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[**1**](#h.4d34og8)**. Introduction & Context**

GRC and the Malagasy Red Cross (MRC) plan a final evaluation in Madagascar from mid-October to mid-November 2025.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Number and Cost Center** | IMG2021\_II014\_MDG\_Local adaptation of farmers / A612333 |
| **Project Donor** | IKI (International Climate Initiative) Medium Grants funded by the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection |
| **Implementing Organisation** | German Red Cross (GRC) |
| **Implementing Partner** | Malagasy Red Cross (MRC) |
| **Project Title** | Increasing resilience and rural livelihoods of most vulnerable farmer households in Antanambao-Manampotsy district, Madagascar |
| **Project Location** | Antanambao Manampotsy City and 6 fokontany (villages) in Mahela Commune, Atsinanana Region, Madagascar |
| **Project Duration** | 40 months |
| **Project Start Date** | 01.09.2022 |
| **Original Project End Date** | 31.08.2025 |
| **Project Extension** | 31.12.2025 |

**1.1 Development and policy context**

Madagascar is the world´s fifth-largest island, situated in the Indian Ocean off the coast of southern Africa. The 2020 World Risk Report ranks Madagascar as the most at-risk country to disasters. Deforestation and forest degradation are among the greatest threats to Madagascar´s terrestrial ecosystems; caused by slash & burning agriculture, grazing pressure, and collection of fuel wood / charcoal production, and indirectly by low agricultural productivity and a lack of alternative energy sources for many households. More recently, the impact of climate change on biodiversity has become apparent, particularly in the marine and coastal environments. Also, insufficient management of agricultural resources, limited protection of cultivars and seeds, limited training related to adapted agriculture, soil degradation and low valuation of traditional agricultural practices are main threats to agricultural biodiversity. The loss in biodiversity negatively impacts on local populations increasing households´ livelihood, poverty and reducing overall resilience to stresses and shocks such as cyclones and pandemics.

As part of its efforts to address these challenges, the Government of Madagascar has developed a National Climate Change Adaptation Plan (NAP) laying out possible interventions.

**1.2 Socio-political and socio-economical context (incl. gender situation)**

Madagascar´s population is estimated at 30.3 million in 2023, faces the challenge of a persistently high poverty (75% in 2022 using the national poverty line of about 4000 ariary per person per day). The median age is at 19.2 years. Despite growth projections, economic challenges such as high population growth (over 2.4% annually) and persistent inflation (averaging 7.6% in 2024) limit the potential for substantial

improvements in living standards. The current account deficit worsened to an estimated 5% of GDP in 2024, due to declining exports of key commodities like vanilla, cloves, cobalt, and nickel.[[1]](#footnote-1)

The disaster risks are exacerbated by the effects of climate change and the El Niño phenomenon. Between late 2024 and early 2025 only, Madagascar endured a succession of 4 cyclones: Dikeledi (Jan. 11th) killed at least three in the north of the country; Honde (Feb. 28th ) caused eight fatalities and displaced over 22,000; and Jude (March 14th ) affected more than 41,000 people and displaced 27,000, causing extensive infrastructure damage; Cyclone Chido (Dec 13th 2024) had only minor impact in Madagascar.

In December 2023, Andry Rajoelina was re-elected President of Madagascar and in December 2024 were held the communal and municipals elections.

Madagascar keeps struggling with widespread corruption at all levels, as well as untransparent governance, that hinder the independency of the executive, legislative and judicial branches established in the constitution.

**1.3 Project/Program set up and institutional context – stakeholders**

The Malagasy Red Cross Society (MRC) was founded in 1963. As an auxiliary to the public authorities, MRC plays a central role in the respective national aid system and is ideally positioned to support the territorial implementation of public policies. It benefits from a decentralized national network, strong experience in community mobilization, and formal partnership protocols with both the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development - MEDD and the National Office for Disaster Risk Management - BNGRC.

The MRC and the German Red Cross (GRC) have a long-standing partnership, with a GRC presence in-country since 2012. Since then, both Red Cross Societies have been working in partnership on several emergency aid and resilience projects funded by institutional, as well as private donors. MRC aims to reduce the negative effects of climate change in Madagascar through climate change adaptive measures. In recent years, several branches have already been trained and equipped for disaster preparedness and response and sensitized to climate change adaptation.

The “IKI” funded project is the start-up project in the thematic of climate change adaption both for MRC and GRC in Madagascar. It is also for the first time that GRC received funds from IKI. Further, it is the first time to implement a project for GRC in Atsinanana region (east coast of Madagascar). The project is implemented trough a CRM project team supported by a GRC Project Delegate based in Vatomandry, and the local CRM Governance and its volunteers based in Antanambao Manampotsy. Further the project is supported by the CRM National HQ and the GRC Delegation (a Head of Office and a Regional Finance Delegate) in Antananarivo.

Communities/target groups: Farmer households in six fokontany (villages) within the most vulnerable commune Mahela in the district Antanambao Manampotsy, 3 DRR Community Committees based in Antanambao Manampotsy, Mahela and Fiadanana, staff and volunteers for the MRC.

Local authorities/stakeholders who are directly involved in the implementation of the project activities for all four project results:

* Representative of Authorities and Ministries in the District Antanambao Manampotsy:
* The Cantonnement for Forest (local MEDD), the CIRAE (directorate for Agriculture), District of Antanambao Manampotsy (responsible as well for Water and Disaster Risk Reduction-DRR), Mayors of the municipality Antanambao Manampotsy and Mahela, the Chefs Fokontany (Village chiefs).
* Representative of regional Ministries/stakeholders in the capital city Toamasina or also named Tamatave of the Atsinanana region who are mainly involved in the development of the district CCA plan, output IV.
* The DREDD (regional MEDD), Regional Direction for Agriculture and Livestock (DRAE), Regional Direction for Water and Hygiene (DRAE), Regional Office for DRR (Regional BNGRC) and the Ministries/stakeholders on National level: BNGRC and National Office for Climate Change (MEDD-BNCCREDD+).

Project outcome and results:

The consultancy needs to evaluate the degree to which the objectives have been achieved to be measured by the indicators for the project outcome and each of the 4 results.

**Outcome:** Community members and district level authorities have strengthened their capacities to adapt to climate change, *pandemics[[2]](#footnote-2)* and secure livelihoods of vulnerable farming communities in the targeted areas.

O.1 Indicator: Percentage of targeted HHs that have an improved CSI (coping strategy index) by the end of the project as compared to baseline.

**Note:** The CSI has been measured during the baseline study in the six villages of Mahela commune in April 2023 – both through a questionnaire (survey) and focus group discussions. In the endline evaluation, the CSI needs to be measured anew.

O.2 Indicator: Number of key actors engaging at the district coordination level (disaggregated by progressive levels of engagement to support the development and implementation of a district adaptation plan (1: formally engaged, 2: informally engaged).

The expected results (outputs) are:

**Output I:** Farming production systems of households in Mahela are improved through introduction of climate adapted livelihood measures and capacity building.

Indicator I.1: Percentage of the targeted individuals have increased knowledge on at least one new climate-adaptation measure by the end of the action.

Indicator I.2: Number of households using livelihood input material (assets, seeds).

Indicator I.3: Number of sessions conducted by the farmer field schools on climate adapted livelihood options.

**Output II:** The communities of the Antanambao-Manampotsy have developed coping strategies to adapt to climate change.

II.1. Indicator: Number of community committees are founded, equipped, and have conducted at least 2 awareness campaigns on climate change.

II.2. Indicator: Number of community committees trained on early warning tools and have conducted 6 simulation exercises in 2023 and 2024 in the respective communities.

II.3. Indicator: The results of the EVCA are presented to the district level authorities of Mahela and Antanambao to inform the district adaption plan.

II.4 Indicator: Percentage of trained community committee members who can identify key measures that can be taken to increase resilience to COVID-19 and climate change.

**Output III:** Target communities are able to protect and manage natural resources through improved water infrastructure and reforestation.

III.1. Indicator: Surface (in ha) of the targeted areas that has been reforested with climate-adapted tree species by the end of the project.

III.2. Indicator: Number of infrastructure/rehabilitation works related to water sources (e.g. wells, boreholes as identified through feasibility studies), and/or drainage management along roads (rainwater passages, slopes containments, etc.) completed by the end of the project.

III.3. Indicator: Number of campaigns organized by the youth clubs.

**Output IV:** MRC and key stakeholder capacities to support climate adaptation, environmental activities and livelihoods resilience to external shocks are improved.

IV.1. Indicator: Percentage of trained MRC (A) staff and (B) volunteers and (C) key stakeholders (disaggregated by gender and sector) who – 3 to 6 months after participating in project training - can give at least one specific example of how they have used their new knowledge/skills in their work.

IV.2. Indicator: A replication concept to support the development of district adaptation plans through MRC branches is developed.

IV.3. Indicator: Number of coordination and advocacy meetings at national level to replicate and implement the district adaptation plans (NAPA).

[**2**](#h.2s8eyo1)**.** [**Evaluation purpose and**](#h.2s8eyo1) **users**

[**2.1 Purpose**](#h.17dp8vu)

The end-of-project evaluation should analyse the achievements of the project and analyse to which degree the project has achieved its specific objectives against the target results. Further the purpose is to:

1. *Ascertain results (output, outcome, impact) and assess the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of this intervention.*
2. *Specific learning: This project is/was an entry point for both MRC and GRC for advancing in climate change adaptation. Therefore, the outcome of the end-of-project evaluation supports the drawing on the experience and lessons learned from this project to exchange with other countries and projects of relevance.*
3. *Accountability to stakeholders and donors: The end-of-project evaluation is needed to contribute to specific topics within the Final Technical Report for IKI – Medium Grants.*

**2.2 Users of the evaluation**

The evaluation is primarily intended for:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **N°** | **Name of user** | **Objective** |
| 1 | MRC project staff and Governance in Antanambao Manampotsy, Vatomandry and Antananarivo and GRC staff in Vatomandry, Antananarivo and Berlin | Justification of intervention, impact of the project, efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery |
| 2 | Stakeholders on district, regional and national level | Information |
| 3 | IKI – International Climate Initiative | Accountability and justification of funding, including results of the end-term-evaluation into final technical donor project report for Medium Grants |

**3. Task description**

**3.1 Evaluation scope**

The scope of the evaluation is as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **N°** | **Results / Indicator** | **Geographical coverage** |
| 1 | Project Outcome and its indicator O.1,  Project Results I to III and its indicators  Project Result IV and indicator IV.1 | District Antanambao Manampotsy: District town and the six fokontany (villages) in the commune Mahela |
| 2 | Project Outcome and its indicator O.2  Project Result IV and its indicator IV.1 and 2 | Tamatave, capital city of Atsinanana region as well as Antananarivo  (Governmental stakeholders as well as MRC/GRC) |

**3.2** [**Evaluation criteria**](#h.26in1rg) **including** [**specific evaluation questions**](#h.26in1rg) **related to the project**

1. [**Relevance**](#h.lnxbz9) **(long-term)**

* *Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?*
* *Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects?*

1. [**Effectiveness**](#h.35nkun2)

* *To what extent were the objectives achieved / are likely to be achieved?*
* *What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?*

1. [**Efficiency**](#h.1ksv4uv)

* *Were activities cost-efficient?*
* *Were objectives achieved on time?*

1. [**Impact**](#h.44sinio)

* *What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?*
* *In how far had the intervention influence on the resilience of the beneficiaries?*
* *How many people were reached?*

1. [**Sustainability**](#h.2jxsxqh) **& Connectedness & Scaling[[3]](#footnote-3)**

* *Is the contribution to resilience of beneficiaries sustainable?*
* *Which measures were implemented to achieve sustainability?*
* *What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?*
* *Assessment of the potential of project approaches and results to last after the project ends[[4]](#footnote-4)*
* *Observation of long-term effects of project results among the target groups now and in the future?[[5]](#footnote-5)*

**3.3 Expectations of the evaluation:**

The evaluation should as well consider the following to feed into the final donor report**:**

**a) Lessons Learned**

Learning experiences during project implementation with respect to e.g.:

* Successfully tested instruments/methods
* Reaching & working with target groups
* Project measures that have not led to a solution
* Project measures that resulted in negative or positive unintended effects
* Project measures not carried out or only carried out with major delays
* Opportunities and challenges in cooperating with implementing partners
* Administrative challenges
* New and relevant capacity gaps
* Comments on any learning experiences regarding gender-related aspects (if applicable)

**b) Gender Mainstreaming and Participation**

* *Did the project ensure that people of all ages and genders and marginalised groups (e.g. poor, indigenous, people with disabilities, youth, etc) could participate equally in project activities and decision-making processes, and benefit from capacity building?*
* *What kind of measures – if any – did the project implement to avoid gender-based discrimination?*

[**4. Evaluation**](#h.z337ya) **design and** [**methodology**](#h.z337ya)

In general, GRC wants as much transparency and participation as possible in an evaluation process. Therefore, depending on the purpose of an evaluation, GRC is usually opting for an evaluation team, composed of an external and a national (local) consultant. The team structure will always be discussed with the project partner beforehand. The team composition as well as the design and methodology of the evaluation are subject matters of the negotiations with the evaluator/s. The methodology to measure the CSI needs to be identical with the methodology applied in the baseline study. It will be shared with the consultant.

**4.1 Evaluation team**

The evaluation team will be composed of:

The external Evaluator and Team leader (consultant)

One internal evaluator from MRC MEAL staff to support data collection, act as guide/translator as well as supporting the data analysis. The person will not be responsible to write the reports.

[**4.2**](#h.3j2qqm3) **Participation of stakeholders**

*It is expected that the Consultants will talk to the following stakeholders, MRC staff/members and GRC Project Staff involved directly or indirectly in the project implementation:*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***N°*** | ***Designation of Stakeholder*** | ***Geographic Area*** |
| *1* | *District Directorate* | ***District Antanambao Manampotsy and Mahela Commune*** |
| *2* | *Mayor of Antanambao Manampotsy* |
| *3* | *District Responsible for Agriculture* |
| *4* | *District Responsible for Environment and Forest* |
| *5* | *Mayor of Commune Mahela* |
| *6* | *07 Villages Chiefs* |
| *7* | *MRC District President* |
| *8* | *MRC District Volunteers* |
| *9* | *MRC District President (His role is mainly in Administration)* | ***IKI Project Office in Vatomandry district*** |
| *10* | *MRC Project Team (3 Officers: Agriculture, DRR and WASH, 3 Assistants: Admin &Finance, 1 Logistics, 1 PMER, 1 Driver)* |
| *11* | *GRC Project Delegate* |
| *12* | *BNGRC-Regional Office for Disaster Risk Reduction* | ***Tamatave or Toamasina – Capital City of Atsinanana Region*** |
| *13* | *DREDD- Regional Directorate for Environment and Sustainable Development and Forest* |
| *14* | *DRAE-Regional Directorate for Agriculture and Livestock* |
| *15* | *DREA-Regional Directorate for WASH* |
| *16* | *MRC Regional Branch* |
| *17* | *MRC Secretary General* | ***Antananarivo*** |
| *18* | *MRC Senior Staff: Head of DRR, Head of SFL[[6]](#footnote-6)* |
| *19* | *GRC Head of Delegation and Regional Finance Delegate* |
| *20* | *BN-CCREDD+ National Office for Climate Change* |

**4.3 Sources of information**

The evaluator team will have access to all relevant project documents like project proposal, project management documents (Gantt Chart, budget), monitoring tools, project reports (narrative and financial), mid-term evaluation reports, etc. These documents are confidential but can be cited and used in the evaluation process. Information which could do harm to any stakeholder if published should be treated in a confidential way. The decision about the publication is the right of GRC.

The following are the documents to be shared:

* Baseline study including findings of copying strategy index
* Project Annual Narrative Reports 2022, 2023, 2024
* Project Presentation 2024
* Internal Midterm Review
* Gantt chart
* Verification sources according to needs (participant lists, training reports, photos, mission reports from project team, etc)

**4.4 Methodology**

The evaluation team should use the available secondary data for analysis. For the collection of primary data, participatory methods should be applied. The choice of methods will have to be presented and described by the consultant in his technical proposal and will be approved by GRC in the kick-off meeting. To evaluate the CSI, the questions and methodology applied in the baseline study should be part of the primary data collection. The IFRC standards for evaluation\*[[7]](#footnote-7) should be respected and are the framework and basis for any evaluation activity executed by a consultant under GRC contract.

**5. Evaluation process with timetable and reporting**

The evaluation process has different phases and is described in the following paragraphs.

The process will be guided by the contracting parties. The timetable will be agreed by both parties. The consultant should deliver a concept for the evaluation process in form of the inception report. Further reporting will consist of a preliminary report, which will serve as basis for an evaluation workshop and the final report, which will be the product to be delivered, including the validated workshop results.

**5.1 Timetable**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date (tentative)** | **Task** | **Responsible person** | **Days** |
| 10.11.2025 | Introductory meeting with evaluation team, online | GRC and consultants | 0.5 |
| 11.-12.11.25 | Analysis of relevant documents | Consultants | 2 |
| 13.-14.11.25 | Delivery of inception report | External Consultant | 2 |
| 15-16.11.25 | Travel to Madagascar | External Consultant | 1.5 |
| 17.-18.11.25 | Kick-off meeting in Antananarivo including travel by road from Antanarivo to Vatomandry | GRC and consultants | 2 |
| 19.-28.11.25 | Kick-off meeting in Vatomandry, implementation of evaluation in Antanambao-Manampotsy district, including travel to the district and back to Vatomandry. Conduction of interviews and focus groups discussions with stakeholders and participants for the different activities, the survey and FGD to measure the CSI need to be included. | Consultants | 10 |
| 23.-25.11.25  29.11-1.12.25 | The interviews with the stakeholders based in Tamatave can be done remotely via Teams. Return travel to Antananarivo, interview with one national stakeholder. | Consultants | 3 |
| 2.-3.12.25 | Preliminary report delivery | External Consultant in the lead | 2 |
| 4.12.25 | Workshop report validation in Antananarivo | GRC and Consultants | 0.5 |
| 5.12.-8.12.25 | Final report preparation including return travel to country of departure | External Consultant | 3.5 |
| 9.- 10.12.25 | Report reception, corrections, final discussion | Consultants and GRC | 2 |
|  | Total |  | 29 |

**5.2 Reporting**

**5.2.1 Inception report**

An inception report offers the opportunity for the evaluator/s and GRC to clarify the contract and the ToR after a first study of the existing project documentation. The inception report of the evaluator/s should not be longer than 5 pages. The evaluator/s will give feedback to GRC about the ToR and their feasibility. This is the point where the evaluator/s, based on the information from the secondary data, can clarify open questions and possibly suggest changes to the content or direction of the evaluation as well. The inception report should be delivered before the evaluation starts. It should contain:

* The key data of the end-term evaluation (Project title, project data, commissioner of the evaluation, contractors, …)
* Feedback / Amendment of the ToR – suggestions for ToR amendments if necessary
* Status of the evaluation preparation (team, timetable, distribution of tasks, reporting)
* Evaluation design: Chosen methods, approach, steps for their implementation.
* Tools for their implementation should be submitted directly in French (questionnaires, data processing and analysis etc.)
* A draft implementation plan for the evaluation

The inception report will be discussed with GRC and the evaluator/s. Any changes of the ToR need an agreement of both parties, because they might change the conditions and thereby the contract between GRC and the evaluator/s.

**5.2.2 Preliminary report**

All findings, conclusions and recommendations including the evaluation methodology should be described and presented by the evaluator/s in a short preliminary evaluation report. The results of the preliminary report will first of all be discussed with GRC and the partner/s and will serve as basis for the preparation of the evaluation workshop. The report will be presented by the evaluator/s in the evaluation workshop.

**5.2.3 Evaluation and validation workshop**

Representatives of MRC, GRC, stakeholders and the evaluator/s will come together in the evaluation workshop. The workshop will be organized to discuss and validate findings, lessons learned and recommendations proposed by the evaluator/s. Stakeholders might formulate additional recommendations if necessary. Possible content of an evaluation workshop:

* Presentation and discussion of the preliminary evaluation report
* Validation of lessons learnt and recommendations by all stakeholders
* Collection of additional observations or recommendations

It is expected that the evaluator/s present a structure for the workshop as part of their preliminary report. GRC and MRC are responsible for the workshop preparation and all related logistics. The same is for the workshop/meeting with the project team in Vatomandry to present a summary of the findings during the evaluation in Antanambao Manampotsy. **In the two workshops, the findings need to be presented in French language.**

**5.2.4 Final report**

The final evaluation report should consider the validation of the stakeholders during the final workshop and has to be delivered at least **1 week** after the workshop. All consultant works, inception-, preliminary- and final report should be delivered in **English** language.

The consultant will give his/her recommendations but should incorporate the validation process during the workshop in the final report, including additional recommendations from the workshop participants. The report will have to be approved by German Red Cross. **The final report should, as a minimum, include the following elements and not be longer than max. 50 pages:**

* Key data of the evaluation (from the inception report)
* Executive summary – a tightly drafted, to-the-point, free standing document (max. 5 pages) with the following, fixed structure:
  1. Short project description
  2. Key questions of the evaluation
  3. Key findings

(Structured (if applicable) along the OECD DAC criteria and the additional criteria from IKI: Relevance / Effectiveness / Efficiency / Sustainability / Impact)

* 1. Lessons learned
  2. Major recommendations (Mainly general recommendations)
* Introduction – with purpose of the evaluation, scope, key questions, short description of the project to be evaluated and relevant framework conditions.
* Evaluation design and methodology
* Key findings with regards to the questions pointed out in the ToR
* Conclusions based on evidence and analysis
* Recommendations as expected in the ToR, which are relevant and feasible and targeted to the respective audience
* Lessons learnt, as generalizations of conclusions for a wider use.
* Annexes (ToR, list of consulted persons/organisations, consultes documentation, literature, etc.)

Key findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a clear and transparent way, possibly put next to each other in a table to demonstrate the logic.

The report can be extended by the evaluator/s by additional points if necessary.

GRC HQ, the project team and the partner will analyse the final report, especially the feasibility of the recommendations proposed by the evaluator/s. The list of recommendations will be

**5.3 Responsibilities and duties**

**GRC/MRC**

* Will provide the consultant(s) with all necessary project documents and other supporting documents
* Will be provided an induction meeting with MRC MEAL colleagues to coordinate the evaluation
* Will facilitate transport in Red Cross vehicles and rental vehicles in the district Antanambao Manampotsy as far as possible and available.
* Will support the consultant to make room reservations in Vatomandry and Antanambao Manampotsy
* Will provide the consultant with tablets for primary data collection in the field.
* Will facilitate and pay for the logistics like for example workshops, costs for MRC volunteers and staff supporting the evaluation in the field.
* Will give a security briefing to the consultant upon arrival in Antananarivo.
* Will sign the contract with the consultant and cover the consultancy fees as per the contract. The international flight from the consultant´s home country to/from Madagascar as well as the planned inland flight from Tamatave to Antananarivo will be booked and paid by GRC.

**The Consultant / Evaluator**

* Will define and share the methodology, the timeframe, and the intended outputs/outcomes of the various stages of the work.
* For the collection of primary data in the district Antanambao Manampotsy, the prepared questionnaires etc. will need to be translated from French into Malagasy language.
* Will specify arrangements required to organize the workshop of the preliminary findings of the evaluation or any other activity in close cooperation with the GRC Project Delegate based in Vatomandry.
* Will follow the timeframe agreed and shall communicate any unforeseeable change as soon as possible.
* Will submit all deliverables (inception report, preliminary and final evaluation reports) to GRC as per the agreed timeline.
* Will revise the draft reports based on the comments from GRC/MRC.
* Needs to sign the Declaration of Conformity
* Will need to submit a financial offer in EUR including all personnel costs (like travel arrangements including booking and paying for hotels and flights (both international and within Madagascar), communication, insurance, and Perdiem, stationary etc), no additional renumeration shall be paid.

The GRC Project Delegate and MRC project team will support logistics and access to communities, as well as supporting the organization of meetings with stakeholders and help with translating.

**6. Evaluation quality and ethical standards**

The evaluator/s should take all reasonable steps to ensure that the evaluation is designed and conducted to respect and protect the rights and welfare of people and the communities of which they are members, and to ensure that the evaluation is technically accurate, reliable, and legitimate, conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and contributes to organisational learning and accountability. Therefore, the evaluator/s should adhere to the evaluation standards of the IFRC (See as well footnote page 4).

The final report will be evaluated by GRC based on a checklist of criteria. The evaluator/s will receive feedback from GRC before the final payment of the consultant contract is approved.

**7. Dissemination of evaluation results and their application**

The following organisations will receive the final report: MRC, IKI, GRC.

**8.** **Application process and award of contract**

**8.1 Key tender information**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Type of tender | Open invitation to tender/ **public tender**  **Alternate offers** are **permitted** | |
| Tender documents | 1. Terms of Reference 2. Draft contract 3. Data Processing Agreement (GDPR & TOMs) 4. Declaration of Conformity 5. Code of Conduct of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement & Rules of Conduct for staff and volunteers on GRC missions   *All documents are an integral part of the contract.*  **In addition, questions answered** by the contracting party as well as corrections made to the tender documents published on the GRC website are part of the contract. | |
| Publication | <https://www.drk.de/das-drk/aktuelle-ausschreibungen/>  *This link contains the only binding version of all documents, regardless of information shared in other portals/ through other ways. Revisions, additions, answers to questions etc. are also published here and constitute an integral and binding part of the documents. Interested applicants are encouraged to check regularly for updates.* | |
| Schedule | Publication of tender | **13 October 2025** |
| **Deadline for questions** from applicants | **20 October 2025, 12:00 CEST** |
| **Deadline for submission of offers** | **26 October 2025, 12:00 CEST** |
| Envisioned timeframe for award of contract | **27 October to 3 November 2025** |
| Envisioned timeframe for signature of contract | **7 November 2025** |
| Estimated start of evaluation exercise | **10 November 2025** |
| **Offer binding period** | **26 November 2025** |
| Submission of questions and applications | **Via** **email:** to Georgina Herzogenberg, Country Manager, [G.Herzogenberg@drk.de](mailto:G.Herzogenberg@drk.de)<mailto:>, keeping [h.schaetti@drk.de](mailto:h.schaetti@drk.de) in cc. Stating as subject: **T61-Projectevaluation-IKI-2025-01** **“Application for IKI project evaluation Madagaskar - 2025”**  in **English** language. | |
|  |  | |

## 8.2 Application dossiers

Incomplete dossiers may not be considered, which applies to both formal requirements and content requested.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Letter of motivation | Including:   * Brief overview of relevant experiences and qualifications |
| 2. Curriculum vitae | * Of all members of the team undertaking the exercise * Must provide evidence for the essential qualifications sought (University diploma, etc.) |
| 3. Technical proposal | Including:   * Brief summary/ outline of the consultant(s)’ understanding of the task at hand * Proposed evaluation design and methodology * Timetable |
| 4. Financial proposal | * The financial proposal should show an overall sum excluding VAT. Prices of offers are compared on this basis. * The following costs are covered by GRC outside of the contract for this evaluation in line with the German Federal Travel Cost Act and should be included in the financial offer: Airfare, visa, and accommodation. Local transport will be provided by GRC in-country. In case local transport is not arranged directly by GRC, the consultant´s costs are reimbursed up to the threshold stated in the Federal Travel Cost Act upon submission of original receipts. * The financial offer must specify * the travel costs, * the daily consultancy rates and * the total net sum. * Please indicate country of taxation and taxpayer ID. GRC will cover VAT of consultants registered outside of Germany as per reverse-charge procedure (for consultants registered in the common European area) or applying this procedure accordingly (for consultants registered in third countries). |
| 5. Work samples | * 1 report of an evaluation or relevant similar research, or, if full reports cannot be shared for confidentiality reasons, executive summaries/ factsheets (tasks, objective, results, methodology, lessons learned, etc.) * Max. 5 years old, with contributions of the evaluation team members either established clearly in the report or clarified by the applicant in the application dossier |
| 6. Declaration of Conformity |  |

## 

## 8.3 Qualifications, admission and scoring

Evidence of fulfillment of the criteria noted below is assessed based on the documents submitted with the application.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Criteria for admission to tender | Application dossiers are complete and cover all content requested, and are submitted on time in the way specified |
| Essential qualifications of evaluator/consultant:   1. All key members of the evaluation team have at least 5 years’ experience in conducting evaluations in international development cooperation and/or humanitarian assistance 2. In-depth knowledge about agriculture, livelihood, climate change adaptation and protection of the environment in the rural African context 3. University degree in discipline relevant to the scope of the assignment (e.g. Agronomist, DRR-Advisor with focus on CCA or similar). 4. Proven experience in program management and carrying out capacity development within an international partnership/civil society context, including knowledge of assessing institutional management structures and systems in project implementation. 5. High analytical, writing and workshop facilitation skills. 6. Sound experience in community based/HH assessments. 7. Language proficiency both in French as well as in English is a must. 8. Physical mobility and openness to basic accommodation in the field as project locations/communities are remote and must partially reached by foot. |
| Criteria for evaluating admitted offers | * The proposed technical approach demonstrates a high level of (50%):   + Understanding of the overall task at hand (15%)   + Suitability of methodology to cover the scope and complexity of the task at hand with a sufficient level of detail to generate reliable results (25%)   + Feasibility of timetable/ workplan given the envisaged timeframe (10%) * The quality of the submitted work sample with regards to the suitability of the design and methodology applied to the task at hand (10%) * Price (40%) |

**Preferable qualifications sought among applicants (not required for admission):**

* Knowledge of the Red Cross and Red Crescent;
* Experience with conducting as well as managing evaluations;
* Expertise and experience in research methods as well as process facilitation, with a diverse range preferred.

**Method for evaluating offers:**

Offers are awarded points based on the criteria and the weight assigned to them outlined above. The total number of points achieved by an individual offer is determined by calculating a point value for the financial proposal (Price Point Value – PPV) and a point value for the qualitative criteria (Quality Point Value – QPV), which are then summed up. PPV and QPV are calculated as follows:

PPV = ((price of cheapest offer / price of offer to be evaluated) x 100) x 30%

QPV = Σ((points for 1st criterion x 20) x % weight of 1st criterion) + (2nd criterion) + (…))

Total points = PPV + QPV

Points for quality criteria are assigned based on the following considerations:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Points | Technical proposal | Work samples | Presentation |
| 5 | Demonstrates exceptional understanding of the evaluation requirements, specifically the strategic and contextual aspects, with detailed and comprehensive evaluation methodology that address all aspects of the ToR within a minimal timeframe | Offers outstanding and highly relevant work samples that are of very high quality, showing a concise understanding of their subject matter, highly suitable methodology as well as relevant and realistic outcomes tailored to the target audience | Provides a highly professional and engaging presentation, capturing the strategic focus of the evaluation, and outlining approach, methodology, and expected outcomes in a concise way, as well as reflecting a thorough insight into the subject matter |
| 4 | Shows a strong understanding of the evaluation requirements, including strategic and contextual aspects, with detailed evaluation methodology that address most aspects of the ToR within a feasible timeframe | Provides high-quality and relevant work samples that demonstrate a strong relevance with the ToR, showing a strong understanding of their subject matter, suitable methodology and relevant outcomes | Delivers a clear and professional presentation, capturing the focus and context of the evaluation, that effectively communicates the approach, methodology, and expected outcomes, showing good insight into the subject matter |
| 3 | Demonstrates a sufficient understanding of the evaluation requirements, with an adequate methodology that address the requirements of the ToR, within an acceptable timeframe | Presents acceptable work samples that are relevant and to the ToR content of sufficient quality, showing sufficient understanding of their subject matter, acceptable methodology and answering to the main purpose. | Offers a satisfactory presentation that communicates the approach, methodology, and expected outcomes of the evaluation adequately |
| 2 | Shows a limited understanding of the evaluation requirements, with methodologies that address some aspects of the ToR, in a timeframe that is not suitable | The work samples submitted are only partly relevant, with a lower quality and minimal alignment with the assignment´s objectives | Provides an incomplete or partially clear presentation that only partially communicates the approach, methodology, and expected outcomes, with limited references to the evaluation requirements |
| 1 | Demonstrates an inadequate understanding of the project requirements, with insufficient solutions that fail to address the key aspects of the ToR | Provides work samples of low quality and relevance to the contract's objectives | Delivers a poor presentation that lacks clarity and does not effectively communicate the approach, methodology, or expected outcomes, with minimal or irrelevant references to the evaluation requirements |
| 0 | Shows no understanding of the evaluation requirements, with no methodology provided | Work samples provided are of poor quality and/or entirely irrelevant | Does not present any approach, methodology, or expected outcomes |

## 8.4 Application and selection process

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Questions on tender | **Applicants are strongly encouraged to raise their questions on the tender in the way and within the deadline specified above.** Questions and answers will be published in an anonymized form under the link provided. They form an integral part of the contract. |
| Bid opening/ admission to tender | Offers received will be screened for compliance with formal requirements and admission criteria. **GRC reserves the right to communicate with the applicants after submission of offers to seek clarifications within a reasonable time limit and within the boundaries set by procurement regulations. This is documented.** |
| Scoring of admitted dossiers | Offers fulfilling admission requirements will be evaluated based on the criteria and method outlined above. At minimum, the three (3) offers with the highest score will be invited for an online presentation; in case of a tie for the last rank, both applicants shall be invited. |
| Information on award of contract | GRC will inform the candidate(s) about the decision reached. Candidates may enquire for feedback on their individual application. |

**9. Main Abbreviations**

BNGRC Bureau National de Gestion des Risques et des Catastrophe /

National Office for Disaster Risk Management

CCA Climate Change Adaptation

CSI Coping Strategy Index

DRR Disaster Risk Reduction

FGD Focus Group Discussion

GRC German Red Cross

GFFO German Foreign Federal Office

HH Household

IFRC International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

IKI Internationale Klima Initiative / International Climate Initiative

MRC Malagasy Croix-Rouge / Malagasy Red Cross

MEDD Ministère d´Environnement et de Développement Durable / Ministry for

Environnement and Sustainable Development

TOR Terms of Reference

WASH Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

**10. Annex**

* Contract Draft
* Data Processing Agreement
* Declaration of Conformity
* Code of Conduct
* Rules of Conduct for Staff and Volunteers on Mission

1. https://www.worldbank.org/country/madagascar/overview [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Pandemics: This project has been written during Covid-19. In mid-2022, the ban has been lifted. Pandemics have therefore not been tackled by this projet. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. From IKI Template Final Technical Report [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. SFL=Food Security and Livelihood [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. ***The IFRC Evaluation Standards*** *are:*

   1. Utility: Evaluations must be useful and used.

   2. Feasibility: Evaluations must be realistic, diplomatic, and managed in a sensible, cost effective manner.

   3. Ethics & Legality: Evaluations must be conducted in an ethical and legal manner, with particular regard for the welfare of those involved in and affected by the evaluation.

   4. Impartiality & Independence; Evaluations should be impartial, providing a comprehensive and unbiased assessment that takes into account the views of all stakeholders.

   5. Transparency: Evaluation activities should reflect an attitude of openness and transparency.

   6. Accuracy: Evaluations should be technical accurate, providing sufficient information about the data collection, analysis, and interpretation methods so that its worth or merit can be determined.

   7. Participation: Stakeholders should be consulted and meaningfully involved in the evaluation process when feasible and appropriate.

   8. Collaboration: Collaboration between key operating partners in the evaluation process improves the legitimacy and utility of the evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)