

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Mid-term Impact Evaluation

SMEs Promote Resilience, Inclusion and Innovative Transformation

(SPRINT) Project

1. Background

SPRINT is a six-year project (2023–2029) funded by GAC and implemented by Cowater in Lao Cai province. It aims to enhance the socio-economic wellbeing of EMW through clean growth in the agriculture sector in the Lao Cai province of Vietnam (Ultimate Outcome 1000). This will be achieved by (i) improving gender-responsive and tailored on the job training both in business and financial management and in access to markets; (ii) investing in the capacity of these groups to identify, adopt and integrate CSA and clean energy solutions (including RE & EE) in the agri-food sector as well support innovations for clean growth solutions in agriculture (Intermediate Outcome 1100). Through a holistic intervention that enhances EMW's capacity to participate in community and business as leaders; while also creating understanding amongst leaders and community actors to enable their support and acceptance of EMW as participants and leaders in business and community, the Project promotes and increases women's economic empowerment and influence (Intermediate Outcome 1200). With this EMW will be better equipped and supported to participate in a more inclusive agri-food sector and in their communities, which is imperative to the socio-economic wellbeing and prosperity of EMW.

SPRINT collaborates closely with Ethnic Minority Women (EMW), Lao Cai provincial Government actors including People's Provincial Committee (PPC) as the Project Hosting Agency; Provincial Cooperative Alliance (PCA) as the Project Owner; Department of Agriculture and Environment (DAE), the Provincial Women's Union (WU), Ethnic Minority (EM) communities, and agriculture market actors.

SPRINT has identified eight priority agricultural value chains in Lao Cai Province, including cinnamon, tea, bamboo shoots, sticky rice, indigenous apples (táo mèo), mulberry, medicinal herbs, and mixed vegetables. Accordingly, all technical support and interventions implemented to date have been focused on prioritizing entities and stakeholders engaged in these selected value chains.

2. Rationale and Purpose of the Midterm Impact Evaluation

By March 2027, the Project will have completed its first two years of full implementation (fiscal year 3 and year 4), marking an important milestone to assess progress and inform planning for the remaining years, including Years 5 and 6. The midterm impact evaluation, adopting the OECD-DAC performance criteria¹, aims at assessing the **project's outcome-level changes** and performance that align to the PMF and for learning and planning purposes. It will also focus on evaluating the activity-level design and implementation, value-for-money and potential opportunities for partnership with relevant stakeholders since the administrative merger effective 1 July 2025.

¹ Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, Coherence, Sustainability

3. Objectives of the Midterm Evaluation

The midterm evaluation is intended to serve four key objectives:

1. **Capture progress across outcome-level indicators in the PMF**, including the Ultimate Outcome, Intermediate Outcomes, and associated Immediate Outcomes.
2. **Assess changes in behaviour, adoption of practices, and early signs of institutionalization** among target beneficiaries, intermediaries, and partner institutions.
3. **Respond to selected evaluation questions using a hybrid approach**, combining focused impact assessment with selected OECD-DAC criteria, particularly **Effectiveness, Impact, and Sustainability**.
4. **Generate actionable recommendations for the remaining years of implementation** to strengthen delivery, learning, and sustainability.

Specifically, the evaluation will:

1. **Measure progress towards the Ultimate Outcome, two Intermediate Outcomes and their associated Immediate Outcomes.** Building on existing data that is being collected by the project, the midterm evaluation will be required to assess progress against the Ultimate, Intermediate and Immediate outcome indicators as outlined in the PMF (See details in Annex 1).
2. **Capture outcome-level intended and unintended change beyond indicator measurement**, including behavioural change, adoption of improved practices, early institutional shifts, and signs of ownership, replication, and sustainability among EMW, MSMEs/cooperatives/producer groups, and relevant stakeholders.
3. **Apply selected OECD-DAC criteria** to examine key evaluation questions, with particular emphasis on **Effectiveness, Impact, and Sustainability**. Under **Effectiveness**, the evaluation should go beyond progress against PMF indicators to examine how and why change is occurring, including contribution pathways, behavioural and institutional dimensions, GEDSI-related outcomes, and any intended and unintended effects. Where relevant, key assumptions in the project's logic model should also be tested.
4. **Assess cross-cutting dimensions**, particularly **GEDSI and climate resilience/clean growth**, as integral to the analysis of results, effectiveness, and sustainability rather than as standalone themes only.
5. **Generate clear and prioritised recommendations for Years 5 and 6** to strengthen implementation, adaptive management, sustainability, and the project's contribution to women's economic empowerment and clean, climate-resilient growth in Lao Cai.

4. Scope of the Midterm Evaluation

4.1. Technical focuses

The midterm evaluation should use the OECD-DAC criteria as a guiding framework; however, its primary focus should be on capturing and assessing results to determine the

effectiveness and impact of the project, including its contribution to GEDSI, sustainability, and continued relevance to the local context. In line with this hybrid approach, effectiveness should be assessed against the PMF indicators while also examining the extent to which observed changes can be linked to project interventions.

In addition to quantitative measurement of progress, the evaluation should generate qualitative evidence to better understand changes in behaviours, practices, agency, and institutional engagement among target groups and intermediaries. Particular emphasis should be placed on capturing results across the PMF outcome levels, especially under Intermediate Outcomes 1100 and 1200, and on explaining how these changes are emerging for EMW, MSMEs/cooperatives/producer groups, and relevant public and community actors.

This includes assessing: (1) changes in the performance, resilience, and market engagement of EMW-focused MSMEs/cooperatives/producer groups within targeted value chains; (2) the effectiveness and tangible results of clean growth solutions and their contribution to climate-resilient agriculture; (3) improved access to and use of market opportunities, technologies, productive resources, and financial services; (4) changes in the perception, agency, voice, and active participation of EMW in climate-resilient agriculture and related decision-making processes; and (5) strengthened institutional capacity, coordination, and enabling conditions among actors such as the WU, PCA, DARD, commune authorities, and other relevant stakeholders. Across these areas, the evaluation also seek to understand qualitative dimensions of change, including behaviour change, adoption of practices, early signs of institutionalization, and any emerging unintended effects.

4.3. Time frame

The evaluation timeframe should cover the implementation period from March 2025 to March 2027.

5. Key Evaluation Questions

The key evaluation questions are aligned with the intermediate outcomes and immediate outcomes describing in the Annex 2. Interim Evaluation Matrix. It is recommended that the evaluation team review and submit an enhanced matrix in the technical proposal.

6. Methodology

The midterm evaluation will adopt a mixed methods of data collection such as surveys, KIIs, FGDs, document review and a limited number of deeper impact case studies feeding into the DAC structured findings. The data analysis should go through the baseline-midline comparison, differentiation between the value chains, gender and geography and other parameters as the foundation of qualitative and quantitative data disaggregation. Statistical tests should be applied where appropriated. The thematic coding, data source triangulation and contribution analysis with proven data will be deployed clearly. Embedding GEDSI within the analytical approach, clarify how

intersectionality and barriers faced by EMW will be analysed across outcome areas (particularly under effectiveness, behaviour change, and institutionalization) is critical.

6.1 Desk Review

The evaluation will be commenced with the project document review including PIP, PMF, baseline report, project reports and the annual work plans. Additionally, the accompanied studies and activities report produced by the project will be supplemented document. The desk review findings (especially baseline and PMF data) will be used analytically as a comparator for midterm results and to inform sampling, tool design, and contribution analysis.

6.2 Quantitative Method

The survey with institutional (trained entities and grant recipients) and individual (entities staff and manager and affiliated members) beneficiaries reached directly and indirectly through the interventions is necessary to populate quantitative results to date across the eight prioritised value chains, geography and ethnic groups. The survey data should link to PMF indicators, including baseline-midline comparison and aggregation of results at outcome level (especially 1100 and 1200).

The applicant should propose a representative survey design, including justification of sample size and methodology, aligned with the program's reach and evaluation objectives.

6.3 Qualitative Method

The qualitative component will be designed to explain and contextualize quantitative findings, with a particular focus on behaviour change, adoption of practices, GEDSI outcomes, and (un)intended effects across target groups and intermediaries.

Data collection tools will include:

- Key Informant Interviews (KIs);
- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs);
- In-depth interviews with a sub-sample of respondents to explore specific thematic areas (e.g., agency, leadership, and decision-making).

Qualitative data will be analysed using a structured analytical framework, including thematic coding and, where appropriate, outcome harvesting and contribution analysis, to assess how and why changes are occurring and the extent to which they can be linked to project interventions.

This analysis will explicitly integrate GEDSI considerations across all outcome areas, including examination of intersectionality (e.g., gender and ethnicity), barriers faced by EMW, and differences in access, agency, and participation across target groups. GEDSI dimensions will therefore be analysed as part of the core assessment of effectiveness, behaviour change, and institutionalization, rather than as a standalone theme.

Case Studies

Case studies will be used as an analytical approach within the qualitative component to support triangulation and deeper understanding of outcome-level change. A limited number of two in-depth case studies will be selected to illustrate key dimensions of change emerging under the program.

The case studies will be purposively selected to reflect diversity across:

- Value chains;
- Types of interventions (e.g., grants, technical support, training);
- Stakeholder groups (e.g., EMW, MSMEs/cooperatives, institutional actors).

Each case study will aim to:

- Illustrate contribution pathways between project interventions and observed outcomes;
- Provide evidence on behaviour change, adoption of practices, and GEDSI-related outcomes;
- Assess sustainability, institutionalization, and potential for replication or scaling of interventions.

The final selection and design of case studies will be refined during the inception phase, in consultation with the project team, to ensure alignment with evaluation priorities and available resources. The following themes are referral for developing case studies, ordered by prioritisation:

- 1) Clean growth solutions and climate-resilient agriculture: adoption, viability, and scalability of CSA/clean energy interventions
- 2) Women's economic empowerment and leadership: agency, leadership, decision-making, and participation in value chains
- 3) Institutional strengthening and enabling environment EMW leadership/influence: effectiveness of government actors (WU, PCA, DAE) and sustainability of interventions
- 4) Capacity strengthening of MSMEs/cooperatives/producers
- 5) Market opportunities and systems development

6.4 Geographic coverage and Sampling frame

The field data collection plan should cover the project's impact areas at the entrepreneurial and individual beneficiaries' location. The sites for data collection will be agreed based on the discussion with the Project and partners (PCA, WU) and specific communes/wards considered as impact area. After the July 2025, the project impact area are 38 wards and communes of Lao Cai province and belong to the former Yen Bai districts and town including Yen Bai town, Van Yen, Luc Yen, Van Chan, Tram Tau and Mu Cang Chai district.

6.5 Validation

The evaluators and the Project team will arrange a validation workshop after the first draft reported agreed. This workshop aims at triangulation of results, refinement of conclusions, and testing of preliminary contribution pathways with stakeholders. This

extended validation workshops with local partners will be held following before the final reported is finalized.

6.6 Sampling approach

The sampling approach will ensure representation across key stakeholder groups while remaining proportionate. The evaluator team should propose a feasible sample size that will be integrated in the Evaluation Matrix that help for clear approach in data collection and data validation mean:

6.6.1. Key Informant Interviews (KIs)

These should be based on the list of participants or stakeholder who were actively engaged in the program.

- Project team (HQ + field): 3–5
- Government partners (PPC, PCA, WU, commune leaders): 10–15
- MSMEs/Cooperatives/Producers groups: 30–35

Total KIs: 45–55 interviews

6.6.2. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)

- EMW beneficiaries (by district/value chain): 6–8 FGDs
- Mixed groups (WU, leaders, community actors): 2–3 FGDs
- MSMEs/Cooperatives/Producers groups: 5–6 FGDs

Total FGDs: 13–17 groups (6–8 participants each)

6.6.3. Survey

The sample size (N) calculation must be based on the total program reach to date, 95% confidence with 10% margin of error, and test 90% / 5% scenarios, and using assumptions of design effect and non-response rate. The evaluation team should propose in the inception report a feasible sample size and survey plan to meet the contextual conditions and resources.

7. Quality Control

7.1 Ethical Considerations/safeguards

All the fieldwork must adhere to Cowater's Code of Conduct and Vietnam's Laws ensuring informed consent, confidentiality, and gender sensitiveness.

7.2 Technical Quality

To secure evaluation and deliverables quality (detailed in Section 8 below), the evaluation team should propose clearly the commitments during the execution of the evaluation. It is suggested that the inception report, field plan, data collection tools, initial reflection from fieldwork and reports are discussed open and agreed among the evaluation team and local partners. The evaluation methodology and tools must be developed and validated in consultation with the SPRINT Team Leader, SPRINT MEL Specialist, and HQ MEL Advisor to ensure alignment with PMF, GAC standards, and program realities. Any changes with the agreed document and approaches should be

consulted with the Project in advance. The component leads (of 1100 and 1200) and Clean Growth, Energy & Environment Specialist and Grant Manager will be responsible for technical oversight, strengthening the review/feedback loop (including timelines and accountability), and ensuring clearer links between data quality, triangulation, and deliverable approval standards.

The data analysis should be processed by clear methods and relevant software(s) for qualitative and quantitative inputs. Data collection tools should be piloted and well-trained to the enumerators as well as consulted with the local partners.

7.3. Deliverable Review Process

- The SPRINT project team will review all deliverables and provide consolidated feedback.
- Each deliverable will undergo at least one formal review cycle.
- The evaluation team must address all substantive comments before final approval.

8. Deliverables

The evaluation team will be responsible for producing a set of high-quality, evidence-based deliverables that meet GAC and Cowater standards. The deliverables should demonstrate clear triangulation of quantitative and qualitative findings, with explicit reference to data sources. All the deliverable must be evidence-based, clearly structured, and aligned with the PMF and evaluation questions.

Data must be fully accessible to the project, including dataset, codebook, tools and coding frameworks.

The evaluation team is responsible for addressing consolidated feedback from the project team before final approval.

All deliverables should be submitted in English (and Vietnamese where applicable), and undergo at least one formal review cycle.

Stage	Deliverable	Description / Content
1. Inception Phase	Inception Report	- Detailed methodology, evaluation design, and refined workplan
		- Evaluation matrix linking questions to PMF indicators, data sources, and methods
		- Sampling strategy and rationale (aligned with program outreach)
		- Draft data collection tools (survey, KII/FGD guides, case study approach)
		- Ethical and safeguarding protocols, data management plan
		- Limitations and mitigation measures
		- Proposed Table of Contents for the final report

2. Tools & Data Preparation	Final Data Collection Tools and Dataset Framework	- Finalized quantitative and qualitative tools (including consent language and enumerator guidance)
		- Enumerator training materials and observation/checklists
		- Data collection protocols and quality assurance procedures
3. Data Outputs	Clean Dataset and Raw Data Submission	- Clean, anonymized quantitative dataset(s) with codebooks
		- Qualitative raw data (transcripts, notes, summaries)
		- Documentation of disaggregation (e.g., sex, ethnicity, geography, value chain)
4. Analysis and Drafting	Draft Mid-Term Evaluation Report	- Structured report aligned with agreed Table of Contents
		- Analysis of progress against PMF indicators (1100, 1200 and relevant immediate outcomes)
		- Presentation of findings across OECD-DAC criteria (with clear linkage to outcomes)
		- Integration of qualitative insights (behavioural change, unintended results)
		- Preliminary conclusions and prioritized, actionable recommendations
		- Annexes (methodology, evaluation matrix, tools, limitations)
5. Validation	Validation Workshop	- Presentation of preliminary findings and recommendations to project stakeholders
		- Facilitation of validation and feedback discussions
		- Documentation and integration of stakeholder feedback
6. Final Outputs	Final Mid-Term Evaluation Report	- Revised report incorporating stakeholder feedback
		- Strengthened analysis of outcome-level progress and contribution pathways
		- Clear, practical recommendations for the remaining project period
		- Compliance with GAC reporting and formatting standards
7. Knowledge Products (Optional but Recommended)	Summary Briefs	- 2–3 concise (4–6 page) briefs highlighting key findings, lessons learned, and recommendations for different audiences (e.g., policy stakeholders, implementing partners, CSOs)

9. Timeline and Work Plan

The midterm evaluation is scheduled for Q4 (January-March 2027) with an estimated 50 working days, to be refined once scope and budget parameters are confirmed. The evaluation work plan should cover the tasks and deliverables as follows:

Phase	Tasks and Deliverables	Timing	LoE (days) consultancy
1	Contracting and a preparatory meeting to finalize the proposal	Week 1	1
2	Desk review and inception report preparation	Weeks 1–2	7
3	Inception report submission and finalization	Week 3	2
4	Data collection tools, field work plan preparation and finalization	Week 4	4
5	Enumerator training (1 day), tools piloting (2 days) and data collection (12 days)	Weeks 5–6	15
6	Field data collection validation meetings	Week 5 and 7	1
7	Data cleaning and analysis	Weeks 8–9	7
8	Preliminary findings presentation	Week 10	1
9	Draft report submission	Week 11	5
10	Validation workshop	Week 12	1
11	Final report and learning products	Weeks 13–14	6
Total			50 days

10. Team Composition and Qualification

This assignment is open **only to Vietnamese** consultant teams or service providers legally registered and operating in Viet Nam. It is recommended that Vietnamese consultant team or service provider with experience in agriculture business, value chain development, clean growth, gender equality, and women's economic empowerment.

No.	Position	Required qualifications
1	Team Leader / Senior Evaluation Specialists	• Degree in evaluation, development studies, economics, agriculture, gender studies, climate change, social sciences, or related field. • At least 10 years of experience leading evaluations of donor-funded development projects. • Experience with OECD-DAC criteria and theory-based evaluation. • Strong understanding of RBM and PMF-based assessment. • Experience with contribution analysis, outcome harvesting, or similar methods. • Excellent English report writing skills. • Experience in Vietnam or Southeast Asia is strongly preferred.
2	Gender Equality / WEE Specialist	• Strong experience in gender equality, women's economic empowerment, ethnic minority inclusion, and social norms analysis. • Experience designing and applying gender-sensitive qualitative and quantitative tools. • Understanding barriers faced by EMW in agriculture, household decision-making, leadership, and market participation. • Ability to analyze empowerment beyond participation numbers.
3	Clean Growth / Climate / Agriculture Specialist	• Experience in CSA, renewable energy, energy efficiency, climate resilience, low-carbon agriculture, or clean technology adoption. • Ability to assess technical appropriateness, adoption, maintenance, financial viability, and scalability. • Experience working with MSMEs, cooperatives, producer groups, or agricultural value chains.
4	Quantitative Research and MERL Specialist	• Experience designing surveys and analyzing PMF data. • Strong skills in data cleaning, statistical analysis, and indicator review. • Experience with baseline-midline comparison. • Ability to prepare clean datasets, codebooks, and technical memos.
5	Local Researchers / Enumerators	• Experience conducting KIIs, FGDs, and surveys in rural and ethnic minority contexts. • Vietnamese language fluency. • Local language capacity is an advantage. • Training in safeguarding, informed consent, and gender-sensitive interviewing.

11. Submission Package Requirements

Interested consultant teams should submit a package in **English** of:

1. **Technical Proposal**, including:
 - Understanding of the assignment
 - Detailed evaluation methodology (quantitative and qualitative approaches)
 - Sampling strategy aligned with program outreach
2. **Proposed evaluation matrix** linking evaluation questions, indicators, data sources, and methods (mandatory)
 - Data management, quality assurance, and triangulation approach
 - Risk mitigation measures
 - Detailed work plan and timeline (including level of effort)
3. **Team Composition and Roles**, including:
 - Clear roles and responsibilities of each team member
 - Level of effort (days) allocation per expert
4. **CVs of Proposed Team Members**
5. **Relevant Evaluation Report Samples** (maximum 2–3)
6. **Financial Proposal**, including:
 - Detailed budget breakdown (professional fees, fieldwork, travel, data collection, translation, etc.)
 - Level of effort by team member
 - Key assumptions
7. **Availability Statement**
8. **Safeguarding, Ethics, and Data Protection Statement**
9. **Declaration of No Conflict of Interest**

12. Proposal Selection Criteria

Main Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Weight (%)
1. Technical Proposal (50%)	Methodological rigor and evaluation design (mixed methods, OECD-DAC alignment, theory-based approach)	15%
	Alignment with GAC/RBM and PMF (quality of evaluation matrix, outcome measurement, contribution analysis)	10%
	Sampling and data collection approach (feasibility, tools, triangulation, data quality)	10%
	GEDSI integration and context responsiveness (WEE, ethnic minority inclusion, behavioural change analysis)	5%
	Clean growth / climate / agriculture relevance (technical understanding and assessment of adoption/scalability)	5%
	Workplan, feasibility, and risk management (realistic timeline, LoE, mitigation measures)	5%
Subtotal		50%

2. Team Composition and Experience (30%)	Team role, composition and experience (role clarity, balance of expertise, inclusion of local capacity)	20%
	Relevant past performance (quality and relevance of submitted evaluation samples)	10%
Subtotal		30%
3. Financial Proposal (20%)	Cost competitiveness / value for money	10%
	Budget clarity and realism (breakdown, alignment with methodology, assumptions)	10%
Subtotal		20%
Total		100%

Scoring guidance:

Each sub-criterion will be scored on a scale of 0–5 (0 = unacceptable, 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = very good, 5 = excellent). Scores will be weighted according to the percentages above to derive the final technical, team, and financial scores.

Annex 1: SPRINT's Outcomes and Related Indicators

EXPECTED RESULTS	INDICATORS
Ultimate Outcome 1000: Enhanced socioeconomic wellbeing of Ethnic Minority Women (EMW) in agriculture and clean growth in Yen Bai province of Vietnam	1000.1: Perception of provincial authorities of the increase to EMW's empowerment through clean economic growth 1000.2: % of total EMW (disaggregated by ethnicity, age group, disability, and commodity, where relevant) surveyed expressing a positive change in their socio-economic conditions
Intermediate Outcome 1100: Improved performance of EMW-focused MSMEs/coops/producer groups in gender responsive and climate resilient value chains in the agriculture sector	1100.1: # of total targeted EMW-focused MSMEs/coops/producers, reporting improved performance by applying climate smart techniques in gender responsive and resilient value chains in the agriculture sector 1100.2: % of total targeted EMW-focused MSMEs/coops/producers, reporting improved performance by applying climate smart techniques in gender responsive and resilient value chains in the agriculture sector 1100.3: total number of targeted EMW engaged, reporting improved performance through gender responsive and resilient value chains in the agriculture sector (improved performance includes but may not be limited to, increased sales revenue, improved productivity, and reduced cost from energy efficient and/or RE/EE solutions) 1100.4: # of tons of greenhouse gas emissions reduced 1100.5: \$ value of increased sales revenue of EMW-focused MSMEs/ coops/producers through gender responsive and climate resilient value chains 1100.6: # of hectares (area) of farmland, and other managed agricultural landscapes under climate smart agriculture management
Intermediate Outcome 1200: Increased influence of EMW in clean economic growth in the agriculture sector	1200.1: % of total EMW in surveyed reported increased confidence their ability to actively participate and/or influence in the clean economy 1200.2: Narrative of their perception of their influence on discussions or decisions in agriculture and clean economy at the HH and community level

EXPECTED RESULTS	INDICATORS
	1200.3: # of EMW surveyed that implemented an agreed minimum set of climate-smart agriculture or food system strategies, technologies or practices that support low carbon pathways, disaster risk reduction pathways, and reduce climate vulnerability
Immediate Outcome 1110: Improved business capacity of EMW-focused MSMEs/coops/ producer groups in business development, management, and building market linkages in agriculture	1110.1: # and % of total targeted EMW-focused MSMEs/coops/producers reporting increased confidence in their business capabilities 1110.2: % of total targeted EMW-focused MSMEs/coops/producers, apply recommended practices on business and financial management from their trainings/awareness (usage) 1110.3: # of total targeted EMW reporting positive changes in business development service and management services, information, and new/expanding markets/linkages (usage/adoption)
Immediate Outcome 1120: Enhanced climate adaptive capacity of EMW-focused MSMEs/coops/ producer groups in agriculture.	1120.1: # (total) of EMW-focused MSMEs/coops/producers using climate resilient agricultural solutions (i.e. RE/EE solutions) 1120.2: Nature of changes 1120.3: # of total targeted EMW reporting improved capacity to use climate adaptation solutions
Immediate Outcome 1130: Enhanced ability of EMW-focused MSMEs/coops/ producer groups to innovate for clean growth solutions in agriculture	1130.1: # (total) of EMW-focused MSMEs/coops/producers adopting innovative approaches for clean growth solutions in agriculture 1130.2: Narrative on the nature of innovative approaches being adopted
Immediate Outcome 1210: Increased access to productive resources and clean growth opportunities by EMW in agriculture	1210.1: # (total) of targeted EMW having access to productive resources, finance and clean growth opportunities in agriculture 1210.2: Narrative of new opportunities in clean growth
Immediate Outcome 1220: Improved ability of EMW to be active participants and leaders in resilient and clean- growth solutions in agriculture	1220.1: # of total targeted EMW report improved awareness and/or ability to actively participate or lead in using resilient and clean growth solutions in agriculture
Immediate Outcome 1230: Increased capacity of key public, private and	1230.1: % of key public, private and community actors surveyed including the WU, PCA, DARD and other Government agencies reporting increased confidence

EXPECTED RESULTS	INDICATORS
community actors, including the WU, PCA and DARD, and other relevant Government agencies, to promote the socio-economic empowerment of EMW	in their capacity to promote the socio-economic empowerment of EMW 1230.2: Narrative on types of initiatives taken to support or promote socio-economic empowerment of EMW by key public, private and community actors. 1230.3: % of total targeted EMW surveyed who report improved perception of the public, private and community stakeholders' ability to promote participation of and socio-economic empowerment of EMW

Annex 2: Interim Evaluation Matrix

EXPECTED RESULTS AND INDICATORS	KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS	DATA COLLECTION METHODS
Intermediate Outcome 1100: Improved performance of EMW-focused MSMEs/coops/ producer groups in gender responsive and climate resilient value chains in the agriculture sector		
1100.1: # of total targeted EMW-focused MSMEs/coops/producers, reporting improved performance by applying climate smart techniques in gender responsive and resilient value chains in the agriculture sector 1100.2: % of total targeted EMW-focused MSMEs/coops/producers, reporting improved performance by applying climate smart techniques in gender responsive and resilient value chains in the agriculture sector 1100.3: total number of targeted EMW engaged, reporting improved performance through gender responsive and resilient value chains in the agriculture sector (improved performance includes but may not be limited to, increased sales revenue, improved productivity, and reduced cost from energy efficient and/or RE/EE solutions) 1100.4: # of tons of greenhouse gas emissions reduced	• To what extent have MSMEs/coops/producers improved business performance (productivity, market linkage, profitability...)? • What behavior changes are observed by adoption of climate-resilient and clean growth practices? • What factors enable or hinder improved enterprise performance? • To what extent are gender equality and inclusion outcomes being achieved? • Are barriers faced by EMW (access, norms, resources) being reduced? • How effectively is climate resilience integrated into business and production practices? • To what extent are the improved business, climate adaptive, and clean growth practices (CSA, clean energy, market linkages) adopted by EMW and their MSMEs, cooperatives and producer groups likely to be financially and economically viable and to continue beyond SPRINT support, and how does this differ across EMW subgroups (ethnicity, remoteness, enterprise maturity)?	• Desk review project's document • Survey and KII with entities trained and received grants • IDI and FGD with groups of EMW and household members in the value chain

EXPECTED RESULTS AND INDICATORS	KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS	DATA COLLECTION METHODS
1100.5: \$ value of increased sales revenue of EMW-focused MSMEs/ coops/producers through gender responsive and climate resilient value chains 1100.6: # of hectares (area) of farmland, and other managed agricultural landscapes under climate smart agriculture management	Has an appropriate exit and transition strategy been developed, and is there demonstrated willingness and capacity among EMW, enterprises, and partners to sustain benefits and the enabling environment after the project closes?	
Intermediate Outcome 1200: Increased influence of EMW in clean economic growth in the agriculture sector		
1200.1: % of total EMW in surveyed reported increased confidence their ability to actively participate and/or influence in the clean economy 1200.2: Narrative of their perception of their influence on discussions or decisions in agriculture and clean economy at the HH and community level 1200.3: # of EMW surveyed that implemented an agreed minimum set of climate-smart agriculture or food system strategies, technologies or practices that support low carbon pathways, disaster risk reduction pathways, and reduce climate vulnerability	- To what extent has the influence, agency, and leadership of EMW increased in clean economic growth in agriculture? - To what extent are gender equality and inclusion outcomes being achieved? - Are barriers faced by EMW (access, norms, resources) being reduced? - Is there any specific marginalised group of EMW with special needs? - To what extent are the capacities, tools, and coordination mechanisms introduced through SPRINT being integrated and institutionalized within partner institutions (WU, PCA, DAE) to sustain support to EMW economic empowerment and clean growth beyond the project? - What evidence is there of partner institutions and government actors demonstrating sustained commitment, capacity, and budgetary or staffing	- Desk review project's document - KII with Women's Union and other stakeholders - Survey, IDI and FGD with groups of EMW, household members in the value chain, and influencers trained by project

EXPECTED RESULTS AND INDICATORS	KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS	DATA COLLECTION METHODS
	allocation to continue promoting EMW participation and clean, climate resilient agriculture? • Do SPRINT's tested models (grants, training approaches, CSA and clean energy solutions, market systems) show potential for replication or scaling beyond the target value chains and communes, or for integration into government plans and budgets? • What financial, institutional, political, and environmental risks or trade-offs may undermine the durability of SPRINT's results, including those arising from the 1 July 2025 administrative merger, and how resilient are the underlying systems and capacities to these? • What factors are enabling or constraining institutional uptake, coordination, and the continuation of benefits across the different target groups and levels?	
Immediate Outcome 1110: Improved business capacity of EMW-focused MSMEs/coops/ producer groups in business development, management, and building market linkages in agriculture		
1110.1: # and % of total targeted EMW-focused MSMEs/coops/producers reporting increased confidence in their business capabilities 1110.2: % of total targeted EMW-focused MSMEs/coops/producers, apply recommended practices on business and	• To what extent have MSMEs/coops/producers improved in services delivery comprising business management, financial management, and market linkages? • What are observed in business practices and service delivery capacity? • Who and how are the benefits with affiliates in the	To be developed by evaluation team

EXPECTED RESULTS AND INDICATORS	KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS	DATA COLLECTION METHODS
financial management from their trainings/awareness (usage) 1110.3: # of total targeted EMW reporting positive changes in business development service and management services, information, and new/expanding markets/linkages (usage/adoption)	value chain?	
Immediate Outcome 1120: Enhanced climate adaptive capacity of EMW-focused MSMEs/coops/ producer groups in agriculture.		
1120.1: # (total) of EMW-focused MSMEs/coops/producers using climate resilient agricultural solutions (i.e. RE/EE solutions) 1120.2: Nature of changes 1120.3: # of total targeted EMW reporting improved capacity to use climate adaptation solutions	- To what extent are target groups adopting climate-resilient and clean growth technologies and practices? - What evidence exists of improved adaptive capacity? - Who and how are the benefits with targeted groups including MSMEs/coops/ producer groups affiliates?	To be developed by evaluation team
Immediate Outcome 1130: Enhanced ability of EMW- focused MSMEs/coops/ producer groups to innovate for clean growth solutions in agriculture		
1130.1: # (total) of EMW-focused MSMEs/coops/producers adopting innovative approaches for clean growth solutions in agriculture 1130.2: Narrative on the nature of innovative approaches being adopted	- To what extent are MSMEs/coops/producers innovating and adopting new clean growth solutions? - What is the evidence of replication or demonstration effects? - Who and how are the benefits with targeted groups including MSMEs/coops/ producer groups	To be developed by evaluation team

EXPECTED RESULTS AND INDICATORS	KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS	DATA COLLECTION METHODS
	affiliates?	
Immediate Outcome 1210: Increased access to productive resources and clean growth opportunities by EMW in agriculture		
1210.1: # (total) of targeted EMW having access to productive resources, finance and clean growth opportunities in agriculture 1210.2: Narrative of new opportunities in clean growth	- To what extent has EMW access to financial services, inputs, technologies, and business development services improved? - Are services more responsive to the specific needs of EMW (e.g., culturally appropriate, accessible)? - What barriers (social, economic, geographic) remain for EMW in accessing these services? - How has improved access translated into changes in economic opportunities or outcomes?	To be developed by evaluation team
Immediate Outcome 1220: Improved ability of EMW to be active participants and leaders in resilient and clean- growth solutions in agriculture		
1220.1: # of total targeted EMW report improved awareness and/or ability to actively participate or lead in using resilient and clean growth solutions in agriculture	- What changes are observed in leadership roles held by EMW (e.g., in cooperatives, producer groups, local institutions)? - What factors have enabled or constrained EMW participation and leadership? - Are these changes sustained beyond project-supported activities?	To be developed by evaluation team
Immediate Outcome 1230: Increased capacity of key public, private and community actors, including the WU, PCA and DARD, and other relevant Government agencies, to promote the socio-economic empowerment of EMW		
1230.1: % of key public, private and community actors surveyed including the WU, PCA, DARD and other Government agencies reporting increased confidence in	- What changes are observed in attitudes and behaviors of key stakeholders (e.g., government, private sector, communities)? - What and how do key stakeholders influence the	To be developed by evaluation team

EXPECTED RESULTS AND INDICATORS	KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS	DATA COLLECTION METHODS
their capacity to promote the socio-economic empowerment of EMW 1230.2: Narrative on types of initiatives taken to support or promote socio-economic empowerment of EMW by key public, private and community actors. 1230.3: % of total targeted EMW surveyed who report improved perception of the public, private and community stakeholders' ability to promote participation of and socio-economic empowerment of EMW	community happened? • Are there examples of institutionalization (e.g., policies adopted, practices embedded)? • What is the likelihood of sustainability and scaling of these changes?	