

Winrock International
Rural Enterprise for Alleviating Poverty II (REAP II) Project

Memo. No. REAPII/Final Evl/92/5-15

Date: May 19, 2015

Subject: Request for Submission of Proposals for Final Evaluation of REAP II Project

Dear Managing Director/ Executive Director,

The REAP II project funded by USDA requests interested Consulting Firms/Organizations who have experience in evaluating development projects to submit proposals for conducting a Final Evaluation of the REAP II Project. The selected firm will be responsible for conducting the evaluation in line with the terms and conditions and following the scope of works mentioned in this document attached.

This Request for Proposal consists of the following:

1. Proposal invitation and terms and conditions for assignment;
2. Terms of reference for REAP II Final Evaluation
 - a) Background
 - b) Purpose of evaluation
 - c) Scope of work
 - d) Evaluation methodology
 - e) Evaluation Team
 - f) Timing of the evaluation
 - g) Deliverables
 - h) Estimated budget
 - i) Mode of payment
 - j) Attachment A, B, and C

To be eligible for consideration, firms must provide all required information and supporting documents mentioned below and in the Terms of References in this document.

- a) Registration certificate/trade license of the Consulting Firm/Organization
- b) VAT and income tax certificate for current fiscal year
- c) Profile of the firm including all necessary information

Only qualified firms/ groups those meet or exceed the preset proposal evaluation criteria will be contacted. All proposal preparation and submission costs are at the firm's own expense.

Time frame of the work: The Evaluation is to be completed within the stipulated time schedule mentioned in the attached document. If the work is affected due to any force majeure, time may be extended only through mutual agreement.

Deadline for submission of proposal

Proposals to be submitted both electronically (e-mail to reap.procurement@winrock.org) and in hard copy within the last date and time mentioned. Hard copy has to be submitted to REAP II office, House # 2, Road # 23/A, Gulshan-1, Dhaka 1212 in a sealed envelope addressed to Chief of Party, REAP II on or before **June 3, 2015, 5:00 PM**.

Requirements for proposal

All requirements for the development of the proposal has been mentioned in the Terms of Reference and Scope of Works under this document.

Contents of proposal

The firm should address the following areas in its proposal.

- a) Institutional Capacity
The firm must present a description in narrative format following the Terms of Reference and Scope of Work.

- b) Technical Proposal
To be prepared following the Terms of Reference and Scope of Work mentioned in this document.

- c) Details of proposed budget
Cost will have to be estimated as per section VIII of the TOR and SOW of the Proposal document. This estimate is to be attached at the end of the proposal.

Period of validity of Proposals

The submitted proposal shall remain valid for a period of 90 (ninety) days, starting from the submission date.

Sincerely,



S.N. Choudhury
Chief of Party
Rural Enterprise for Alleviating Poverty II (REAP II) Project
Winrock International
House # 2, Road # 23/A, Gulshan-1, Dhaka-1212
Bangladesh

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

For Final Evaluation on Rural Enterprise for Alleviating Poverty II (REAP II) Project

Background of the Project

Rural Enterprise for Alleviating Poverty II (REAP II) is a 4-year, \$3,021,288 project implemented in Bangladesh with funding by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). Winrock International is the prime implementer of the project and Land O'Lakes Inc. is a sub-awardee. The execution period of the project is from October 2011 to June 2015. The total REAP II project funding included \$2,910,600 resulting from the monetization of Crude Degummed Soybean Oil, and \$96,135 provided by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Project leadership is based in the main project office in Dhaka, with project field staff based in offices in Shamvugonj (Mymensingh district) and in Chuknagar (Khulna district).

The goal of the REAP II project is to ensure a comprehensive approach that accelerates inclusive agricultural-based growth and improves income generation opportunities, reduces poverty, improves nutrition, helps in gender development and improves quality of life for rural small and marginal farming families. As a result of increased intensity of the activities, employment creation and income opportunity for the poor families of the project area is expected to increase. One of the major focuses of the project is to empower farmers including women by increasing their skills, knowledge and attitude and increase their access mainly to quality inputs and markets, and also to finance and information, in key agricultural sub sectors through an enterprise development and value chain approach. The project assists the farming family to select specific agro-based enterprise activities suitable to their available resources, experience and input supply, and access to finance and marketing opportunities within each sub sector (aquaculture, horticulture and livestock) supported by the project.

REAP II works with all the important actors of the value chain of each sub-sector to improve the quality of the products and services through improved communication and business relationships. For example, in the case of aquaculture the project establishes effective linkages among farmers, nursery operators, hatchery owners, other input traders and buyers (fish traders) to ensure quality inputs, services and better prices for their products. In horticulture, REAP II is establishing linkages among farmers, seed and input traders, and buyers. Each actor of the value chain will be linked up with different government and nongovernment agencies to improve their product quality and service delivery.

For sustainable local extension services in the project area, the project develops the capacity of input traders, builds the capacity of existing poultry & livestock vaccinators and creates local poultry & livestock vaccinators, and fish nursery operators, so that they have the capacity to give technical assistance to the farmers for grow-out technology and provide solutions to any problems occurred during the rearing period. The project transfers environmentally friendly and sustainable technology to produce safe products.

The five objectives of the project are

- Reduce poverty through improved productivity of the aquaculture, horticulture and livestock subsectors – using a market-driven value chain approach that strengthens private sector delivery of information, inputs and financial services to smallholders.

- Develop business-oriented associations and establish producer groups in the aquaculture, horticulture and livestock sub-sectors by developing business-oriented cooperatives/ associations that enable producers to aggregate supply and attain marketable volumes for domestic and export markets.
- Increase access to markets through Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) with leading agribusiness firms and trade associations to enable a sustained flow of information, inputs, product delivery and output marketing services to rural smallholders.
- Increase dietary diversity through specialized training in food consumption and nutrition.
- Build capacity of local agricultural entities including local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and Government of Bangladesh (GoB) extension agents to ensure long-term program sustainability.

Working area of the project

The project works in the following areas of Bangladesh,

- Gouripur and Tarakanda Upazila (sub-district) of Mymensingh district in mid-north region;
- Dumuria of Khulna, Tala of Satkhira and Keshabpur Upazila of Jessore district in southwest region.

Programmatic Context

REAP II works with smallholder and marginal farmers to enhance their technological capacity in improved management of horticulture, aquaculture and livestock activities aiming to increase productivity and income. REAP II selected the small and marginal farmers for participation, with priority to farmers, farmers groups and associations, input suppliers, and traders who met the established criteria of willingness to participate, access to productive resources, and willingness and ability to invest own resources, plus additional criteria for each beneficiary type.

Partner Implementers

Land O'Lakes Inc. was an international sub-awardee responsible for conducting the commodity monetization process, and for program activities related to livestock, nutrition, and monitoring & evaluation.

The REAP II project also issued subgrants to local Bangladesh organizations to support implementation. Bangladesh Association for Social Advancement (BASA) received a subgrant to conduct activities in mid-north region (Mymensingh), and Satkhira Unnayan Sangstha (SUS) received a subgrant to conduct activities in southwest region. The subgrantees executed the program activities under the guidance and supervision of the REAP II project personnel.

Targeted Beneficiaries

REAP II targeted 12,000 small and marginal farmers and 3,000 marginalized women beneficiaries. The project also targeted 1,190 input & output traders, government and NGO extension personnel, and employees of agricultural enterprises including fish hatcheries, fish and plant nurseries etc.

Mid-Term Evaluation

The project conducted a Mid-Term Evaluation, by Matrix, a third party firm. The report will be made available to the evaluators as listed in Attachment B. See Attachment C for summary.

I. Purpose of the Final Evaluation

This Evaluation of the REAP II project will be carried out in the last year of the program. The purpose is to assess relevancy, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of the REAP II program. It is envisioned that the Scope of Work and the evaluation tools will be planned by the firm with input from the implementing organization and the project staff.

USDA views evaluation as a tool for learning and accountability. The purpose of this final evaluation is to assess the overall performance progress of the REAP II project; assess the overall impact of the interventions; document lessons learned; and assess overall sustainability of the project. A variety of methodologies may be used to carry out evaluations and will include project documentation review, project data review, interviews with REAP II staff and implementing partner staff, surveys of participants and/or collaborators, implementation or process evaluations, evaluation assessments, or other special studies.

The Evaluation will be critically and objectively review and evaluate the project's implementing experience and the implementing environment, assess whether targeted beneficiaries received services as expected, assess whether the project met all of its stated indicators, goals and objectives, review the results frameworks and assumptions, identify intended and unintended effects, identify best practices and what worked and what did not work.

The final evaluation is expected to provide input related to the above-mentioned purposes in a cost-efficient manner. The team will assess the implementer's final progress in meeting all five objectives. The evaluation should also do a thorough review of the methodologies used during the baseline and mid-term evaluations, correct any calculation errors if necessary, and conduct a final evaluation based on the indicators found in the REAP II Plan of Operation and following the criteria of measuring progress mentioned in the plan of operation. A final update of the progress of all indicators, including comparisons against the Mid Term Evaluation, is required. The evaluation will be shared with USDA and may be shared with other government personnel and project beneficiaries.

This Evaluation information may be used by USDA FAS to meet reporting requirements to the US Congress, so quality and acceptability of report to be insured by the firm.

II. Scope of Work (SOW)

The study will evaluate the relevancy, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of the implementation of the REAP II project against the objectives stated in the REAP II project scope of work and the FFP program. The Evaluation Team will need to use baseline survey report , PMP survey reports (I-IV), mid-term evaluation report, periodical and annual reports, annual operational plan, performance management plan, training records, technical documents etc. to assess expected effectiveness and efficiency of the project. The Evaluation Team will need to draw on documented experience and verify preliminary results achieved to-date. The tentative period for conducting evaluation to be from mid-June to mid-July, 2015.

Implementation Progress

The REAP II project performance will be reflected by progress with implementation of the five objectives and cross cutting activities. The team shall summarize and compile information on progress and compare progress to plans and impact targets for the project. The team shall rely on existing reporting documents for this and shall not require special reports. Program implementation performance: The team will document and assess progress in delivery of planned inputs, namely seed of high-yielding varieties of vegetable, fish, prawn, poultry, goat, quality feeds, medicines, vaccines etc. and program equipment, planned outputs, including number of people trained, and other types of direct and indirect beneficiaries; and impacts achieved to-date and prospects for impacts from the program activities. The team should assess cost efficiency and/or cost effectiveness of program activities and identify major factors influencing efficiency and effectiveness.

REAP II Program Strategies

The team shall evaluate the following program strategies:

- Capacity building of beneficiary farmers and producer groups
- Making access of producer groups to service providers and input suppliers
- Collective marketing process
- Farmers' association and capacity building
- Strengthening of local agricultural entities for sustainable supports
- Dietary diversity improvement for the marginalized women

REAP II Implementation Issues

Successful implementation of improved agricultural activities, collective production and marketing system, backward and forward linkages in agro-enterprises, microfinance, and market access are the key issues. In examining the extent to which this is understood and practiced, the Evaluation Team shall assess implementation arrangements for the current REAP II project, including:

- Program alignment with FFP objectives
- Technical quality of program
- Maximizing program impact
- M&E and impact measurement
- Project feedback

REAP II Program Management

- The Evaluation Team shall assess overall management of the REAP II project. The team should evaluate the adequacy of overall coordination among the implementation partners, support, monitoring, and direction of the project.
- Evaluate management of project activities on a procedural level, such as grant applications and grant management, and beneficiary selection, to determine if fair criteria are in place which contributes to achieving project objectives and best value.
- Evaluation of all grants and in-kind materials.

III. Methodology

The Evaluation team must be able to travel through and visit the project areas and be conversant and comfortable with local customs and languages. An approach and methodology is proposed below. The team is free to modify this with Winrock's approval as appropriate within the constraints of the resources available to carry out the Evaluation.

1. Documentation review: The team shall review available documentation relating to the REAP II Project (see Attachment B).
2. Informant interviews: The team shall interview (in person, by phone or e mail) key stakeholders and beneficiaries of the REAP II project. Key stakeholders shall include: USDA HQ Washington and USDA Regional Agricultural Attaché; Winrock International staff and Land o' Lakes staff, including field staff; local partner organizations; and beneficiaries (farmers, businesses, grantees). The team may choose to conduct some interviews by phone or conduct surveys, with the assistance of project staff.
3. Data collection and analysis: The team shall draw on the M&E data available from the REAP II baseline and PMP reports. The team may complement this with surveys of beneficiaries, grantees, partners, country staff, or others and/or with independent ratings of program reports, capabilities, implementation or other program aspects.
4. Field program reviews: The team shall visit selected beneficiaries and grant recipients to obtain insights to program operating procedures, reporting and activities, and impacts. The team shall review these and may choose to revisit these beneficiaries or select others. Selection should attempt a balance among different participants along the value chain, of varying size and participation with REAP II. It may consider program implementation, performance data, geographic region, type of activity or livelihood, gender, or other factors. The team shall obtain approval from the REAP II management on the proposed sites and the composition of the team before travel. It is expected that the Evaluation consultants will split up tasks and interviews within the limited timeframe and limited resources. Attachment A includes a checklist of issues that should be considered in REAP II reviews.

The team shall operate and carry out analytical work independently of USDA and REAP II implementing organizations, but will be expected to interact with USDA and implementing organization staff on a collegial basis.

IV. Evaluation Firm/Team

USDA FAD regulations (see 7 CFR Part 1499.13 and 7 CFR Part 1599.13), require that evaluations will be independent and conducted by a third party. The regulations specify that the third party conducting the evaluation:

- Is financially and legally separate from the participant's organization;
- A minimum 5 years of experience in conducting qualitative and quantitative impact and performance evaluation in similar international development program;
- Experience in evaluating horticulture, livestock, aquaculture and other similar agricultural development programs;

- Has staff with demonstrated knowledge, analytical capability, language skills and experience in conducting evaluations of development programs involving agriculture, education, and nutrition;
- Uses acceptable analytical frameworks such as comparison with non-project areas, surveys, involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation, and statistical analyses;
- Uses local consultants, as appropriate, to conduct portions of the evaluation; and,
- Provides a detailed outline of the evaluation, major tasks, and specific schedules prior to initiating the evaluation.

The evaluation should be conducted by people who are not involved in the design and implementation of the project and the evaluation process must be free from political influence and organizational pressure.

The proposed team and specialties are listed below. All team members should have university degrees in their fields and English language fluency. All team members must have experience conducting evaluations and be familiar with evaluation sampling, methodologies, data analysis, and impact assessment. The team may propose an alternative team composition to meet the needs of the Evaluation efficiently and effectively. All team members and level of efforts will be approved by Winrock before the start of the evaluation. Professional qualifications for the Evaluation Team members are proposed as follows:

Team Leader: The Team Leader will be Masters in Social Science or in any other discipline and must have 10 years' experience leading evaluation teams in Bangladesh and collecting data and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data. Team Lead must have at least 15 years of experience with agricultural development and capacity building activities in Bangladesh and experience with monitoring and evaluation and project/activity design experience. Experience working with US government funded programs is highly desirable.

Horticulture Specialist: The Horticulture Specialist will be Graduate or Masters in Agriculture/ Horticulture and must have 10 years of experience with agricultural development in Bangladesh, particularly in development and capacity building of horticulture value chains involving rural smallholder and marginalized producers. The Horticulture Specialist should have experience conducting monitoring and evaluation and project/activity design. S/he should understand the project's context and the target beneficiaries of the project. S/he must be experienced in the knowledge conducting KII, FGD, quantitative and qualitative data collection etc.

Aquaculture Specialist: The Aquaculture Specialist will be Graduate or Masters in Fisheries or Aquaculture management and must have 10 years of experience with agricultural development, particularly in development and capacity building of aquaculture value chains involving rural smallholder and marginalized producers in Bangladesh. The Aquaculture Specialist should have experience conducting monitoring and evaluation and project/activity design. S/he should understand the project's context and the target beneficiaries of the project. S/he must be experienced in the knowledge conducting KII, FGD, quantitative and qualitative data collection etc.

Livestock Specialist: The Livestock Specialist will be Graduate or Masters in Livestock Sciences and must have 10 years of experience in the development of livestock value chains in Bangladesh, particularly with capacity building of smallholder producers and an understanding of relevant production and marketing systems and challenges. The Livestock Specialist should have experience conducting monitoring and evaluation and project/activity design. S/he should understand the project's context and

the target beneficiaries of the project. S/he must be experienced in the knowledge conducting KII, FGD, quantitative and qualitative data collection etc.

Community Development Specialist: The Community Development Specialist will be Graduate or Masters in Social Sciences and must have 8 years of experience with rural community development in Bangladesh, particularly in development and capacity building of rural smallholder and marginalized producers that participate in agriculture and aquaculture livelihoods. The Community Development Specialist should have experience conducting monitoring and evaluation and project/activity design. S/he should understand project dynamics and experience in conducting KII, FGD, quantitative and qualitative data collection etc.

Program Analyst: The Program Analyst must have a Master's degree (or equivalent) and minimum 5 years of experience working in international development. The Program Analyst will focus on data collection and analysis and must have excellent communication skills, good computer and documentation skills, and experience with monitoring and evaluation for development projects. S/he will be well conversant with different data analysis tools. S/he will support report production.

V. Deliverables

- **Inception Report:** Following the desk review, the team shall submit to Winrock/USDA for concurrence an inception report (2-3 pages) that includes a projected schedule for carrying out the Final Evaluation, for finalizing further decisions (e.g., detailed methodology of sampling, sample of questionnaire & method of analysis, field visit schedules, additional surveys if required, etc.), and for completing deliverables. Lead Evaluator will be required to speak to USDA Washington and Regional Agricultural Attaché by phone prior to the start of fieldwork. This is an opportunity for both USDA and the evaluator to discuss expectations of the evaluation and highlight any specific areas of interest. Winrock International will not be present for this particular meeting.
Due date: TBD
- **Draft Final Report:** The team shall submit a draft final report for review by Winrock and make a presentation of the preliminary findings if requested. Winrock will have ten business days from the submission/presentation to provide the team with written comments, corrections, and other input to the Evaluation. The team members shall be available to Winrock staff for reasonable amounts of time for verbal inputs and discussion of the draft report. Due date: TBD
- **Presentation of Findings:** The team will present the findings before completion of the report. Due date: TBD.
- **Final Evaluation Report:** The team will submit a Final Report containing an Executive Summary and covering all activities accomplished, lessons learned, and recommendations plus annexes within 100 pages. The final report to be submitted to USDA and Winrock. Due date: TBD

Upon receipt of the final evaluation report, USDA will engage collaboratively with Winrock to discuss the proposed actions that need to be taken to address the findings and recommendations.

Timeline and Level of Effort:

Timeline and level of effort should be articulated in consideration of followings points, the required days may vary:

- Document review, preparatory work, preparation of Inception Report- 2 days.
- Familiarization visit, discussions with USDA, Winrock, and document review- 3 days.
- Survey key stakeholders - 7 days.
- Analysis and Workshop with the staff members - 1 days.
- Preparation of draft report- (data editing, entry, tabulation, analysis, interpretation, presentation) - 7 days.
- Preparation of final report- 3 days.

VI. Eligibility Criteria for the organization

In addition to the above mentioned eligibilities the firm must provide all required information and supporting documents mentioned below and in this document for consideration,

- a. Registration certificate/trade license of the firm
- b. VAT and Income Tax certificate for current fiscal year
- c. Detailed profile of the firm

VII. Terms and conditions of the proposal

1) For submission of proposal:

Proposals are to be submitted both electronically (e-mailed to reap.procurement@winrock.org) and in hard copy **no later than June 3, 2015 by 5:00 p.m.** Hard copy to be submitted to REAP II office, House # 2, Road # 23/A, Gulshan-1, Dhaka 1212 in a sealed envelope addressed to Chief of Party, REAP II.

2) Timeframe of the Evaluation including submission of Final Report:

It is expected that the evaluation work to be started on June 15, 2015 and completed by July 15, 2015 by the firm.

Requirements for proposal

a) Language and currency

All documents related to this proposal shall be in English and all costs shall be calculated in Bangladesh Taka (BDT)

b) Page setup

The document should be written in 12-point of Times New Roman font, single spaced, and with one-inch margins on A4 paper.

c) Page length

The maximum page length for the proposal is 25 pages, which will include a cover page, organizational profile, institutional capacity statement, technical proposal, CVs of proposed team members, and a cost narrative. Number of pages for the annexes (if any) is not limited.

d) Materials to be attached

Any supporting material to the proposal to be annexed with the proposal.

Contents of proposal

The firm should address the following areas in its proposal:

- a) Background of the firm
- b) Purpose of evaluation
- c) Scope of work
- d) Evaluation methodology
- e) Evaluation Team roles and professional qualifications
- f) Timing of the evaluation
- g) Deliverables
- h) Estimated budget
- i) Mode of payment
- j) Institutional Capacity

The firm must present its Institutional Capacity in narrative format with descriptions of the following:

- Firm/organization profile (supplemental material could be placed in the annex);
- Organizational capacity statement;
- Organization's knowledge of aquaculture, agriculture, livestock, agriculture enterprises, gender balance issues, health, nutrition, households income status, etc.;
- Previous experience conducting evaluation work of similar size and scope;
- Availability of relevant staff.

The firm is encouraged to demonstrate:

- A minimum of 5 years of experience in conducting quantitative and qualitative impact and performance evaluations in similar complex international development programs.
- Experience in conducting research and evaluation of USG international development programs. Preference will be given to those who have experience in USDA Food for Progress programs.
- Experience in designing or evaluating livestock, horticulture and other similar agricultural development programs.
- Experience in qualitative evaluation techniques such as key informant interviews, focus group discussions, observations, and case studies.
- Experience in quantitative data collection, statistics/econometrics, farmer, household, business surveys, sample size selection, design effects, questionnaire design, etc.
- Ability to communicate, read, and write fluently in English and other languages as appropriate.

Evaluation Procedure for selecting firm for Final Evaluation

A review team/proposal evaluation committee comprising members from different Winrock projects formed by REAP II will evaluate the proposals based on technical merit and cost estimates as per attached formats and grid lines.

Terms and Conditions of solicitation

a) **Period of validity of Proposals**

The submitted proposal shall be valid for a period of 90 (ninety) days, starting from the submission date.

b) **Non-Binding Solicitation**

Winrock reserves the right to reject any or all bids received in response to this invitation of Proposal, and is in no way bound to accept any proposal. Winrock additionally reserves the right to negotiate the contents of the finalized proposal.

c) **Confidentiality**

All information provided as a part of this solicitation is considered confidential. Proposals, discussions, and all information received in response to this solicitation will be held as strictly confidential, except as otherwise noted.

d) **Notification**

Prior to the expiration of the validity of the proposal, Winrock shall notify the successful firm that submitted the highest scoring proposal in writing and will invite them for contract negotiations. Winrock reserves the right to invite the second or third ranking firm for parallel negotiations too.

e) **Right to Final Negotiations**

Winrock reserves the right to negotiate on the final costs, and final scope of work, and also reserves the right to limit or include third parties at Winrock's sole and full discretion in such negotiations. Upon failure to reach agreement on the contents of the contract as stipulated in this document, Winrock has the right to terminate the negotiations and invite the next-best ranked firm/ organization/institution for negotiations.

f) **Communication**

All communication regarding this solicitation must be directed to appropriate contact point at Winrock only. Otherwise it will lead to disqualification of the proposal.

VIII. Detail of proposed budget

The Evaluation budget submission should contain at least the following line items of estimates (to be funded through project funds).

Budget Item	Quantity	Cost in BDT
Team Leader	---- days	
Horticulture Specialist	---- days	
Aquaculture Specialist	---- days	
Livestock Specialist	---- days	
Community Dev. Specialist	---- days	
Program Analyst	---- days	
Travel to field	---- trips	
Accommodation & perdiem	---- days	
Report writing	---- days	
Report printing and binding	---- sets	
Sub-total		
VAT 15%		
TOTAL		BDT
In word: BDT		

Mode of payment

The payments will be made in Account Payee check in favor of the firm/organization upon successfully completion of the study and duly approved invoices at the end of the work and submission of final report.

Tax and VAT will be deducted at source from the bill as per govt. rules and regulations. All bills must be submitted with appropriate invoices.

IX. Payment Schedule

- The payment may be made through three instalments and account payee check;
- 10% of the contract amount will be paid in advance on submission of work plan/ inception report and invoice after signing contract;
- 45% upon submission of draft report based on deliverable guidelines;
- 45% upon acceptance of final report and dissemination.

X. General conditions

- The Assignment shall not be sub-contracted to anyone.
- Agreement for additional time requirement to complete the assignment without changing the scope of work must be made in writing. The additional time, however, cannot be more than one weeks.

- Proposals that are submitted late, incomplete or are non-responsive will not be considered. Only qualified firms that meet or exceed the proposal evaluation criteria will be contacted.
- All proposal preparation and submission costs are at the firm's own expense.
- Confidentiality of all the information will be assured at all times.
- Copyright and intellectual property right belongs to Winrock International.

It is mentioned here that REAP II Project, Winrock International has right to accept any or reject any or all proposals without showing any reason. No persuasion is expected. Only short listed firm/consultant will be contacted for financial negotiation and modification of work schedule (if needed).

Attachment A:

REAP II Final Evaluation Specific Issues Checklist for REAP II Review

Sample key questions and issues to be addressed are listed below. Some of these issues may require or benefit from input from Winrock HQs key informant interviews and reports. The donor can contribute questions they would like answered. Questions should be answerable based on empirical evidence.

1. REAP II Project Goals and Objectives
 - a. Did the REAP II project meet its stated goals and objectives?
 - b. Did REAP II meet the targets for each activity objective?
 - c. What direct and indirect impacts of the project can be reported and/or observed?

2. USDA Involvement
 - a. Were REAP II project activities adequately coordinated with USDA in-country programs and staff?
 - b. Had USDA provided adequate oversight and supervision of the Program?
 - c. Do USDA Missions attempt to “over-manage” activities?
 - d. Were there other issues or problems in this area?

3. Core REAP II project Implementer Management
 - a. Was implementing organization headquarters adequately staffed with technical, management personnel necessary to carry out the project, or are appropriate technical and management consultants engaged as needed?
 - b. Were systems in place to ensure the safety and security of consultants, home office staff travelers?
 - c. Did ex-pat assignments encourage experience sharing and promote learning and improved project operations and technical approaches?

4. REAP II Program Implementation
 - a. Were the REAP II Bangladesh offices adequately staffed with technical, management and support personnel necessary to carry out the project?
 - b. Were country partners for REAP II clearly defined as to roles and responsibilities and effective in helping to identify and work with beneficiaries?
 - c. Were beneficiary selection procedures sound, beneficiaries and partners well briefed on REAP II Project objectives and requirements, beneficiary and partners baseline data collected appropriately, and beneficiary follow-up and impact assessment monitoring procedures and in place and effective?
 - d. Were the strategies for REAP II activities sound with:
 - i. Clear definition of problems to be addressed or opportunities to be exploited.
 - ii. Clear strategy for use of technical assistance and impact on the project objective. Do activities and assignments (completed/on-going/planned) reflect a coherent plan and phased strategy for addressing problems and constraints identified in the value chain or sector?
 - iii. Strategies being implemented to promote spread of benefits from project assistance
 - iv. Clear and reasonable indicator targets
 - v. Realistic and justifiable impact targets (cost/benefit, cost efficiency, or other)

- e. Were procedures in place and being implemented to collect required baseline and impact data?
 - i. How, when and by whom was baseline data collected?
 - ii. How, when and by whom was impact data collected?
 - iii. Are there problems with any of the Indicator definitions?
 - iv. Are there any specific problems with data collection?
 - v. Do staffs think that Indicators and the data collection system are capturing most of the project benefits?
 - vi. How sound is the overall system for monitoring and evaluation of impacts from the REAP II project?
- f. Were there other issues or problems in this area?

5. REAP II Project Impact and Sustainability

- a. Relevance:
 - i. What beneficiary needs were met due to project interventions?
 - ii. How did the project interventions align or support Bangladesh agriculture and/or development investment strategy; and USDA and US Government development goals, objectives and strategies?
 - iii. Did project design address economic, cultural, and political context and existing relevant program activities?
- b. Effectiveness:
 - i. Has the project achieved its objectives as outlined in the results framework?
 - ii. How effective were project interventions at contributing to expected results/objectives?
- c. Efficiency:
 - i. How did the project's use of project resources contribute to project results?
 - ii. How appropriate was the type and level of project resources for the results achieved?
 - iii. How did the project increase the impact of project resources, through sharing or leveraging outside resources?
- d. Impact Assessment:
 - i. What can be determined about mid and long term effects, intended and unintended, of the project interventions?
 - ii. To what extent are these effects due to project interventions, and/or due to other factors?
- e. Sustainability:
 - i. How likely are the project benefits to endure after the project is completed?
 - ii. How has the project supported and developed partners and beneficiaries for continuation of project benefits, for local ownership of the project, and for sustainable partnerships.

6. Special REAP II Project Issues

- a. Do REAP II project activities/staff promote gender equity in development, promote women's participation as staff and beneficiaries, and provide gender disaggregated reporting on outcomes and impacts?
- b. Are environmental issues considered for the execution of project interventions?
 - i. Have a list of approved/registered pesticides/other on file at the REAP II offices
 - ii. Are project activities being implemented through environment friendly approaches?

7. Are there other program strategy, management, budget or implementation issues at the country level that need to be addressed or considered to improve the performance of REAP II?

Attachment B

Background and Resource Materials

Successful bidder will receive information for review such as the following.

- Cooperative Agreement between USDA and Winrock International
- Sub Contract Scope of Work between Winrock International and Land O'Lakes
- Sub-recipient agreements with local NGOs
- Annual Plan of Operation of REAP II
- LogMon Reports : 1-8
- Semi-Annual/ Annual Reports
- Success Stories drafted by REAP II staff
- PMPs of REAP II, M&E planning documents
- Baseline report of the project
- Mid-Term Evaluation of the project
- Power point presentations
- Other materials

Project Activity Records

- Training participant records and documentation
- Records of procurement of materials for beneficiaries, distribution records, reporting
- Workshops document
- Photographs and videos

Attachment C.

REAP II Mid-Term Evaluation Summary

The objectives of the REAP II project midterm evaluation include focusing on each aspect of the project indicators, and analyzing its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and the sustainability of the project. The evaluation looked at the outputs, outcomes, goals and the factors that affected the different stages of the project implementation cycle and recommendation for future implementation of REAP II.

Evaluation methodology was designed and used based on the objectives and scope of the work of the study as delineated in the TOR. Participatory approaches were followed for the field study using mostly qualitative information collection method.

Key-informant interviews, focused group interviews, and PMP II was cross checked with the project staff (PNGOs), and beneficiaries. Information was collected using formatted guidelines, checklist, and questionnaires for meetings with key informants. PMP II information was used as quantitative information and field survey information, secondary review was qualitative information, both were used for the midterm evaluation as necessary.

Respondents of the Evaluation:

- REAP II project staffs and experts
- Representative of Partner NGOs
- Partner NGO Staffs
- Project beneficiaries – producers from Aquaculture, Horticulture, Livestock, Marginal Women Group
- Relevant Government Officials – Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE), Department of Fisheries (DoF), Department of Livestock Service (DLS)
- Donor Representative – USDA
- Inputs suppliers – company representative, wholesalers, retailers
- Output Market Traders – in all sectors
- Local Market Committees representatives
- Other development agencies those are working in similar areas

Steps of Evaluation. The overall evaluation process was carried out as follows:

- Team Formation and Orientation
- Conceptualization of the project and midterm evaluation of REAP II
- Location mapping and sampling of the FGDs
- Literature review and feedback from REAP II
- Preparation of data collection instruments
- Field Survey
- Data compilation and analysis
- Reporting

Team formation and Orientation. At first team was formed and oriented on project objectives, evaluation methodology, and required information, especially on sectoral & business attributes, capacity building process, market development strategies, market potentialities, business constraints and opportunities and viable business development services.

Conceptualization of the project and midterm evaluation of REAP II.

A project concept meeting was held at REAP II office with all sectoral experts of REAP II to understand and conceptualize the REAP II project and midterm evaluation. Some of discussions were – relevancies and background of the project, results and indicators of the project, project strategies, project objectives, field

operatives, target beneficiaries work plan, activities accomplished and plan of work for future, sectoral and location specific sensitivity, and SOW for midterm evaluation

Literature Review.

The following documents were reviewed for the midterm evaluation:

- Project proposal of REAP II
- PMP II quantitative information and results
- Criteria for beneficiaries’ selection
- Annual operational plan (AOP) of 3rd years of REAP II
- Baseline survey Report of REAP-II Project
- Periodical Report of REAP II (Oct’11-Dec’12)
- Annual Report of REAP-II (Oct’12-Sept’13)
- Semi-Annual Report of REAP-II (Oct’13 – March 2014)
- Annual Report of REAP II (Oct’13- Sept’14)
- Annual performance data table from PMP survey up to March 2014

Source of Quantitative Information. Source of quantitative information are as follows:

- PMP I and PMP II quantitative information and results
- Baseline survey Report of REAP-II Project
- Periodical Report of REAP II (Oct’11-Dec’12)
- Annual Report of REAP-II (Oct’12-Sept’13)
- Semi-Annual Report of REAP-II (Oct’13 – March 2014)
- Annual Report of REAP II (Oct’13- Sept’14)
- Annual performance data table from PMP survey up to Sept 2013
- Annual performance data table from PMP II survey during May 2014

The Evaluation Team/ firm will also have access to different materials developed for the project beneficiaries including Handbook, booklet, fliers etc.

Field visit mapping

As per project documents - REAP II is working with 12,000 marginal and small producers/ farmers (300 producers groups), 3,000 marginal women (MW) (100 MW group). There are 41 Agro Business and Service Centers established by REAP II as apex body of the groups. The working areas of REAP II shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Location of the project

Regions	District	Upazila	Beneficiaries	
			Producer Group Members	Marginal Women Group Member
Mid North	Mymensingh	Gouripur	2400	600
		Tarakanda	2400	600
Southwest	Khulna	Dumuria	2,400	600
	Satkhira	Tala	2,400	600
	Jessore	Keshobpur	2,400	600
2 region	4 districts	5 Upzila	12,000	3,000

In consultation with REAP II, the following samples were determined for the evaluation.

Table 2: Methods and Tools of the Evaluation

Methods	Key respondents	#	
KII	REAP II, Govt. representatives, PNGOs	GoB – 3 in each upazila	15
		Traders (inputs + outputs)	15
		Project Staffs	12
		PNGOs	2
FGDs	Producer group, MWG, ABSC, Inputs and Outputs traders	Producer group - One in each upazila in each sub sector	15
		MWG	5
		ABSC	5
		Inputs and Outputs traders	5
Consultation Meeting	REAP II and PNGOs	REAP II Dhaka	3
		REAP II Field along with PNGOs	2
Briefing Meeting	REAP II and PNGOs	REAP II Dhaka	2
		REAP II Field along with PNGOs	2
Total person met			743 (332 Male, 401 Female)
Validation and dissemination workshop	All direct and indirect stakeholders	One participatory workshop	44

Activity Objective 1: Improve Productivity of the Aquaculture, Horticulture and Livestock Subsectors

- Household income is increased by BDT18,500 (US\$240) from baseline, target was US\$250. REAP II is very close to its target

Horticulture

- All 12000 beneficiaries are involved in horticulture and are producing seasonal vegetables such as cauliflower, different gourds, tomato, beans, brinjal, okra, leafy vegetables
- Average production was found to be around 20 kg /decimal where baseline was not available. Adoption of new methods/techniques is just started it the output will surface and expected to be visible in successive seasons as per opinions of participating farmers. Efficacy of technology in agricultures takes relatively considerable time to yield results;
- 74% farmers (who have pond) cultivate in pond dikes, baseline was 24% it shown an increasing trend
- The project has seen a 55% yield (2043Kg/ha) increase from baseline (1313.13kg/ha) in pond dike, target is 80% increment from baseline, seems lot of efforts to be required to reach target.
- Horticulture yields by marginal farmers have increased by 35% (3206kg/ha); baseline was 2375kg/ha and target in 45% increased from baseline in homestead areas, positive trends has shown to reach the target
- 5% average price increase for vegetable reached to Tk.24/Kg during PMP II, which was Tk.23/kg (\$.30) during PMP -I. All agricultural prices are competitive, so no influence can be made for price determination. Good quality produces, and linkage with large buyer can provide more prices for the rural farmers.
- 78% farmers (9360 out of 12000) were reportedly practicing improved technologies in horticulture when midterm evaluation was on-going, that indicates 50% of additional farmers has adopted the techniques compared to baseline (28%). New, improved, and modern cultivation practices are better pest management (IPM), use of HYV seeds, quality grade inputs, dike cropping, and post harvest management.
- Average yield of vegetable has increased by 9 kg/decimal and reached to 30kg/decimal where baseline was 21 kg/decimal

Aquaculture:

- 33% fish yield has increased to 488kg/ha compared to baseline 366.79 kg/ha for fresh water fish, which is on track of the REAP II project implementation target of 40%.
- Average shrimp production reached to 1 kg/decimal during PMP II which was below 0.6 kg during baseline, it has shown positive increment due to improved farming. Overall, Prawn and shrimp farming has shown 41% increase in yield compared to PMP I, baseline data was not available and target was 40%.

- 80% farmers now practicing better technologies in fish farming, a significant increase of 61% from baseline 18.7%
- Farmgate price of fish Tk.160/Kg and that is 8% increase in price compared to PMP I, (Tk.148/kg), baseline data was mixed with fish, prawn, shrimp, which cannot be comparable, where target of farmgate price increment would be 15%.
- 80% farmers among the project beneficiaries adopted improved fish farming technology, compared to targeted 70%, well ahead of the target.

Livestock

- Against the projected target of 25% increase in livestock and milk production outputs, an increase of 37% (Tk.16270), beef fattening 56% (Tk.26,789), goat 24% (Tk.6767) and poultry rearing 6% (Tk.5323) has been recorded, baseline prices of these were Tk.11,887, Tk.17,195, Tk.4,640 and Tk.5,006, respectively. This is good indication of the impact of REAP II interventions.
- 62% farmers (4300) are practicing improved technology, which means 35% adopted new and improved technology in livestock rearing methods compared to baseline of 27% where target is set at 70%. At the midpoint of the project, this trend is positive and may exceed the target with wide margin.
- Prices of livestock commodities during baseline were not available but prices of milk Tk.32/liter, beef (gross per bull) Tk.26,789, Egg Tk.6/pc, hen per piece Tk.149, Goat/Mutton (gross Goat) Tk.3567 reported by farmers during PMP II survey were in record and during all FGDs these were validated.

Activity Objective 2: Establish Producer Groups in Aquaculture, Horticulture, and Livestock:

300 producers group, 100 MWG and 40 ABSC have been formed and are functioning well, although the ABSCs are at growing stage and needs to strengthen further.

Activity Objective 3: Increase Access to Markets

130 output traders have been linked with production groups, cooperatives and processors for marketing purposes. By April 2014, in all upazila under REAP II project facilitated establishment of linkage with producers, inputs suppliers and output traders. Altogether, 55 output traders and about 50 inputs suppliers have established linkages with producers groups, ABSCs and/or individual farmers. However this activities needs to strengthen further.

Activity Objective 4: Increase Dietary Diversity

- As per PMP II, 63% family decisions were reportedly made jointly on household issues at family levels, besides 11% decision were taken by female member of the family. On the other hand, 30% decisions are reportedly taken by male member of the family. During baseline, it was found that average 48% in decisions were made jointly; in average, women alone made 8% decisions, Although during the project period the target set for joint decision making is 80% but indications during mid-term appeared positive and was also validated at FGD and it is expected that the target will be met at the end of the project, if not exceeded. Interesting fact is that all of the marginal women are now taking part in joint family decision making process.
- Marginal women are now contributing households earning by about 15% to the family income which is 25% higher than that of baseline, although target is 30%. Need to identify and facilitate IGAs for MWGs
- 100% of 3000 MWG members are directly benefiting from USG assistances and it was validated by interviews and FGDs. It indicates vulnerable households if get proper assistances are able to utilize those as it was shown from USG assistance provided through REAP II.

Women's dietary diversity increased by 80%:

- 55% increased in dietary diversity in MWG during the midterm evaluation (as per PMPII report) where target is 80% and baseline was absent, which behind the target and need refresher training, promotion on nutrition and dietary diversity. During PMP –I survey the women's dietary diversity was 43% and in PMP-II stands 55%.

Activity Objective 5: Build Capacity of Local Agricultural Entities

- 70% increase in the adoption of improved technology and practices among technical professionals who support farmers were recorded;
- 12,000 farmers (100%) improved linkages with service providers;
- **158** institutions/ organizations undertook activities that either improved capacity/ competency or strengthening their capacity as a result of USG assistance.
- All are exceeded target in this area

REAP II has made some good efforts to coordinate with public extension agencies and to a certain extent with similar projects in the country to share their experiences, and use lessons learned from previous and current projects operated by WI.

At the mid-point of the project, the establishment of producer groups has already achieved the target. Access to markets by producers groups also shows good indication toward achieving the target.

The following recommendations were made by the consultants:

- REAP II should have clear exit strategy
- ABSCs to be strengthened towards sustainability
- Further training or refresher courses to be conducted for the producer groups, MWGs for the remaining period of the project
- Linkage with large buyers, processors needs to be enhanced
- Project promotional materials needs to be developed in terms of sectoral activities, nutrition and dietary diversities, and strengthening ABSCs further.
- Emphasis to be given on post harvest management
- Training implementation and impact should be assessed
- Increase synergy of REAP II with similar project t to share knowledge and results