaluation team will be led by the evaluation consultant. The team will be comprised of representatives from Help Channel Burundi, and MCC Rwanda/Burundi. Specific roles of each team member will be discussed as the terms of reference are more fully elaborated and the team members are selected.

8.0 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

All writing, books, articles, artwork, computer programs, databases, source and object codes and other material of any nature whatsoever produced in whole or in part by the consultant in the course of their services to Help Channel Burundi shall be considered a work made for hire, or otherwise, and therefore Help Channel Burundi's property.

Without permission of Help Channel Burundi, the consultant is not allowed to share any information with external bodies and all documents prepared and all data and information gathered by the consultants are the property of the client. The consultant shall not be entitled either directly or indirectly to make use of such documents or works without the prior written consent of the client (Help Channel Burundi).

9.0 LOCATION OF WORK

This consultancy will be based in Bujumbura, Burundi. The consultant will use their own computer and will have a workspace (desk, chair, etc) at the Help Channel Burundi office. Data collection will be conducted in-person at the Help Channel office and in the field with HCB accompaniment. Consultant can choose to be home-based for the writing of the final evaluation report only.

10.0 BUDGET AND PAYMENT CONDITIONS

The evaluation will be financed under year 3 of the current project budget (#2924). Payment will be by bank transfer in installments, based on invoices. Terms to be negotiated.

11.0 ESSENTIAL QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

The evaluation consultant should meet the following criteria:

- Experience in using outcome-harvest evaluation approach or extensive experience in similar qualitative data collection and evaluation methods and other relevant qualitative data collection tools;
- Experience in project/program evaluations, including evaluation experience of agriculture programming in complex environments;
- Experience in rural Burundi, understanding of local dynamics and culture preferred;
- Minimum master's degree;

- Technical knowledge in humanitarian food assistance and agriculture programming;
- Experience in gender-sensitive and gender-transformative programming principles;
- Excellent analysis and synthesis skills;
- Excellent interpersonal, facilitation, and communication skills;
- Experience in qualitative and quantitative methods;
- Language requirements: English and French required. Fluency in Kirundi preferred; and
- Willingness to work and travel in challenging environments.
- Commitment to following all necessary COVID-safety precautions, including mask-wearing in relevant settings

Minimum Information to provide on the Expression of Interest (EOI):

- Curriculum Vitae (CV), with three professional references
- A writing sample from recent work
- Expression of Interest
 - Indicate relevant experience and knowledge, how you meet the candidate requirements, and suggested approach for how you envision providing the requisite technical support to the Foodgrains Bank network internal evaluation team.
 - Details of the offer
 - Number of proposed days of work
 - Total cost of the offer (including consultant fee, lodging, food, etc. *Transportation to the field is covered by the project budget*)
 - Currency of the offer
 - Validity of the offer (Minimum one month)
 - Date and signature
 - Name, address, phone, and contact person

Please forward your writing sample, proposal, quotation, and a copy of your complete CV by **May 27, 2022** to Help Channel Burundi info@helpchannel.org and copying Mr. Normand normand.ndayizeye@gmail.com with “Burundi Evaluation Consultant – YOUR NAME” in the subject line. If you wish to deposit your application in person, please deliver it to the Help Channel office on Avenue Bururi, #2, Rohero. Help Channel will contact short-listed candidates by **June 3, 2022** with interviews the week of June 6th.

ⁱ <http://helpchannelburundi.org/who-we-are/>

