

Regional Climate Smart Agriculture (RCSA) Programme

Terms of Reference for Project Mid-Term Review (MTR) to be Conducted by an External Consultant

# **Background**

The NORAD supported Regional Climate Smart Agriculture Programme (RCSA) aims to reduce the vulnerability of targeted rural communities in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda to climate change while improving the livelihoods of those communities. The means to achieve this programme result will entail increasing the capacity of the CFU’s In-Country Partners (ICPs) and interested Civil Society Organisations to deliver high-calibre Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) Conservation Farming Minimal Tillage (CF MT) to their Lead Farmers and farmers. It is envisioned that the 2 098 programme Lead Farmers will continue to provide timely and appropriate training and support to interested farmers after the end of the programme.

Over the life of the programme, the CFU expects to have 49 340 CF MT small-scale farming adopters, who will have converted 32 190 hectares to one form of CF MT practice or another by 2020 – *see the table 1 below* for a country-by-country breakdown.

**Table 1: Summary of Key Programme One and Two Outcomes and Outputs (2017-2020)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **LFs Trained** | **Farmers Trained** | **CF MT Adopters** | **Hectares Converted** |
| Kenya | 900 | 25 000 | 12 000 | 8 100 |
| Tanzania | 198 | 51 020 | 17 340 | 11 290 |
| Uganda | 1 000 | 50 000 | 20 000 | 12 800 |
| **Totals** | **2 098** | **126 020** | **49 340** | **32 190** |

It is expected that all of these adopters will realise an increase in their on-farm yields by up to 50% and at least 80% of the adopting households will have sufficient maize stocks from one harvest to the next.

By training farmers, farmer groups, CSO executives and extension staff and Public and Private Sector partners in Climate Smart Agriculture Conservation Farming Min Tillage, the programme directly addresses five of the seventeen United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDG):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| SDG Number | SDG | RCSA Impact |
| 1 | No Poverty | Increased yields from the correct application of the CSA CF MT practices will enable rural households and their communities to realise higher income streams from their agricultural activities.  Increasing the capacity of targeted CSO leaders to access key services such as inputs, markets and third party service providers and technical knowledge for the benefit of their members will also lead to increased incomes for farmer group members as well as third party service providers such as tillage and spray service providers. |
| 2 | Zero Hunger | This is accomplished by doubling and tripling (through the correct application of the CSA CF MT practices) on-farm productivity especially for women. The correct application of the CSA CF MT practices also improves in the medium term soil quality ensuring the longer term viability of the farm holdings. |
| 5 | Gender Equality | The RCSA aims to ensure that CSO leaders provide equal access training and learning platforms for all key programme activities. The RCSA is also aiming to increase the number of women in CSO leadership roles and as Lead Farmers. Ensuring that women have equal access to the various training and learning platforms increases their chances at making their farming activities much more profitable for themselves and their families. |
| 13 | Climate Action | The RCSA is exposing farmers and policy makers across several levels to the climate smart attributes that the correct application of the CF MT practices can have. |

Addressing these five UN SDGs is also in line with NORAD’s long-term goals of improving the livelihoods and resilience to climate change and economic shocks of vulnerable rural households in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda.

For further detail regarding the programme’s design and goals lease refer to the programme proposal and results framework.

# **Rationale and Purpose**

The rationale for the RCSA Mid-Term Review is three-fold:

1. As a management and learning tool for the CFU, NORAD, and the contracted partners;
2. Act as an assessment to test the continued validity of the programme;
3. Assist the CFU and its partners to make adjustments to key programme activities and approaches (if required) to ensure that programme milestones are satisfactorily met.

The MTR should also examine, what reasons (if any) are impacting progress against targets.

# **Objectives**

There are five key objectives to the Mid-Term Review:

1. Assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of project implementation, including assessing the institutional arrangement, partnerships, risk management, M&E and project implementation
2. Determining the relevance of the RCSA project in relation to the existing needs of the stakeholders and environment,
3. Independently determine the results achieved to-date, and to assess to what extent the objectives of the RCSA are achieved, or likely to be achieved;
4. Assessing the long term sustainability of project interventions after the close of the programme;
5. Identifying lessons learned on the strategic approach (strategic processes and mechanisms chosen to achieve the project objectives),

# **Scope of the Evaluation**

Within this framework, specific issues and questions to be addressed will include, but not be limited to, the following:

## Effectiveness

* 1. Are the activities implemented in accordance with the project plans? If not, why?
  2. What outputs have been achieved? To what extent do they contribute to the objectives?
  3. How effective are the approaches and structures in delivering the desired outputs? How can they be improved?
  4. Do the ICPs work with CFU HQ effectively?
  5. Is the partnership structure effective in achieving the desired outputs?
  6. Has the partnership with the ICPs, ACT, and SACAU been effective? If not, then what have been main the issues or bottlenecks?

## Efficiency

1. Are the available technical and financial resources adequate to fulfil the project plans?
2. Are the funds being spent in accordance with project plans and using the right procedures?
3. Have there been any unforeseen problems? How well were they dealt with?
4. Are the capacities of the partners adequate?
5. What have been the roles of the ICPs and staff and are they appropriate?
6. Is there an effective process, built into the management structure for self-monitoring and assessment, reporting and reflection?

## Relevance

1. Establish whether or not the design and approach are relevant in addressing the identified needs, issues and challenge
2. To what extent is the project contributing to the strategic policies and programmes of RCSA and that of the ICPs?

## Sustainability

1. Is the approach used likely to ensure a continued benefit after the end of the project?
2. Are all key stakeholders sufficiently and effectively involved? Are their expectations met and are they satisfied with their level of participation?
3. Are alternative or additional measures needed and, if so, what is required to ensure continued sustainability and positive impact?

## Impact

1. Is the project bringing about desired changes in the behaviour of people and institutions?
2. Have there been any unintended positive or negative impacts arising from particular outcomes?
3. What could have been the likely situation (of the environment and its management) without the project?
4. Which positive role and/or negative effects/impacts in terms of gender/vulnerable households and the environment can be attributed to the programme/
5. Have the CSOs working with the ICPs benefited from the programme and how?

# **Methodology**

The methodology for the mid-term review is to be developed through consultation with CFU HQ and ICPs taking into account the budget and the ToRs. The methodology adopted should update the preliminary issues and questions outlined within the ToRs, specifying the specific review issues, questions, methods of data collection and analysis that will be undertaken. It should encompass a combination of both qualitative and quantitative methods. It should also allow for wide consultation with all interested partners and stakeholders and should include:

## A desktop review of all relevant documentation, including (but not limited to):

1. Initial ½ day meeting (face-to-face if possible) or via Skype with the consultants. The initial meeting will focus on the following:

* Clarify the MTR deliverables
* Detailed time table and work plan to complete the MTR, with milestones
* MTR Report Template and Outline
* Clarify any outstanding issues with the consultant regarding the MTR and contract

1. The project document, contracts and related agreements;
2. Annual work plans and budgets
3. Progress Reports
4. Technical reports

## Face to face interviews and discussions

These are discussions with all key stakeholders involved in the project to ensure that the review is carried out in a participatory manner. A list of key ICPs and stakeholders would be identified at an early stage (see tentative list – attachment 1) and a consultation process developed. All stakeholders consulted should be in a position to present their views in confidence to the team and to identify issues, opportunities, constraints and options for the future

## Electronic interviews.

These can be through teleconference or written comments – e.g. email; where ICPs cannot be reached for face to face interviews. CFU HQ (Lusaka) and country partners will assist with the organisation of meetings and discussions, and inform the relevant stakeholders of the review process and their role in it, well in advance

# **Deliverables**

The review team shall be responsible for the following reports, which are to be submitted to the CFU HQ

1. An Inception report outlining the proposed methodology and detailed responsibilities of each team member to be submitted prior to the commencement of the MTR process.
2. A Findings report, which should include the following:
3. An assessment of the performance of the project, based on the project document, contracts and agreements
4. identification of the main lessons learned
5. A folder containing a combination of field pictures and cleaned and final dataset.

# **Timeline**

The mid-term review is scheduled to take place in the month of September 2019, for a total of 30 working days inclusive of travel and broken down as follows:

1. Review of background documentation and preparation of methodology – 3 days
2. Discussion and agreement on proposed methodology with project partners – 1 day
3. Assessment of project progress and performance – including field visits and interviews with project partners and key stakeholders – 14 days
4. Analysis of findings and production of draft report – 4 days
5. Debriefing - presentation and discussion of findings to project partners - 1 day
6. Finalization/revisions of the report and submission – 4 days
7. Travel days – 4 days

# **Qualifications of the Successful Applicants**

1. Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
2. Experience working in Eastern and Southern Africa.
3. Demonstrated understanding of issues related Conservation Agriculture/ Climate Smart Agriculture
4. Excellent communication skills;
5. Demonstrable analytical skills;
6. Project evaluation/review experiences within the Agriculture Sector is a great advantage;
7. A Master’s degree in Statistical sciences, Agriculture, economics or other closely related field. A lower degree with **vast** experience in evaluations is also acceptable.

# **Attachment 1:** Project partners and key stakeholders – tentative list

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Organisation and Country** | **Contact Person** | **Contact Details** | **Alternative Contact Person** | **Contact Details of Alternative** |
| 1. CFU HQ Lusaka, Zambia | Collins Nkatiko | +260 965 238 007 | Mike Mailloux  Eliot Zvarevashe | +260 965 238 141  +260 964 733 111 |
| 1. CFU HQ Lusaka, Zambia | Brenda Lungu | +260 978 905 827 |
| 1. CFU Tanzania | Hamisi Dulla | +255 782 722 488 | Moses Mjingo | +255 767 010965 |
| 1. REDS Uganda | Edward Gitta | +256 772 456892 | Alice Mukasa | +256 774 114519 |
| 1. PAFID – Nairobi, Kenya | Colin Gunson | +254 723 740522 | Anthony Kweyu Nyongesa | +254 723 882322 |