



# We are able!

Co-creating inclusive governance for access to basic resources that leaves no one behind



Terms of Reference  
for the Final Evaluation  
*March 2025*





# Table of Contents

1.	Introduction .....	3
2.	Background .....	3
3.	Project Theory of Change .....	4
4.	Objectives of the Final Evaluation.....	4
5.	Scope of Work.....	5
6.	Key Evaluation Questions .....	5
7.	Methodology.....	6
	7.1 methodological approach.....	6
	7.2 Evaluation structure .....	7
8.	Deliverables .....	8
9.	Timeline .....	8
10.	Evaluation Team Profile .....	8
11.	Budget .....	8
12.	Application Process .....	9
13.	The Reference Group .....	9
	Annexes .....	9
	Annex 1: Overview of documents used .....	10
	Annex 2: overview of Basket Indicators.....	11

# 1. Introduction

This document serves as the reference framework for the **Final Evaluation** of the We are Able! Project to be conducted in 2025. It outlines the project's background, Theory of Change, objectives, and proposed structure of the Evaluation. Key elements include research questions, suggested methodology (to be refined and elaborated by the evaluator(s)), timeline, deliverables, required qualifications, the Reference Group, and the budget.

In 2021 a Baseline study was conducted to assess the situation in the targeted areas before the start of the project. This report will now be used to compare the situation at the end of the project period. In 2023, a Mid-term Review was conducted, resulting in several adjustments to the project's strategy and activities. The most significant change was the implementation of Lobby & Advocacy activities at higher levels, such as the provincial or even national level, to enhance the scale and impact of the project's outcomes.

The Terms of Reference is informed by key documents such as the Baseline and Mid-term Review report mentioned above and other documents provided by IOB, which is part of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs. A full list of source documents is provided in Annex 1.

## 2. Background

**We are Able!** aims to strengthen Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and Organizations of Persons with Disabilities (OPDs) in six fragile and conflict-affected countries—Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), South Sudan, Sudan, Uganda, and Ethiopia—by enhancing their capacity for lobbying and advocacy. The project focuses on promoting sustainable and inclusive access to basic resources, thereby contributing to improved food security in alignment with Sustainable Development Goal 2 (SDG2). Particular emphasis is placed on persons with disabilities, as they are often at heightened risk of food insecurity.

The **We Are Able!** initiative arose from a call by Southern partners for empowerment, inclusion, and support to demonstrate their capability and potential. OPDs play a pivotal role in fostering responsive, inclusive, participatory, and representative decision-making processes at all levels. As representative organizations of persons with disabilities, OPDs are deeply rooted in and committed to the principles and rights enshrined in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD).

The program aligns with the Dutch Embassies' Multi-Annual Country Strategies, which prioritize food security in each country where We Are Able is implemented. A gender-sensitive, Disability-Inclusive Development Approach is integral to the program, ensuring that all activities are inclusive and accessible to both women and men with disabilities.

The six countries have all had their set-backs and turmoil, which affected the execution of the project. Several of these challenges have led to different levels of security and accessibility and are likely to cause certain obstacles for the implementation of the evaluation. In **Burundi**, prolonged fuel shortages reduce accessibility of remote areas and decrease mobility more in general. Parliamentary elections in 2025 might cause unrest and are likely to have an impact on the evaluation. A rapid and large influx of Congolese refugees could create stability challenges and make data collection more difficult. The rapidly deteriorating security situation in the **DR Congo**, marked by the swift advance of M23 poses a significant challenge to the evaluation process. With M23 now controlling most of the project implementation areas, access has become severely restricted, jeopardizing the ability to conduct on-site assessments and gather reliable data.

**Ethiopia** has experienced dramatic turmoil, especially with the Tigray conflict from 2020 to 2022,



which caused widespread suffering and displacement. However, as compared to the other parts of the country, in the operational areas of the project (Oromia, Diredawa, Harara, and Addis Ababa), the security issues have no significant effect on the program operation due to the relative stability and security of the eastern part of the country and Addis Ababa. In line with this, it is expected that there will be no major challenges for the implementation of the evaluation. **South Sudan** remains highly unstable, with security threats increasing. The project locations in Jonglei state continue to face severe challenges, intensified by ongoing conflicts in neighbouring localities and climate shocks leading to floodings among other issues. This may also reduce accessibility during the time of the evaluation. Since the October 2021 military coup, **Sudan** has struggled with widespread political instability. Insecurity and logistical challenges hinder humanitarian efforts, which is likely to hinder data collection. Although **Uganda** faced mixed weather conditions, including prolonged dry spells that significantly affected agriculture and food security, the overall situation has remained stable. It is unlikely to cause major restrictions on data collection.

The consortium behind **We Are Able!** shares a unified goal of fostering inclusive food security. The consortium comprises ZOA, the African Disability Forum (ADF), the SeeYou Foundation, and The Leprosy Mission Netherlands (TLM), alongside implementing partners VNG International and The Hague Academy for Local Governance.

### 3. Project Theory of Change

The Theory of Change of the WeAreAble! Project is composed of three pathways of change. Each one of these pathways contributes to the overall goal of the project, which is described as:

*“By 2025, through engagement with public authorities (formal and informal powerholders), men, women and youth with disabilities and other excluded groups, through resilient and capable local CSO/OPDs in six fragile and conflict-affected countries, are successfully influencing laws, policies, practices and norms for improved food security for all.”*

The three pathways that can be distinguished in the Theory of Change are 1. Community Mobilization, 2. Strengthening CSOs/OPDs and 3. Engaged public authorities. The Theory of Change is elaborated in the proposal document and has been reviewed in the Mid-term Review. The proposal document as well as the report of the Baseline and the Mid-term review will be made available to the evaluators once the team has been identified and contracted.

### 4. Objectives of the Final Evaluation

The objectives of this Final Evaluation are:

1. To assess the project's effectiveness, relevance, coherence, and sustainability. It intentionally excludes the OECD/DAC criteria of efficiency and impact to maintain a focused and thorough analysis.
2. To analyse the extent to which the project achieved its intended outcomes, including improvements in food security policies for persons with disabilities.
3. To analyse collaboration of the partners within the consortium as well as the collaboration in the Partnership with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
4. To identify systemic and behavioural changes among stakeholders.
5. To document lessons learned, unintended results (positive or negative) and any spin-offs from the project.
6. To measure the end-line values of the Basket Indicators that were measured during Baseline and Mid-term as well.



Findings and recommendations from the evaluation will be used to share with stakeholders, including donors and implementing partners, to ensure accountability, foster learning, and enhance the design and implementation of similar initiatives. In order to guarantee that the recommendations will be genuinely considered, a management response will be formulated by the management of the consortium, stating for each recommendation if, when and how it will be followed up.

## 5. Scope of Work

Principally, the evaluation will cover all six project countries if accessibility and security allow. The current situation in Sudan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Burundi and South Sudan is likely to hinder on-site evaluation activities. If on-site assessments become unfeasible, alternative methods for remote data collection will need to be explored. The focus of the evaluation will be on activities implemented from the project's inception to its conclusion. Key stakeholders include OPDs at local municipal and national levels; local, district, regional and national authorities, community members and the partner organisations in the consortium. The evaluation will consider gender and intersectionality by determining in the inception phase, in collaboration with the commissioner of the evaluation, on what intersecting identities the focus will be. This will be done to ensure a comprehensive analysis. Due to accessibility and security it may not be possible to implement all methodological components of the evaluation in each of the six countries.

## 6. Key Evaluation Questions

The evaluation will address the following key questions, taking into account the differences between people with disabilities to address intersectionality where relevant:

### *a. Change brought about by the project (effectiveness)*

1. To what extent have activities been implemented effectively and to what extent have the planned outputs been realized?
2. To what extent have the realized outputs contributed to changes in systems, policies, practices and norms and to what extent in changes in food security for persons with disabilities?
3. a. Did the implementation of the project lead to unintended (both positive and/or negative) outcomes? If so, how did they take shape and affect the achieving of outcomes? b. If the above applies, what are unforeseen, or unintended results of the project, both within the consortium members and the implementing partners (e.g. at the level of organisational policies and practices on disability inclusion)?
4. To what extent, and if so how, has the implementation of the project led to successful engagement with policy makers at all levels, impacting laws and policies on inclusive food security?
5. To what extent has the implementation of the project (in line with its ToC) lead to progress as expressed by the outcome indicators (i.e. Basket Indicators)?
6. To what extent has participation of persons with disabilities in decision-making processes at various levels improved (if at all) and what was the contribution to this of WaAI?
7. To what extent, and if so how, has the implementation of the project and the Shift of Power strategy led to changes in southern leadership; i.e. to what extent do country actors or



partners across the different tiers express increased ownership of the partnerships agenda setting, implementation and budget decisions?

8. How have women and girls, in all their diversity, as part of an intersectional approach, been effectively mainstreamed in the implementation of the programme, as vulnerable groups within the focus on persons with disabilities and to what extent has their agency been strengthened?

*b. Relevance*

9. How has the WaA! adaptive programming approach been flexible to adjust to changing circumstances?
10. To what extent have the recommendations of the MTR been implemented, and to what extent, and if so how, did this result in improvement of outcomes?

*c. Coherence*

11. To what extent was the project aligned and coherent with other relevant initiatives (e.g. projects by other actors), policies, and stakeholder priorities?
12. To what extent has the consortium effectively collaborated internally among its members, and how well has it engaged and coordinated with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to achieve shared objectives?

*c. Sustainability*

13. To what extent and, if so, how have measures to achieve sustainability been put in place?
14. To what extent is it likely that capacity strengthening efforts of OPDs and CSOs, local authorities and other stakeholders will prove to be sustainable over time?

*d. Lessons learned*

15. What lessons, in particular on CSO strengthening and policy influencing, can be drawn from the project's implementation, and how can these lessons inform future initiatives?

## 7. Methodology

### 7.1 methodological approach

An elaborated and coherent methodological approach will have to be elaborated by the evaluation team in the inception phase. The foundation of the methodology will adopt a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative and quantitative data collection methods and techniques that ensure triangulation and a robust analysis.

Within the wide range of methodologies available to assess effectiveness, certain characteristics are necessary components to make a plausible claim about the project's effect. Qualitative evaluation methods that allow a plausible claim, have the following steps in common: (i) formulate cause-effect attribution/contribution questions; (ii) reconstruct an intervention theory; (iii) formulate an alternative theory; (iv) collect data along with intervention and alternative theory; (v) validate the theories step by step. In view of the complexity investigating 'change' and the many stakeholders contributing to change, it is recommended to follow these different steps. An overview of methodologies that adhere to these steps can be found in [this article](#) by White and Philips (2012).



Data collection methodologies may include, but are not limited to:

- **Desk Review:** Analysis of key project documents, including the baseline report, mid-term review findings, progress reports, and country-level documentation.
- **Stakeholder Interviews:** Semi-structured interviews with OPDs, CSOs, FBOs, local authorities, project participants, and with stakeholders that are external to the project, such as representatives from UN agencies, representatives from regional or local NGOs (either disability-focused or focused on Food Security), representatives from local authorities that do not have a direct or indirect role in the project. This allows findings of the ETE and case studies to be cross checked. Please note that one of the IOB quality criteria focuses on the inclusion of sufficient independent data sources, hence the inclusion of interviews with external stakeholders.
- **Focus Group Discussions:** Sessions with community members and persons with disabilities to gather insights on project impact and participation. If deemed of added value for the evaluators can decide to include local governments and groups not involved in the programme.
- **Surveys:** Quantitative surveys to assess specific project outcomes, including changes in food security and systemic improvements.
- **Field Visits:** Site visits in each project country to observe activities and engage with local stakeholders.
- **Case Studies:** a (to be determined) number of case studies that highlight certain achievements or lessons learned from the project and ideally described from different perspectives (e.g. different age groups, different gender, etc.).

The methodology should clearly show how triangulations of data is done between the different tools of data collection. And the methodology should show how the gender lens is used to be able to take the participation of all into account, and also analyse how activities contributed to gender equality when it comes to persons with disabilities inclusion and food security of persons with disabilities.

As part of the Final Evaluation, the assessment will include the measurement of endline values for a defined set of **Basket Indicators developed for the project** (see also evaluation question 5). These indicators are integral to evaluating the project's overall performance and outcomes, providing quantitative benchmarks for assessing progress against baseline and MTR values. Data collection for the Basket Indicators should be conducted in alignment with the project's established methodology to ensure consistency and comparability across the evaluation phases. For this purpose the same tools that were developed by the consultant who performed the baseline study need to be used again. Several questionnaires, including a guidance document on how to use these tools will be made available to the selected consultant.

The evaluation will adhere to the Evaluation quality criteria as published by IOB, which is attached as annex 3 to these ToR.

## 7.2 Evaluation structure

The evaluation will be carried out by a lead evaluator in collaboration with a diverse team in language, gender and competencies. The lead-evaluator is responsible and accountable for the entire evaluation process. Their duty is to oversee the evaluation, ensuring that data collection across all countries adheres to pre-defined quality standards, and analysing the consolidated data.



## 8. Deliverables

The evaluator(s) will deliver the following outputs that must adhere to IOB evaluation quality criteria:

1. **Inception Report:** Detailing the proposed methodology, data collection tools, and work plan. In the inception phase the key evaluation questions will be specified by formulating sub-questions.
2. **Presentation of preliminary data** to participants of the ETE for cross checking.
3. **Draft Evaluation Report:** A comprehensive analysis addressing all evaluation questions and objectives.
4. **Final Evaluation Report:** Incorporating feedback from the consortium, presented in a clear and actionable format. The evaluation report should not exceed 40 pages, excluding annexes. The final evaluation needs to contain an executive summary in English and French.
5. **Presentation of Findings:** A summary of key insights and recommendations for stakeholders.

## 9. Timeline

The evaluation will be conducted over four months, with key milestones as follows:

- **June 2025:** Inception phase, including desk review and methodology development.
- **July-September 2025:** Data collection and field visits.
- **September – October 2025:** Data analysis and preparation of the draft report.
- **October - November 2025:** Finalization of the report.
- **December 2025:** Presentation and approval meeting of the final report.

## 10. Evaluation Team Profile

The evaluation team should include professionals with the following qualifications:

- Extensive experience in evaluating development projects, particularly in fragile and conflict-affected settings.
- Expertise in disability-inclusive development and food security. Involvement of persons with disabilities in the evaluation team is an advantage.
- Strong knowledge of participatory evaluation methodologies.
- Proficiency in working with diverse stakeholders, including OPDs and marginalized groups.
- Excellent communication and report-writing skills.
- Strong working knowledge of English and French of at least one team member is an important advantage.

## 11. Budget

A total budget of up to **€158,000** has been allocated to support the full evaluation process, covering all phases from design through to delivery and dissemination. This total includes resources for evaluator fees, travel and logistics, data collection, coordination and facilitation, and stakeholder engagement activities such as a sense-making and presentation workshop. Proposals



should include a detailed and realistic budget for the main evaluation activities, with a maximum of **€105,000** available for the external evaluation team's direct costs.

An additional **€53,000** has been reserved to support the broader evaluation process, including internal facilitation, administrative support, and costs related to evaluator participation in the sense-making and presentation workshop. These workshop-related costs will therefore be covered **outside** the €105,000 available for the evaluator's core activities.

For the purposes of this assignment, we assume that the assignment is exempt from VAT in accordance with applicable regulations. Should this assumption prove incorrect, VAT obligations will be addressed in compliance with relevant tax laws.

## 12. Application Process

The application process will consist of two phases.

Phase 1: Interested evaluators or teams are requested to submit:

1. An Expression of Interest outlining their motivation and understanding of the task (2 pages)
2. An estimation of the total costs with a budget on headlines.
3. CVs of the consultant or the team members highlighting relevant experience.
4. References from similar evaluations conducted in the past.

Expressions of Interest should be submitted to Peter Das [p.das@zoa.ngo](mailto:p.das@zoa.ngo) and John Chandiga [cjohn@adf-secretariat.org](mailto:cjohn@adf-secretariat.org). The deadline for submitting the Expression of Interest is 28/05/2025. Evaluators, evaluation teams or research institutes from East Africa are especially encouraged to apply.

Phase 2: A selection of three shortlisted evaluators will be invited to elaborate a full proposal based on the expression of interest. These proposals will be discussed with the commissioner of the evaluation in interview. Based on the full proposals and the interview an evaluator (or team) will be selected. The deadline for submitting the full proposal is 16/06/2025.

## 13. The Reference Group

The Reference Group plays a vital role in ensuring the quality, methodological rigor, and independence of the End Term Evaluation. Serving as a sounding board for the commissioner, it provides guidance on key aspects of the evaluation, including the approval of the Terms of Reference (ToR), the selection of the evaluation team, the refinement of the evaluation methodology, and the review of the draft report. The group is composed of both internal stakeholders and external evaluation and thematic experts, ensuring a balanced perspective that enhances the credibility and robustness of the evaluation process.

## Annexes

1. Overview of source documents used
2. Overview of Basket Indicators
3. Evaluation quality criteria as published by IOB (Separate attachment)



## Annex 1: Overview of documents used

We are able!, *We are able! Co-creating inclusive governance for access to basic resources that leaves no one behind*, October 2020. (proposal document).

Geerlings, E., *We Are Able! Baseline Report*, October 2021.

Geerlings, E. & Rijnveld, W., *We Are Able! Mid-term Review*, September 2023

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Extra information on the SCS MTRs (including its assessment by MFA)*, October 2022.

IOB, *IOB evaluation quality criteria*, July 2022.



## Annex 2: overview of Basket Indicators

Code	Indicator
SCS2	# of laws, policies, and norms/attitudes, blocked, adopted, improved for sustainable and inclusive development
SCS3	# of times that CSOs succeed in creating space for CSO demands and positions through agenda setting, influencing the debate and/or creating space to engage
SCS4	# of advocacy initiatives carried out by CSOs, for, by or with their membership/constituency
SCS5	# of CSOs with increased L&A capacities
SCS6	# of CSOs included in Strategic Partner's programmes (cumulative)
SCS7	# of organisations with improved links to constituencies
SCS8	The percentage of surveyed women and girls say they have improved social inclusion in their communities
WaA 5	WaA!5 Reduced percentage households with a Food Consumption Score (WFP indicator) < 35* in households with persons with disabilities.
WaA6	WaA!6 Proportion of total adult population with disabilities with secure tenure rights to land, (a) with legally recognized documentation, and (b) who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and type of tenure
WaA7	WaA!7 The number of Public Authorities with an improved LIA-score
WaA8	WaA!8 The percentage of LIA processes that focused on Food Security