REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
FOR
ENDLINE STUDY OF GEAT PROJECT

Development Wheel (DEW) is inviting the interested Consultant/Consultancy firm for End line Study of Gender Equity Awareness Training in Fair Trade Artisan Groups project based in Dhaka. Interested qualified Consultant/Consultancy firm having required experiences & expertise mentioned in the Terms of Reference (ToR) are requested to submit the proposal by the following timeline.

Last date of submission: **15 February 2024** on or before **11:59 PM** Bangladesh time.

Detailed ToR and relevant information's are available on (Add Link)

Development Wheel (DEW) reserves the right to accept or reject any or whole proposal without assigning any reason, whatsoever.

Service Contract
for
Conducting the Final Evaluation of
"Gender Equity Awareness Training in Fair-Trade Artisan Groups"

ATTACHEMENT A

Terms of Reference for Evaluator -Final Project Evaluation

GENERAL INFORMATION

Services/ Work Description: Independent final evaluation for Gender Equity Awareness Training in Fair-Trade Artisan Groups.

Duty Station: Dhaka

Project Title: Independent final evaluation for Gender equity awareness training in fair-trade artisan groups.

Type of the Contract: Service contract

Duration: 40 days

Expected Start Date: February 15, 2024.

BACKGROUND

The "Gender Equity Awareness Training in Fair-Trade Artisan Groups" project, implemented by the Development Wheel (DEW) in Bangladesh, has achieved significant advancements in promoting gender equality and creating safe workplaces that adhere to fair-trade principles within artisan groups. The project specifically targets six fair trade groups and their artisans, positively impacting over 900 individuals, with a particular focus on empowering women artisans.

The project encompasses two primary objectives. Firstly, it aims to enhance the capacity of ECOTA and its member organizations' middle management to effectively address gender-based discrimination in the workplace. Secondly, it strives to promote the rights and agency of artisans by combating gender-based violence and discrimination within their working environments.

To accomplish these objectives, the project focuses on evaluating working conditions and traditional practices related to gender issues, assessing the risk levels of gender-based violence and discrimination in the craft sector, and strengthening the knowledge and capabilities of partner organizations to ensure gender equality, equity, and safe workplaces that align with fair-trade principles.

This project funded by **Christian Aid UK & Bangladesh and People Tree Foundation UK & Japan**. It is implemented by the **Development Wheel (DEW) with ECOTA Fair Trade forum and six member organizations**. The project team aspires for this initiative to serve as a role model for other organizations, inspiring them to undertake similar endeavours to promote gender equality and empower women artisans.

An end-line survey conducted by a consultancy firm is essential in a project for several reasons:

Evaluation of Impact: The primary purpose of an end-line survey is to assess the impact and effectiveness of a project. It helps determine whether the project has achieved its intended outcomes and objectives, and to what extent. This evaluation is crucial in understanding the project's overall success and identifying areas for improvement.

Evidence-Based Decision Making: End-line surveys provide valuable data and evidence that inform decision making in the development sector. The findings can help project managers, policymakers, and stakeholders make informed choices regarding future interventions, resource allocation, and strategic planning. This ensures that limited resources are directed towards initiatives with proven impact.

Accountability and Transparency: End-line surveys contribute to accountability and transparency in the development sector. By conducting independent assessments of project outcomes, the consultancy firm provides an objective perspective that holds project implementers accountable for the results. This promotes good governance and ensures that project activities align with the intended goals and expectations.

Learning and Knowledge Sharing: The findings of end-line surveys contribute to learning and knowledge sharing within the development sector. By analysing the successes and challenges of a project, lessons can be extracted and shared with other organizations and practitioners. This helps build a collective understanding of what works and what doesn't, facilitating continuous improvement in development practices.

Stakeholder Engagement and Participation: End-line surveys involve engaging with various stakeholders, including beneficiaries, community members, and local & international partners. This engagement fosters participatory approaches, giving voice to those directly affected by the project. It allows stakeholders to provide feedback, express their opinions, and contribute to the evaluation process, ensuring that their perspectives are considered in decision making.

Sustainability and Long-Term Planning: Assessing the impact of a project through an end-line survey helps identify factors that contribute to sustainability. It provides insights into the project's long-term effects and whether it has achieved lasting change. This knowledge is valuable for designing future projects and strategies that prioritize sustainability and address any gaps or challenges observed.

Overall, an end-line survey conducted by a consultancy firm in this project is necessary to evaluate project impact, inform decision-making, ensure accountability, promote learning and knowledge sharing, engage stakeholders, and facilitate long-term planning. It plays a vital role in improving development interventions and maximizing their positive outcomes for the communities and individuals they aim to serve.

1. **Purpose of the independent final evaluation and key objectives;**

The independent final evaluation report needs to be a substantial document that (a) answers all the elements of the Terms of Reference (ToR); (b) provides findings and conclusions that are based on robust and transparent evidence; and (c) where necessary supplements the grantee's own data with independent research.

The independent final evaluation has two key objectives:
- To independently verify (and supplement where necessary), grantees' record of achievement as reported through Annual Reports and defined in the project's logical frame;
- To assess the extent to which the project performed well and was good value for money, which includes considering;
    - How well the project met its objectives;
    - How well the project applied value for money principles of effectiveness, economy, efficiency in relation to delivery of its outcome;
    - What has happened because of the funding that wouldn't have otherwise happened; and
    - How well the project aligns with funding goals of supporting the delivery.

The specific objectives also include:

At programme management level
- Determine strengths and weaknesses of the project management and support structure (project planning, design, implementation; resource management and monitoring, evaluation and learning, support and backstopping from donors)

At goal, purpose and output level

- To measure the effectiveness of the project in increasing the representation of women in leadership positions within artisan organizations

- To assess the Increased knowledge and skills of middle management on gender-based discrimination and its impact on the workplace

- To assess the capacity of local partners for Adoption and implementation of gender-sensitive policies and practices by ECOTA and member organizations.

- To assess influence over business environment in adoption and enforcement of a comprehensive gender equity policy that addresses all aspects of the organization's operations.

- To assess the enhanced awareness and understanding of rights and agency among artisans

- To assess why particular business/technical service that the project tried to introduce did not work, why particular other services that were tremendously beneficial among many were not adopted by others.

- Asses the improved job satisfaction and reduced turnover rates among women artisans due to a more inclusive and supportive work environment.

- Assess the extent to which value for money has been achieved in the implementation of project activities; exploring if the same results could have achieved for less money and the extent of any obvious links between expenditures and project outputs/outcomes

- Determine factors that led to the change/impact and the extent to which all the institutional arrangements (partnership relationship, ECOTA and DEW Management, M&E, and coordination function) contributed (or not) to this impact.

- Determine the extent to which the broader context (political, security, environmental, social, and financial) has impacted upon the project's progress?

3. Audience for the evaluation
This independent evaluation is commissioned by Development Wheel and will be shared with project funders, management and staff of its partners, project staff and participants, project associates, other relevant actors.

4. Verification of grantee reporting

The first task of the final evaluation is to verify grantee achievement. The record of achievement will be presented in past Annual Reports and progress against the project log frame. This exercise could include verifying information that was collected by the grantee for reporting purposes and possibly supplementing this data will additional information collected through primary and secondary research.

Verifying the results from the project log frame will begin to capture what the project has achieved. However, there will be other activities and results that occur outside of the log frame that may require examination in order to respond to the different evaluation questions. Verifying reporting will also necessarily include a review of the data and systems that were used to populate results.

5. Assessment of value for money

Each final evaluation should assess the extent to which the delivery and results of the project are good value for money. Value for money can be defined in different ways, but at minimum the evaluation report should include an assessment against:

- How well the project applied value for money principles of effectiveness, economy, efficiency in relation to delivery of its outcome;
- What has happened because of the funding that wouldn't have otherwise happened; and

6. Evaluation Issues and Key Questions

To ensure comparability across the final evaluation reports, the research framework that is designed by Independent Evaluator should respond to the *appropriate* questions below

There are three fundamental questions that this evaluation should address:

- *Did we do what we said we would do in this project? (Validity)*
- *Did it make any difference? (Impact Assessment)*
- *What would we do differently? (Strategic relevance and learning)*

6.1 Relevance

- *To what extent did the grantee support achievement towards the Gender equity and safe working environment for artisans?*
- *To what extent did the project target and reach the poor and marginalized?*
- *To what extent did the project mainstream gender equality in the design and delivery of activities (and or other relevant excluded groups)?*
- *How well did the project respond to the needs of target beneficiaries, including how these needs evolved over time?*

Specific questions also include:

- To what extent did the project respond to the identified problems? What was the quality of the problem analysis and the project's logical framework?
- Have the problems originally identified changed? How flexible was the project to changes in circumstances?
- How relevant was the project to the needs of the different stakeholders'?
- What else has changed in the external context? For example, what has been happening in the craft sector? What impact has this had on our work / future work in this area? What else has supported / hindered our work in this area?
- How did the design of the project take other interventions into account? Were there synergies or duplications?
- Given a second chance, what could be done differently if starting a similar project in relation to project design?

6.2 Efficiency

It is a key concern of many funders that funding is able to demonstrate value for money. Assess to what extent resources were used economically to deliver the project.

- To what extent did the grantee deliver results on time and on budget against agreed plans?
- To what extent did the project understand cost drivers and manage these in relation to performance requirements?

Specific questions also include:

- Which activities were undertaken in order to achieve project results? Were these conducted efficiently (in terms of expertise, time, costs, etc)? Were the activities of the expected quality?

- Were the activities carried out on time? Was the timing appropriate?
- Were there any planned activities that did not happen? If so, why?
- Have the resources been allocated in the most strategic way? Were the results/ outcomes appropriate to the costs incurred? Could the results have been achieved more economically?
- What roles and responsibilities have each partner, including People Tree foundation and Cristian Aid, played and how have these changed over time?
- How successful were the roles that development wheel and the partner(s) played as project management (including grant management) and implementing partner(s)? How could it be improved?
- How has the capacity of the partner/s been built? What can each partner now do that they could not do before? Did that happen because of the project or would it have happened anyway?
- Have we worked with the right partners / target groups? Are there other partners / target groups that Development Wheel should be increasing / decreasing contact with? Are there new partners / target groups that Development Wheel (DEW) should work with?
- Given a second chance, **what could be done differently** if starting a similar project in relation to choose of partners and management arrangements?

6.3 Effectiveness

Assess the achievements of the project in relation to its stated objectives and intended outcomes/ results. This should be a systematic assessment of progress against the final version of project logframe as agreed with the lead funder. Data already provided by the project's monitoring and reporting systems should provide much of the basic information. Quantitative and qualitative data should be referred to.

- To what extent are the results that are reported a fair and accurate record of achievement?
- To what extent has the project delivered results that are value for money? To include but not limited to:
  - How well the project applied value for money principles of effectiveness, economy, efficiency in relation to delivery of its outcome;
  - What has happened because of Christian Aid UK & Bangladesh and People Tree Foundation UK & Japan's funding that wouldn't have otherwise happened; and
- To what extent has the project used learning to improve delivery?
- What are the key drivers and barriers affecting the delivery of results for the project?

Specific questions also include:
- What project strategies and activities have been most effective for ensuring impact for artisan groups?

- What has been done by Development Wheel and ECOTA Fair Trade its partner?
- What outcomes/ results have been achieved (expected unexpected, successes)? Which objectives have been most useful and successful? What were the success factors?
- What changes have been brought about in performance / behaviour of participating organisations and end beneficiaries?
- What is the scope or magnitude of the change achieved? What is the significance/ strategic importance of the achievements?
- What has not been achieved (failures, disappointments, missed opportunities, challenges) and why?
- What was the nature of the participation in this project of different disadvantaged groups (e.g. women, disabled, elderly)?
- Were the assumptions in the project design realised? If not, how did this affect the project?
- What were the risks identified? Did these materialise? If so, how did the project deal with them and reduce the impact on the project? Please complete a risk assessment matrix for inclusion in the final report.
- Are there any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted, e.g. case studies, stories, best practice?
- Please include a table of relevant figures showing achievement against the project indicators as stated in the project log frame.

6.4 Impact

- To what extent and how has the project built the capacity of fair-trade organization and the artisans working within the organization?
- How many people are receiving support from the project that otherwise would not have received support?
- To what extent and how has the project affected people in ways that were not originally intended?

Specific questions also include:
- To what extent and what ways has the project delivered different impacts for men and women participants?
- Please consider how far the achievements can be attributed to the project (or how the project has contributed to any reported changes and impacts) and the extent to which they can be attributed to other external factors.
- Even though there may be no explicit outcomes relating to the environment and gender, please consider any impact on the environment and on women as a result of this project.
- Has there been any impact on people beyond the target groups (for example, in the wider geographical community or the sector as a whole) through learning shared by project participants or as a result of policy work?
- It is also very important to consider the counterfactual, that is, what would have happened to the beneficiaries if the project had not happened. Would some of the changes have happened anyway?
- On the basis of results to date, what impact can realistically be expected long term?

6.5 Sustainability
- To what extent has the project leveraged additional resources (financial and in-kind) from other sources? What effect has this had on the scale, delivery or sustainability of activities?
- To what extent is there evidence that the benefits delivered by the project will be sustained after the project ends?

Specific questions also include:
- To what extent does the sustainability of impact vary between men and women, participants? Why is this?
- Are there indications that elements of the project will be sustainable without further external support? What are these and what are the factors which will determine whether or not they will continue?
- Will the project contribute to lasting benefits? Which organizations could/will ensure continuity of project activities in the project area?
- How committed are participating organisations / partners / participants / businesses to continue utilising new skills, knowledge, techniques acquired during the project?
- Is there evidence of organisations/partners/communities that have copied, up-scaled or replicated project activities beyond the immediate project area? Is such replication or magnification likely?
- How could it have been made more sustainable? (e.g. were whole groups or individuals affected, did the project affect power structures / attitudes / behaviours and practices) Can this be replicated? Why / why not?
- What are the social and political environment/ acceptance of this project?
- What are the implications for on-going work in this area?

Assess and make recommendations on the key strategic options for the future of the project, i.e exit, scale down, replication, scale-up, continuation, major modifications
- Comment on any existing plans
- Make recommendations in addition

6.6 Findings and Recommendations
- What were the main successes and failures of the project, and why?
- What are the challenges and how can they be addressed?
- Which changes/ actions are needed for appropriate and successful implementation?

6.7 Lessons Learned
Learning from experience in order to improve future practice is of strategic importance to Development Wheel, ECOTA Fair Trade Forum and its partners and specific learning questions are identified for each project. Using participatory processes to draw on the experience and knowledge of

key project stakeholders, the evaluator should identify any learning derived in relation these specific questions and more generally any learning from the implementation of the project that can be incorporated into future activities.

Please also consider:
- Lessons related to project implementation / process, for example: project design; project tools, methods and approaches; project management and partnership; project monitoring and evaluation systems; value for money.
- Lessons related to outcomes.
- Lessons specifically related to gender and the environment, even though there may not be specific related outcomes.
- What have been the key learnings on how best to engage with women especially, and with other hard-to-reach groups such as the Garo?

Specific questions also include:
- To what extent are the district and regional associations valued by the artisans? To what extent are they representing the interests of the crafts sector artisans effectively to policy-makers, duty-bearers and other relevant bodies?
- To what extent are the district and regional association's sustainable organizations in their own right? In what specific areas do they need further support?
- Is it possible to disaggregate key impacts (e.g. increase in disposable income, improved productivity, reduced costs) by enterprises size, so that we can better understand the extent to which impacts vary between small, marginal and medium artisans?

  What proportion of group and association leadership positions are held by women? Is it possible to get some in-depth case-studies of women who've risen to these positions and understand what impact this has made on them? Is it possible to get a sense from women in mixed groups that are led by women, what difference having a woman in a leadership position makes for them?

7. Evaluation methods

The consultants(s) (or consulting firm) commissioned to conduct the final evaluation and the grantee are jointly responsible for choosing the methods that are the most appropriate for demonstrating impact. Evaluation methods should be rigorous yet at all times proportionate and appropriate to the context of the project intervention. Where possible, the evaluator(s) are encouraged to triangulate data sources so that findings are as robust as possible. A Project Evaluation Group will be established to both inform and support the evaluation process.

Evaluation methods could include the following:

7.1 Different approaches to assessing impact

Although it is not strictly mandatory, the evaluator(s) are encouraged to apply a mixed-methods approach for assessing impact. This would combine qualitative data to provide an explanation of 'why' and 'how' the project has achieved the type and scale of results that are quantitatively observed.

Assessing impact through experimental or quasi-experimental approaches
To definitively attribute impact, then the establishment of a counter factual is required: e.g. what would have happened to beneficiaries in the absence of the intervention? Evaluators are encouraged to consider the extent to which approaches, such as measuring the difference between treatment and control groups, can be successful in capturing impact while also balancing concerns relating to proportionality. It is likely that experimental or approaches will not be appropriate for a large number of grantees.

Assessing impact through contribution-based research
Contribution-based approaches are helpful for overcoming the attribution issue of proving cause and effect. A contribution-based approach should result in a 'plausible' account of the difference that People Tree Foundation and Cristian AID's funding has made to the impact of grantees. Such an approach is typically informed by a wide range of evidence sources that are brought together to produce a 'plausible' assessment of the 'contribution' of grantees to higher level outcomes and impacts. It is likely that such an approach will be appropriate for a large majority of grantees.

7.2 Indicative materials to review

Relevant to review may include review of the grantee's original application for funding; MOU with People Tree Foundation and Cristian Aid for funding; updated versions of organizational project log frames; monitoring data; monitoring systems, annual reports and comments provided by the Fund Manager; organizational monitoring & evaluation strategy; studies undertaken by the grantee; financial information / information on resources spent; information on synergies / collaboration with People Tree Foundation and Cristian Aid's country programmes and other actors; published material (e.g. to demonstrate sharing of learning with others); and additional relevant documents.

7.3 Indicative methods for conducting primary and secondary research

Relevant primary and secondary research may include: interviews with staff at the grantee organization involved in the management and delivery of work; interviews with various delivery partners; focus group discussions with ultimate beneficiaries; surveys with project partners and other relevant stakeholders where (possible and proportionate); systematic reviews of secondary studies and sources, measuring impact where possible and proportionate through comparison groups and other quantitative methods; and verifying reported data through back checking and quality control assessments.

8. Outputs and Deliverables

8.1 Desk Phase:
- Methodology design / key questions and timeline for approval.
- Feedback to the Project Evaluation Group on initial analysis from literature review and data analysis to identify initial findings, key gaps, review sampling criteria etc.

8.2 Field Phase:
- Written feedback on preliminary findings and conclusions to the Project Evaluation Group.

8.3 Synthesis Phase
- The evaluator will provide a written Evaluation report. The required format for the evaluation report is attached.
- The main body of the report (draft and final version) must be limited to 40 pages. One of the should consist of a table which summarises the findings according to the OECD-DAC criteria.
- The draft report will be initially submitted to Development Wheel (DEW) for comment and review (DEW will then consult with the Project Evaluation Group). Any changes necessary will be made by the evaluator to produce the final report. DEW and its partners are interested to preserve the objectivity of the evaluator but reserve the right to ensure the Evaluation report is of the quality expected.
- The evaluator will present the final report at a dissemination workshop, where project partners and participating organisations will be present. The findings will be discussed and reviewed.

9. Roles and Responsibilities

9.1 Evaluator's Responsibility
- Undertake assignment as outlined in the ToR.
- Complete the tasks in ToR in the allocated time.
- Update project partners on a regular basis concerning progress.

9.2 Project Evaluation Group's responsibility
The Project Evaluation Group is comprised of Executive Director, Development Wheel (DEW), Chair of ECOTA Fair Trade Forum, Project Coordinator, Finance manager, DEW.

This group's main functions are:
- To ensure that the evaluator has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents.
- To validate the evaluation framework, questions and methodology.
- To discuss and comment on reports delivered by the evaluator at each stage of the process.
- To assist in feedback of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

9.3 Provision of logistical and other support
For day to day queries and logistical support the evaluator will contact Subhatun Nur Prithy, Project Coordinator, GEAT Project, DEW who will coordinate any support necessary. He will be responsible for informing stakeholders of any interviews or focus groups, and for providing the contacts of people to be interviewed, dates of visit and itinerary.

10. Evaluation Timetable
The duration for the entire assignment is 40 days. As final evaluation, there is a tight timeframe for the research of this project and the consultant would need to work within the above-mentioned timeline.

12. Profile of the Independent Evaluation provider

The Independent Evaluator should be a suitably-qualified and experienced consultant or consulting firm. The consultant profile should include:
- An evaluation specialist with a minimum of seven years' experience in programme/project evaluation in an international development context. Often a mixed approach that incorporates the technical skills of an evaluation specialist but includes some inputs from a sector specialist is most effective;
- Experience of results-based monitoring and evaluation;
- Ability to design and plan the evaluation approaches and research methodologies, including quantitative and qualitative research methods. Where feasible and proportionate, the person or team should include skills and expertise required to design, plan and conduct impact evaluation, potentially using experimental or quasi-experimental techniques;
- Relevant subject matter knowledge and experience such as education sector, gender, non-state actors and economic growth to ensure the evaluation design and research methods are as relevant and meaningful as possible given the aims and objectives of the project and the context in which it is being delivered;
- Ability to manage a potentially large-scale and complex evaluation and research process, including interpreting baseline data and conducting a final evaluation;
- Ability to design, manage and implement primary research in potentially challenging project environments, such as fragile and conflict affected states. This may include the design of surveys, in-depth interviews, focus group and other research;
- Design and manage data and information systems capable of handling large datasets for monitoring and evaluation purposes; and
- Consideration of the extent to which the evaluator or evaluation team has appropriate country knowledge/experience. This includes language proficiency to conduct the research required or that resources be made available (e.g. translator or social gatekeeper) to enable the research to proceed smoothly; and

While evaluation consultants may be nominated by the grantees, they must not have a conflict of interest with the ongoing activities of grantees.

Recruitment and Appointment: The selected candidate will be contracted and will commence work shortly after recruitment. A service contract will be signed between consultant and Development Wheel (DEW).
Applications must include detailed curriculum vitae with three references (two professional and one personal), along with detail (technical and financial) proposal outlining how and when they intend to accomplish this task.

Applications should be sent to: Shah Abdus Salam at dewsalam@gmail.com copied to Subhatun Nur Prithy at programme.dew@gmail.com

NB: The deadline for applications is February 12, 2024. Only short-listed candidates will be contacted.