

*Terms of reference*

**Evaluation of Bread for the World and Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe's  
climate lighthouse projects**

**1. Introduction**

Bread for the World is the globally active development agency of the Protestant Churches in Germany. In almost 100 countries around the world, it empowers the poor and marginalised to improve their living conditions on their own. The work focuses on food security, the promotion of education and health, the respect of human rights as well keeping the integrity of creation. Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe is the humanitarian aid and relief agency of the Protestant Churches in Germany, providing assistance all over the world and supporting the victims of natural disasters, war and displacement who cannot cope with this emergency on their own. Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe and Bread for the World are part of the Protestant Agency for Diakonia and Development created in 2012 when the four predecessor organizations merged: the Protestant Development Service, Bread for the World, Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe and the Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany.

Climate change, the global threatening situation it has created and the related challenges posed for development cooperation and humanitarian aid triggered an internal debate at the Protestant Development Service and Bread for the World in the mid-2000s. The result of the internal discussion process was that, in 2008, Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe and Bread for the World developed what they called a climate lighthouse concept, which they have since developed further in close cooperation with their respective partners. Lighthouse projects were developed in which the goal “of reducing the risks of climate change to particularly vulnerable target groups and of offering them sustainable development prospects” was pursued in a unified and systematic way.

The lighthouse process contains two main aspects which should mutually reinforce, influence and strengthen each other: (1) On the one hand, a mutual learning process so that partner organisations and Bread for the World and Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe are better qualified with regard to climate-related work. This process was evaluated in 2018. (2) On the other hand, the development and implementation of integrated climate projects by partner organizations in different countries on the basis of a common concept. Three of these projects are to be evaluated in this evaluation. The evaluators recommend 2018 carrying out the upcoming project evaluations in a joint evaluation process.

In **Indonesia**, two Lighthouse Projects are implemented, one by Ikatan Petani Pengendalian Hama Terpadu Indonesia/JAMTANI (IPPHTI), the other by Gereja Toraja (GT).

#### GT

The project partnership is with GT Motivator Training Center Kondoran which was founded in 1983 as a sub-unit of PP-PWGT ((Woman Fellowship of Toraja Church)/ the Toraja Church (Gereja Toraja - GT). The mission of the Training Center is to achieve peacefulness, prosperity and justice for all with focusing on improving of economic livelihood, society health, environment conservation and ecological farming.

The Lighthouse Project (LHP) has been implemented since 2009 in partnership with DKH as lead agency and since 2015 the project was taken over by BfdW as lead agency. The project period 1 January 2015 - 31 December 2018 will be the focus of the evaluation. The project took place in three villages, Bua'tarrung, Batu Sura' and To'pao. On July 1, 2017, an additional project Climate Resilient Agriculture Innovative Investigation Project (CRAIIP) was implemented in the 3 LHP villages plus 2 other villages, namely Buntu Datu and Tallang Sura'. CRAIIP itself is intended to support the achievement of the current LHP. The CRAIIP project period is 1.5 years, specifically, 1 July 2017 until 31 December 2018. The current projects started in January 2019. The project area is in Tana and North Toraja, Sulawesi.

#### JAMTANI/IPPHTI

Up to the end of 2018, the project partnership was with the farmer association Ikatan Petani Pengendalian Hama Terpadu Indonesia (IPPHTI). IPPHTI has about 2 Mio. members all over Indonesia. In December 2018, the Indonesian Farmers Community Network (Jaringan Masyarakat Tani Indonesia/ JAMTANI) was founded with about 37.000 members in 6 provinces in Indonesia. JAMTANI remains closely linked to IPPHTI. The mission of JAMTANI is to develop an ecological agriculture, to increase farmers' sovereignty over sustainable food, to promote farmers rights and to develop farmer independence including gender equity.

The Lighthouse Project (LHP) has been implemented since 2009 in partnership with DKH as lead agency and since 2015 the project was taken over by BfdW as lead agency. The LHP project had been conducted from January 1st 2015 – December 31st 2018 and an additional CRAIIP project from July 1st 2017 to December 31st 2018. The current project started in January 2019. The aim of the projects is to increase the resilience of farmers in facing the negative impacts of climate change. To achieve the project objectives, the project had 3 components, Adaptation, Mitigation and DRR. The project area is 4 villages in Pangandaran District in West-Java und 2 villages in Cilacap District, Central-Java.

In **Ethiopia**, the Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus – Development and Social Service Commission (EECMY-DASSC) started the first lighthouse project as a pilot in 2011. It is currently in its third phase.

EECMY-DASSC is among the faith-based partners of BfdW with a cooperation lasting over 20 years. EECMY is one of the two major evangelical churches in Ethiopia and with more than four million

members EECMY plays an important role in the fight against poverty, HIV/AIDS and rights violations. EECMY is a member of World Council of Churches (WCC), Action by Churches Together (ACT), Christian Relief and Development Association (CRDA) and Joint Relief Partnership (JRP). EECMY is divided into a number of synods, that all run independent development activities. EECMY-DASSC-NCES BO is one of the 30 branch offices across the country operating in Amhara and Afar regions.

The project is located at Legambo Woreda of South Wollo Administrative zone in Amhara Regional State (ANRS), at about 500 km, 575km and 100 km from Addis Ababa, Bahir Dar and Dessie town respectively and has been implementing in four kebele administrations. Objectives are the improvement of the adaptive capacity to climate change of communities in Debera area and the enhancement of the resilience/adaptability of at-risk households over against climate change.

## **2. Objectives of the evaluation**

The overall process includes the implementation of three individual project evaluations of climate lighthouse projects in Indonesia and Ethiopia and a synthesis phase in which comparative and overarching questions are answered.

1. The three Lighthouse projects in Indonesia and Ethiopia have been evaluated on the basis of common and specific questions.
2. Recommendations for the further development of each individual project have been drawn up.
3. The theory of change for each project has been reviewed. The common characteristics of the three theories of change are integrated in a common impact model.
4. In the synthesis phase, comparative and overarching questions are dealt with, common factors influencing impact are identified and recommendations for community-based climate resilience projects developed.

## **3. Key questions for the three project evaluations <sup>1</sup>**

### **Relevance**

5. How far is the project concept responding to the problems faced by the target groups, in particular related to climate change?
6. To what extent are the selection of beneficiaries and interventions directly based on the results of the Risk Assessment (and Rapid Assessment)
7. To what extent are the activities, methods and schedules compliant with the local conditions and the daily and personal activities of the community?
8. To what extent is gender mainstreaming applied to problem analysis and the identification of types of interventions for the assisted groups?
9. How was the project related to the larger setting, e.g. development strategies of the governments affecting local resilience such as large-scale regional land use planning which might contradict or support the LHP approach?

---

<sup>1</sup> Additional evaluation questions which only concern one specific project evaluation can be found in the appendix.

## **Effectivity**

10. To what extent have the project objectives been achieved compared to the planning?
11. To what extent have the adaptation programs / activities implemented increased the resilience (economic, food and adaptive capacity) of farmer families, and in particular the at-risk households?
12. To what extent have the activities in this project successfully addressed community issues related to climate change adaptation and mitigation and disaster risk reduction?
13. What evidence is there that vulnerable sections of the community (women, children and disabled people) are more protected from the risk of natural disasters?
14. What are the real effects (positive and negative) on the target group?
15. How do activities of this program improve access, participation, control, affirmation and benefits for women in the context of gender equality?
16. To what extent were the community, (women and men) and individual high risk HHs involved in the planning, implementation, monitoring? e.g. administering the risk assessment, choice & design of intervention, etc.
17. To what extent does the use of local wisdom in this project support the success of the program?
18. What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives? (supporting and inhibiting factors)

## **Efficiency**

19. Were activities implemented cost-efficiently?
20. To what extent is management of the project carried out time-efficiently?
21. Was the risk assessment methodology efficient for beneficiary selection and developing relevant interventions?
22. Is the implementation of activities in accordance with the predetermined schedule?

## **Impact**

23. Which lasting changes has the project created for the lives in the communities?
24. To what extent does the LHP program influence non-assisted individuals and groups (other farmers, other communities, government) to implement adaptation, mitigation and DRR programs modelled on the example of the lighthouse project?
25. Has the situation of the beneficiaries in the community changed beyond the direct benefits of the interventions? i.e. changes of power relations, change in access to information and resources, gender-justice etc.
26. Which other intended and/or unintended positive and/or negative changes have occurred as a result of the project at impact level?
27. How was the relative impact of the projects on living conditions, i.e. what were the most profound changes to the living conditions / life in the last 3 years ?

## **Sustainability**

28. Can the target group and local stakeholders sustain the interventions after the lifespan of the project? Which ones?
29. If the project phases out, what are the major factors which hinder target groups from continuing to improve their resilience?
30. To what extent has the project used appropriate and effective strategies which can bring sustainability, i.e. can ensure that the communities' benefits continue independently?

#### 4. Questions for the Synthesis Phase

1. To what extent can the three projects and their project strategies be compared?
2. What can be said about the strengths and weaknesses of the three projects in comparative terms?
3. What are the key factors supporting and inhibiting the achievement of objectives?
4. To what extent can the lighthouse projects learn from each other? What are lessons learnt/ best practice examples of the projects which may be transferred to other climate-resilience projects?
5. Are there key factors which increased resilience for the target groups in all 3 projects?
6. How strong is the link between household resilience (in particular high-risk household resilience) and community resilience? (Can indicators at HH-level meaningfully tell us something about community resilience? How relevant is an incremental increase in income for resilience in relation to other factors of resilience, e.g. infrastructural developments by government.)
7. Was the formulation of the specific objectives and indicators consistent with the (implicit) impact chain / theory of change?
8. How did the learnings of the projects influence the work and working culture of the implementing organizations? Any lasting effects, e.g. gender mainstreaming, introducing climate risk assessments in other projects of the same organization?
9. Are there alternative measurements of resilience / climate risk which are less resource consuming and less 'extractive' than the household based risk assessment used in these projects?

#### 5. Evaluation design/methods

The evaluation standards of the DeGEval, Evaluation Society, and the principles and standards of the OECD/DAC should be followed for a participative, credible and fair evaluation. The evaluation should satisfy the OECD/DAC criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability). The evaluators should suggest answers for the above-mentioned key questions on the basis of these criteria. The detailed evaluation design and methodology should be developed by the evaluators.

The following core documents are available: Lighthouse concept, Project applications and reports, Project documents, Reports of external consultants on their activities, Evaluation reports, reports about business trips made by Bread for the World.

#### 6. Evaluation process / Timetable

The total time required for the evaluation is estimated as two and a half months. The evaluation should take place some time between September 2019 and April 2020. The evaluators should indicate their availability within this time period. They should propose a more precise timetable after the contract clarification meeting.

Date	Interim result /Product
16.06.2019	Expression of interest, including questions for clarification
26.06.2019	Circulation of responses to questions raised by interest parties
15.07.2019	Submission of offers
Second half of July 2019	Signing of contract

August 2019	Contract clarification meeting in Berlin
September 2019	Inception Report
September 2019– April 2020	Fieldwork phase in Ethiopia (and Draft of evaluation report)
September 2019– April 2020	Fieldwork phase in Indonesia and Draft of two evaluation reports. Travel information: Travel time between GT, Sulawesi and JAMTANI, Java – 1,5 or 2 days , To Pangandaran: Susi air flight from Jakarta, Toraja: closest airport Palopo LLO
September 2019– April 2020	Synthesis Phase and Draft of Synthesis report
September 2019– April 2020	Drafting of final reports, Presentation of results in Berlin

## 7. Expected products

The following products must be submitted on time, first as a draft and after the commentary by Bread for the World and its partner organizations as a final product.

### **Inception report**

After the contract clarification meeting and the transfer of the core documents to digital form, the evaluators should prepare an inception report (of about 15 pages) describing how the results will be reached and which data needs to be collected, as well as how these will be documented and how they relate to each other. The inception report should also include a detailed timetable, activity plan and a preliminary table of contents for the different reports.

### **Three evaluation reports**

For each project, an evaluation report should be prepared (after the respective evaluation phase), in which the respective questions are answered according to the OECD-DAC criteria and recommendations for further development are given. At the end of each fieldwork phase a debriefing session with the respective partner organization has taken place.

### **Synthesis report**

A synthesis report will be prepared on the basis of comparative and overarching questions on the three projects and the overall process (of about 40 pages).

The results and recommendations should be presented to Bread for the World in Berlin.

### **Creating a summary of the evaluation report**

The evaluators should also, on an anonymous basis, provide a summary of the synthesis report as an extra Word document in German (or in the language of the report). This summary should be between 7000 and 10,000 characters (with spaces) in length and include the following: (1) A short description of the organization carrying out the project and of the evaluated project, (2) the goals of the evaluation and methodological approach, (3) key findings according to the OECD/DAC criteria and (4) recommendations. Ten photos related to the evaluation process should also be submitted.

## **8. Key qualifications of the evaluation team**

We are looking for an evaluation team of two or three consultants: An international consultant as well as a local consultants in Ethiopia and, ideally, in Indonesia. For Indonesia, Bread for the World in cooperation with its local partner NGOs can provide CVs of local consultants who have indicated their interest, for consideration by the evaluation team. Otherwise, partner organizations in Indonesia select a local consultant to be part of the team. The field studies are carried out jointly by the international and local consultant. The international evaluator has the lead on the overall evaluation approach, while at local level the working relationships within the evaluation team needs to be handled flexibly, according to skills and local knowledge.

The evaluation team should have the following characteristics:

- expertise regarding the impact of climate change in the Global South and particularly to the related obstacles to development in rural areas;
- theoretical knowledge of the current debate about the instruments for increasing and measuring resilience to climate change in general and for communities in developing countries in particular;
- practical experience in the implementation of community-based climate change adaptation projects in rural areas of the Global South;
- practical experiences in cooperation with NGO
- Country expertise in Ethiopia and Indonesia
- Experience of process evaluations and organizational development processes and knowledge of empirical data collection and evaluation methods (qualitative methods, quantitative methods, mixed methods design, triangulation)
- gender competence, intercultural competence
- very good knowledge of English, the respective local language (Amharic/ Indonesian) (the local consultants), knowledge of German is an additional asset.
- Ability to travel to tropical regions

## **9. Proposals**

This announcement is based on a two-stage process. At the expression of interest stage, bidders present themselves. Suitable bidders are invited to submit a bid in a second stage.

### **9.1. Expression of interest:**

In a first stage, all interested experts/teams/consultancies submit their expression of interest together with their profile. If the expert/teams/consultancies have questions about the announcement, they shall submit these together with their expression of interest and their profile. We request that you refrain from telephone questions during that time.

Please send us with your expression of interest:

- An application as expert/team/consultancy which gives us an indication of your capacities and skills in implementing the contract including relevant career details of all consultants.
- All questions you may have on the ToR.

All interested parties with the general suitability to conduct the evaluation will be invited to submit an offer. **Expressions of interest by 16.06.2019 per email** to [Christiane.Schulte@brot-fuer-die-welt.de](mailto:Christiane.Schulte@brot-fuer-die-welt.de) and [Ellen.Kalmbach@brot-fuer-die-welt.de](mailto:Ellen.Kalmbach@brot-fuer-die-welt.de)

Any questions asked by interested parties in the context of the expression of interest will be answered by 26.6.2019 and the answers will be sent to all those qualified to submit an offer.

### **9.2. Submission of offers:**

Full offers must be submitted by **15.07.2019**. A complete submission should include:

1. a **content and methodological offer** describing the evaluation conception, timetable coherently and describing which methods will be used to attain the goals of the evaluation.
2. a **financial plan** that includes payment for the evaluator(s), travel costs and other expenses. All costs including VAT should be included in the financial plan.
3. an **informative tabular resume** including references for all the evaluators

We reserve the right to hold interviews in person or by telephone with two or three applicants before making our decision. We reserve the right to award the contract at the time of submission of the tender.

### **Please send your complete applications to:**

Evangelisches Werk für Diakonie und Entwicklung e. V.  
Stabsreferat EMVS, z. Hd. Christiane Schulte, Ellen Kalmbach  
Caroline-Michaelis-Straße 1  
10115 Berlin

**E-Mail: [Christiane.Schulte@brot-fuer-die-welt.de](mailto:Christiane.Schulte@brot-fuer-die-welt.de); [Ellen.Kalmbach@brot-fuer-die-welt.de](mailto:Ellen.Kalmbach@brot-fuer-die-welt.de)**



Appendix:  
Additional evaluation questions to specific project evaluations

Relevance

GT Indonesia	IPPHTI Indonesia
1. Are the three components (adaptation, mitigation, and DRR) in one project synergized and what are the advantages?	
2. To what extent does the CRAIP program help achieve to objectives of the LHP program/ increased the capacity of small-scale farmers to adapt to climate change?	

Effectivity

GT Indonesia	IPPHTI Indonesia
3. To what extent has disaster risk reduction program succeeded in reducing disaster risk to the target group, their assets, and livelihoods, and protection and recovery?	3. To what extent have the established disaster preparedness teams reduced the risk of accidents and loss of assets when climate change disasters did occur in Ciganjeng and Rawaapu Villages?
4. To what extent has the coffee and rice Climate Field School program and the SRI demonstration plot answered the problems faced by coffee farmers?	4. To what extent is the strategy to develop IPPHTI's staff capacity able to serve the target group well and optimally in achieving project objectives?
5. To what extent are the mitigation programs carried out able to reduce the emission and increase absorption of greenhouse gases to the atmosphere?	5. To what extent does the community in Model village benefit from visitors?
6. To what extent is the advocacy carried out capable of influencing local government policies to support target groups in the context of adaptation, mitigation and DRR?	6. To what extent is gender mainstreaming in all components of the IPPHTI program useful for the assisted groups?
	7. To what extent can renewable energy reduce emissions without interfering with the productivity of assisted farmers on Nusakambangan Island?
	8. To what extent has the vulnerability of the assisted groups decreased after the interventions (based on results of RA version 2016 compared to the data baseline)?
	9. To what extent can the contribution of additional income / alternative livelihood sources be a backup when there is a failure / loss of the rice harvest (primary commodity of farmers)?

Efficiency

GT Indonesia
7. To what extent has the management overcome challenges during the process of implementing project activities?

Impact

GT Indonesia	IPPHTI Indonesia
8. To what extent does the 'model village' method help to achieve broader impacts?	10. To what extent is IPPHTI through the Model villages strategy able to influence the district government in Pangandaran, private companies, educational institutions, Non-Governmental Organizations in issuing
9. To what extent does university	

involvement contribute to achieving project objectives and overall goal?	Adaptation, Mitigation and DRR program policies?
<p>10/11 To what extent does university involvement contribute to anchoring new participatory aspects (target-group perspectives) and thematic content (e.g. the value of traditional knowledge) in teaching methods and curriculum?</p> <p>Did the advocacy influence government policies and programs related to climate change (adaptation, mitigation, DRR) at any government level?</p>	
<p>11 To what extent is the LHP program (activities and objectives) known and adopted by government and other institutions / NGOs?</p> <p>12 To what extent does the participation of LHP staff at international meetings influence parties from Indonesia and other countries as well as succeed in improving the quality of LHP programs in GT?</p>	<p>12. To what extent has the network from the university (UNPAD, CCROM IPB, Humboldt) already raised / used / published / advocated ideas and learning from IPPHTI?</p>

#### Sustainability

GT Indonesia	IPPHTI Indonesia
<p>13 How far can the achieved benefits of the economic and environmental aspects of the program be maintained by the community and / or expanded?</p>	<p>13 To what extent will the disaster preparedness team be able to independently protect their communities, especially vulnerable groups, from disasters according to 'SOP' (Main Tasks and Functions) after the project ends?</p> <p>14 To what extent will stakeholders (including government, Universities, private companies, individuals, etc.) continuously contribute to the long term achievement of the project goal?</p>
<p>14 What is the Pusbinlat Motivator-GT strategy to achieve group sustainability and independence?</p>	<p>15 What factors of the greening program (reforestation, rehabilitation, etc.) and community-based mangrove forests' maintenance system, ensure long lasting effects?</p>

#### Sustainability: EECMY-DASSC Ethiopia

<p>1. To what extent can interventions that are fully handed over to the target group (soil and water conservation, enclosures, watershed and spring development) be sustained without the project support?</p>
---