

## Terms of Reference (TOR)

### Endline Survey and Project Final Evaluation of the

### ***Green Guria: Supporting Local Democracy and Rural Development for Inclusive and Resilient Green Growth***

#### 1. Description of The Intervention

“Green Guria: Supporting Local Democracy and Rural Development for Inclusive and Resilient Green Growth” is a EU-funded initiative implemented by [CENN](#), together with its implementing partner organizations - [Young Pedagogues' Union \(YPU\)](#), [Institute of Democracy \(IoD\)](#), and the [Keda Local Action Group \(LAG\)](#) – that aims to reduce poverty and improve the economic and social environment and living conditions of vulnerable rural communities in disadvantaged regions of Georgia by enhancing civic participation, inclusive rural development and green growth.

Overall Objective	To reduce poverty and improve the economic and social environment and living conditions of vulnerable rural communities in disadvantaged regions of Georgia by enhancing civic participation, inclusive rural development and green growth.
Specific Objective	To contribute to building robust, climate-resilient and green communities in Guria via diversification of rural opportunities, fostering competitive economic, agricultural and environmental practices, and engaging civil society, vulnerable groups (VGs), women and youth in participatory and bottom-up dialogue and planning.
Target Location	Guria region municipalities of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ozurgeti;</li> <li>• Chokhatauri; and</li> <li>• Lanchkhuti.</li> </ul>
Project Outcomes	<p><b>1. Improved participatory bottom-up mechanisms for sustainable rural and territorial development.</b> Ozurgeti, Lanchkhuti and Chokhatauri LAGs (3) are established with private, public and civic sector representation and equal gender and youth participation, representing VGs. LAGs are engaged in the rural and territorial development process following the EU's LEADER/CLLD approaches;</p> <p><b>2. Improved policy dialogue and participatory implementation of rural development approaches.</b> Gender and youth-responsive and child- and environmentally-sensitive LDSs are developed based on RBA in a participatory way for 3 target municipalities; LDSs incorporate the needs of the local actors, especially those of VGs, as well as relevant SDGs in accordance with the SDG localisation action plan. LDSs' priorities, promoting mechanisms for resilient and sustainable rural livelihoods, are reflected in Rural Development Agency's (RDA) programs, the LAs' strategy documents and budgets;</p> <p><b>3. Greener and diversified rural economy, increased areas with climate-smart forest and land management.</b> Rural economic diversification and inclusive green growth opportunities are demonstrated and offered via the implementation of sustainable projects (with the potential of replication on a greater scale) that attract people with technical skills and prevent the depopulation of villages. Supported projects generate new development and rural opportunities, build the capacity of local stakeholders and improve: (a) the competitiveness of the agricultural practices and forest use; (b) the diversification of local economic activities; and (c) the quality of life in rural areas by increasing access to public services and infrastructure and/or improving the management of natural resources;</p> <p><b>5. Empowered rural population and improved access for rural citizens to public</b></p>

	<b>services and infrastructure.</b> Civic participation is enhanced and accessibility and quality of state public services for particularly disadvantaged, remote and depopulated rural areas are improved via <b>empowering women, youth and civil society</b> , introducing <b>digital and social innovation in rural services</b> , facilitating multi-stakeholder <b>issue-based dialogue</b> and demonstrating effective <b>CSOs-LAs partnerships</b> . Local youth and women-led initiatives <b>and advocacy campaigns</b> are supported that promote EU values, participatory local democracy, gender equality, climate action and green post-COVID recovery.
Beneficiaries	Local Action Groups, Guria CAG; Local CSOs, women, youth groups; Cooperatives; farmers; SMEs; large private companies Education Resource Centres, schools, VETs Local authorities.
Project Duration	3.6 Years, December 2022 – June 8, 2026

## 2. Purpose and Objectives

The final evaluation is conducted at the end of the intervention, as a mandatory assessment of the design, implementation, and results of the implemented project. The results will be reported to the project team, project stakeholders, and a donor organization. The evaluation is both summative and formative. It is summative in the sense that it aims to assess accountability in terms of achieved results (intended and unintended, direct and indirect, positive and negative, and at output, outcome, and/or overarching goal level). At the same time, the evaluation is formative as it aims to contribute to learning for future similar interventions and/or the next possible phase of the project. The findings will be used to both promote accountability and learning. The evaluation is aimed at assessing all interventions of the project from its start in 2022 up to the latest available data in 2026, as well as additional needs and pathways for its continuation.

The evaluation is aimed at assessing the following Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria:

1. **Relevance:** The extent to which the intervention's objectives and design responded to beneficiaries' global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.
2. **Coherence:** The extent to which other interventions (particularly policies) supported or undermined the intervention and vice versa, including internal coherence and external coherence.
3. **Effectiveness:** The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives and its results, including any differential results across groups.
4. **Efficiency:** The extent to which the intervention delivered results in an economic and timely way.
5. **EU-added value:** The changes which can reasonably be argued are due to the EU intervention.

It is expected that the selected evaluation team will prepare detailed interview guides corresponding to each target group and evaluation criteria, reviewed and approved by CENN.

The general evaluation questions are provided below:

### Relevance

- To what extent objectives of a development intervention were consistent with and meaningful to the municipality and regional needs?
- Were all interventions of the project relevant to beneficiaries' needs?

- To what extent have the (original) objectives proven to have been appropriate for the intervention in question?

#### ***Coherence***

- To what extent has the project been aligned with other interventions implemented by CENN and EU?
- To what extent has the project been consistent with the relevant international norms and standards to which CENN and EU adhere (e.g. HRBA, SDGs)?
- To what extent has the project been aligned with external policy commitments of the region?
- To what extent has the project been aligned with interventions implemented by other actors in the same context?

#### ***Effectiveness***

- To what extent has the intervention achieved the intended objectives?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or underachievement of the objectives?
- To what extent have the needs of target groups been reached? To what extent did the project provide inclusiveness and equity of results among different beneficiary groups?
- Are there any unintended effects, both positive and negative, that have occurred as a result of the intervention?
- Were there any positive and negative effects arising from the intervention's context that require further efforts for scaling up or solving?

#### ***Efficiency***

- To what extent were the costs associated with the intervention proportionate to the benefits it has generated? What factors were influencing any discrepancies? How do these factors link to the intervention?
- Were the allocated resources (human, financial, time, etc.) sufficient for the project?
- Were there any alternatives for achieving the same results with fewer inputs/funds?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ log-frame as a management tool. Were the monitoring instruments of the project sufficient, and follow-up ensured? Review the monitoring tools used: did they provide the necessary information? Did they involve key partners? Were they efficient? Were they cost-effective? Were additional tools required?
- Were lessons learned being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared/transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

#### ***EU-added value***

- What is the additional value resulting from the EU intervention, compared to what could be achieved by others (i.e. EU Member States, other donors, and the country/region)?
- To what extent do the issues addressed by the intervention continue to require EU support?

Evaluations must comply with the OECD-DAC quality standards for development evaluations (<https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>) as well as EU [Better regulation toolbox](#) and [DG NEAR Guidelines on linking planning/programming, Monitoring and Evaluation](#) (updated May 2024).

### **3. Design and Approach**

The evaluation team is expected to provide relevant methods for addressing the evaluation criteria. In addition, the relevant judgement criteria and indicators, and identification of data collection tools

and sources, are expected to be finalized by the evaluation team and agreed upon by CENN. The triangulation of data, sources, and methods should be ensured as much as possible to promote credibility and use of evaluation results. The evaluation design, approach, and methods should clearly show how data collection will be human rights-based, foster environmental sustainability, and be gender sensitive. In addition, all relevant data needs to be disaggregated by sex, age and vulnerability. It is suggested that the final evaluation follows a mixed-methods approach using a non-experimental design, with hybrid (on-site and remote, where applicable) methods. The methods suggested are a document review, secondary data analysis, key informant interviews, focus group discussion(s), and surveys of local community members in target regions.

Under the overall guidance of CENN, the selected partner will be responsible for providing the following tasks:

1. To design the qualitative and quantitative study methodology (including sample designs) in close consultations with the CENN team and based on OECD-DAC and EU quality standards;
2. To develop and pilot quantitative and qualitative research instruments;
3. To conduct the desk study and review relevant secondary data for measuring the achievement of intended project targets;
4. To collect relevant qualitative and quantitative data;
5. To analyze the collected quantitative and qualitative data (including the secondary data obtained from desk study) and submit the first draft report in English language to CENN;
6. To incorporate feedback in the report and submit the final report in English to CENN.

The main stakeholders and beneficiaries who are expected to be involved in the evaluation process are listed below (indicating an approximate number of people in each category).

Selection and justification of each method appropriate for the given group of stakeholders/beneficiaries should be provided in the technical proposal.

The suggested methods for already identified stakeholders are given below:

#### **Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) (partners)**

- Representatives of local authorities (technical specialists working within the municipalities) of target region (approx. 6, 2 per municipality)
- Representatives of Local Action Groups (approx. 12, 4 per LAG)
- Guria CAG (approx. 2).

#### **Focus Group discussions (partners)**

- Representatives of the Capacity Development Program (CDP) program (approx. 8-10)
- Representatives of project's community meetings, trainings, workshops, civic education camps, seminars, open cafés, and the career fairs participants (approx. 15-20)
- Representatives of local CSOs, women and youth groups (approx. 8-10)
- Representatives of sub-grantees/sub- grant recipients (approx. 15-20)

#### **Focus Group discussions (direct beneficiaries)**

- Representatives of CSOs/LAs multi-stakeholder partnerships (approx. 6 people)
- Representatives of local organizations and private individuals involved in the tourism sector (approx. 6 people)
- Representatives of trained VET teachers (approx. 5 people)
- Representatives of study tours' participants (approx. 10 people)

- Representatives of exchange visits in Georgia participants (approx. 10 people)
- Representatives of business forum participants (approx. 5 people)
- Representatives of rural festival participants (approx. 5 people)

**Focus Group discussions (indirect beneficiaries)**

- Beneficiaries of project sub-grants (approx. 20)
- Local community representatives (approx. 30, 10 per municipality)

**Project team to be interviewed**

- Project team (approx. 6 people) including:
  - Project implementing partner organizations (approx. 3, 1 per organization)

**Survey representative of the population in Guria region, providing values for the following indicators**

- The share of the population with the perception of effective participation and inclusiveness in decision-making processes;
- The share of the population reporting a positive change in rural development;
- The share of the population reporting being satisfied with the provided public services and infrastructure (desegregated by gender, age and VGs);
- The number of households reporting new income sources, including the share of the population that reports an increase in average monthly household income;

**In addition, the evaluation team is expected to analyze all reported results in the Logical Framework, including the monitoring data corresponding to the following indicators**

- The number of new local green value chains created;
- The number of new jobs created for women, youth and VGs;
- The number of jobs (including green jobs) supported/sustained (including the share of women and VG employees);
- The number of new businesses/start-ups created (the share of women and youth owners);
- The number of new private sector firms investing in the green sector/value chains in the Guria region;
- The number of women encouraged and entered the rural economy through the support of the project;
- The number of visitors for eco and rural tourism purposes in the Guria region;
- The share of project beneficiaries who increased their digital literacy (desegregated by gender);
- The share of project beneficiaries who found a job after involvement in the project;
- The number of CSOs providing services and advocating for the rights of VGs;
- The number of smallholders that adopted improved technologies and innovation (desegregated by municipalities)

#### **4. Deliverables**

As a result of the assignment, the following deliverables are expected to be submitted to EU:

- **Inception Report**
  - Introduction
    - Objectives and scope of the survey
    - Structure of the report
  - A synthesis of all activities conducted
  - Analysis of the subject of the evaluation's framework



- Reconstruction of the intended intervention logic
  - The proposed EQs (EQ's heading, judgement criteria and indicators, and relevant sources of information and data collection tools)
  - Methodology for the remaining phases
    - Key methodological elements for each of the phases
    - Overall approach for the desk phase
    - Limitations
  - Work plan
  - The conclusions of the kick-off meeting
  - A draft outline of the final synthesis report amending if necessary, that included in the ToR
  - A list of proposed dissemination materials
- **Draft and final report**
  - Executive summary
  - Introduction
  - Key methodological steps, including:
    - Description of all evaluation activities, focusing on the choice of evaluation questions, approaches and methods, limitations to the research (including those linked to data quality and if relevant, to monitoring systems), problems encountered and solutions implemented, and explanation of any difference between the evaluation design and the final report
  - Analysis of the subject of the evaluation's framework
  - Reconstruction of the intervention logic
  - Findings of the evaluation by evaluation question
  - Overall assessment
  - Conclusions
  - Recommendations that should include an indication on:
    - i) responsible actors for their implementation;
    - ii) their importance; and
    - iii) their urgency.
  - A list of dissemination materials produced and of dissemination initiatives performed
  - The Final Report is accompanied by the following annexes:
    - The ToR
    - The methodological approach
    - The evaluation matrix (data collection and analysis by EQs' indicators)
    - List of documents consulted
    - List of persons met
    - Table with the achieved results based on the log frame
    - Raw data
    - Data collection instruments
    - Feedback matrices to the draft reports
- A PPT presentation summarizing the main findings of the study
- Workshops (2) for presentation of inception and final report results
- A final debriefing with project staff

All deliverables must be in English.

**The final draft of the report should be provided to CENN for review no later than June 30, 2026.**

## **5. Schedule**

The process of the evaluation should follow the next steps:

### **Kick-off and Inception Phase (End of March 2026)**

The first phase comprises the following actions/deliverables by the evaluation team:

- a. Desk research and a study/desk review of documents and data (portfolio analysis) provided by the project and documents identified by the evaluation team (other literature/evaluative evidence)
- b. Focus group discussion with the project team focusing on the project theory
- c. Agreement on prioritizing of DAC criteria and selection/focus of the evaluation questions
- d. Review of existing evaluations and studies as a basis for enhancing the project theory
- e. Submission of draft inception report
- f. Incorporation of the written comments into the draft inception report and submission of the final inception report.
- g. A workshop for the presentation of the inception report results.

### **Data Collection and Interview Phase (April-May 2026)**

The main components of the second phase are:

- a. Data collection as agreed upon in the inception report. Any changes to the inception report need written permission from CENN
- b. Key informant Interviews, Focus Group Discussions, and survey data, as applicable.

### **Data Analysis and Submission of Report (June 2025)**

- a. Data analysis and preparation of triangulation matrix.
- b. Submission of a Draft Evaluation Report that must contain at least the following points:
  - a. Incorporation of the feedback (or else non-incorporation of feedback based on a sound justification) by the evaluation team and submission of the final draft report to CENN
  - b. Provision of a PPT presentation summarizing the main findings of the evaluation
  - c. Holding of a concluding workshop, including the presentation of results and conclusion as well as a discussion on refining the recommendations by the evaluation team
  - d. Incorporation of the written comments by the evaluation team and submission of the final version of the report to CENN for coherence screening.

## **6. Management Roles and Responsibilities**

The assignment is mandated by CENN, and the selection of the team and daily management will be provided by the CENN team. Furthermore, CENN will ensure timely communication of the feedback on the final draft report. The evaluation team is responsible for providing all deliverables in a timely manner, taking into consideration requirements as defined in this ToR.

## **7. List of Documents**

The evaluation team will be provided with:



- Project documents (including annexes, revisions, and budget)
- All progress reports
- Information on other projects closely connected with the project and relevant to the assignment
- List of contacts of all persons involved in the implementation of the project (with function, task, contact data, and information on language skills) as well as all local partners (including representatives of the target group, as far as feasible)
- All other relevant documents prepared by the project (e.g. guidebooks, recommendations, etc.).

## **8. The Evaluation Team**

The assignment should be conducted by an organization or a team of experts. The team composition should be detailed and explained in the technical offer, together with a division of tasks among all team members and the added value of each member.

The qualifications that make the applicant eligible for this assignment are:

- An officially registered legal entity (in case of organization)
- At least 5 years of proven experience and results in developing methodologies and research instruments in line with international academic standards and guidelines
- At least 5 years of experience of working on rural development project
- Previous experience in working with international organizations would be a strong asset
- General organizational capability (minimum staffing and structure of the organization) which is likely to affect implementation: organization can demonstrate that it has already developed and implemented similar projects, e.g. quantitative surveys

The team leader should have the following qualifications:

- University degree (at least Master's degree) in Sociology, Social Sciences, or related field, PhD would be a strong asset
- Track record in leading evaluations during the last 5 years (at least three evaluations conducted), proven by at least one such evaluation annexed to the offer
- Solid experience in developing methodologies and research instruments, including quantitative analysis and survey development in line with international academic standards and guidelines proven by at least one writing sample (published or unpublished, to be annexed to the offer);
- At least 5 years of experience in designing and implementing donor-funded projects in the field of social/sustainable development and/or environment in Georgia
- At least 5 years of experience in evaluating donor-funded projects in the field of social/sustainable development
- At least 5 years of experience in working with multi-stakeholders: government, civil society, community-based organizations, and UN/multilateral/bilateral institutions
- Sound understanding of sustainable development and green in the regions of Georgia
- Familiarity with the political, economic and social situation in Georgia
- Fluency in English and Georgian

The other team member(s) should have the following qualifications:

- University degree (at least Master's degree) in social sciences, law, economy or environmental sector
- At least 5 years of experience in leading the design and conducting surveys, writing study reports



- Proven experience with quantitative analysis and survey development and conduct, proven by at least one writing sample
- At least 5 years of proven work experience on project/program evaluations with the OECD/DAC and EU Better Regulation Guidelines & Toolbox evaluation criteria; previous evaluations in the climate change/environmental field in Georgia will be an asset
- Proven familiarity with or work experience in Georgia; evaluation experience in Georgia
- Fluency in English and Georgian

The proposal must include the following components provided below. Incomplete applications will not be considered. The weight of each award criteria is given below:

Evaluation Criteria	Weight of the criteria (%)
<b>1.</b> CVs (maximum 4 pages per person) highlighting relevant experience. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For organizations, a description of the organization's relevant experience.</li> </ul>	20%
<b>2.</b> At least one sample of similar previous work (in English)	10%
<b>3.</b> Technical proposal demonstrating a clear understanding of the assignment. This should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• endline survey and evaluation designs;</li> <li>• data collection and analysis methods;</li> <li>• quality assurance and ethical considerations;</li> <li>• work plan;</li> <li>• division of responsibilities between proposed experts;</li> <li>• and a detailed timeframe.</li> </ul>	50%
<b>4.</b> Financial proposal, including a detailed cost breakdown for the endline survey and the evaluation, presented separately.	20%

The maximum budget allocated for the endline survey and evaluation is 15,000 EURO (excluding VAT), equivalent to Georgian Lari (GEL).

Interested candidates should submit CVs detailing relevant work experience, at least one sample of previous similar work, a technical proposal, and a detailed budget to the following email addresses: [tenders@cenn.org](mailto:tenders@cenn.org) no later than **March 16, 18:00 Tbilisi time**.

Incomplete submissions will not be considered.