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1. Background and Context

The Southern Agriculture Growth Corridor (SAGCOT) Initiative is a private-public partnership that aims to mobilise private sector investment to achieve rapid and sustainable growth by facilitating the development of agricultural businesses through economies of scale, synergies and increased efficiencies. The SAGCOT Centre serves as the body coordinating the planning, implementation and monitoring of the initiative with collaboration from several supporting institutions. The initiative was aligned to the global commitment on sustainable and equitable development as was enshrined in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). UNDP support for the achievement of the MDGs in Tanzania was built on the country knowledge and experiences, as well as policy and planning processes as part of a comprehensive capacity development approach that promotes strong national ownership, facilitates cross-sectoral collaboration, enhances monitoring of development results and ensures participation by civil society and the private sector.

In 2009, a strategy called ‘*Kilimo Kwanza*’, meaning ‘Agriculture First’ or “Priority to Agriculture” was designed. It anchored the involvement of the private sector in the development of agriculture and underscored the critical importance of the private sector participating actively in agricultural production; and in the provision of agricultural inputs, crop marketing and in the agricultural value chain.

It is in this context that, the Government welcomed the idea of the SAGCOT initiative as a public private partnership (PPP) well-placed to achieve the objectives of *Kilimo Kwanza*, in Tanzania’s Southern Corridor which includes the coastal plains and the valleys of Kilombero and Ruaha, as well as the hills and valleys of the Southern Highlands and the Usangu flats. The Southern Agricultural Corridor has the potential of being the breadbasket of Tanzania and beyond the country’s borders. It aims at bringing about food security and wealth creation for the smallholder farmers.

2. Evaluation Purpose

This project evaluation will be conducted in fulfilment of UNDP regulations and rules guiding project evaluations. The UNDP Office in Tanzania is commissioning this evaluation to ascertain the outcomes and impact of the project measured against its original purpose, objectives whilst in the process capturing the evaluative evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of this project, which will set the stage for new initiatives. It is anticipated that the evaluation will outline lessons learned and recommendations which will be useful in contributing to the growing body of knowledge and future projects in agriculture. Specific objectives of the evaluation will be:

1. To assess efficiency and accountability of key partners in the implementation of the project in achieving the project’s outputs

ii)To assess effectiveness of project delivery methodology

1. To review project’s contribution in building institutional capacity of the SAGCOT Centre and available institutional mechanism for sustainability
2. To examine project practices and to provide recommendations on future such endeavors

3. Evaluation scope and objectives

Consistent with UNDP development efforts, UNDP evaluations are guided by the principles of gender equality, the rights-based approach and human development as appropriate. This evaluation assesses the extent to which project initiatives have addressed the issues of social and gender inclusion, equality and empowerment; contributed to strengthening the application of these principles; and incorporated the UNDP commitment to rights based approaches and gender mainstreaming in the project design.

The assignment will include the following tasks:

i) Review relevant SAGCOT initiative documents, project documents and reports to familiarise with the project objectives, intended outputs and outcomes.

ii) Review relevant government documents including Five Years Development Plan, Long – Term Perspective Plan, Annual Work Plans of the project and budgets

iii) Review project and activities implementation reports

iv) Take stock of results achieved and identify lessons learnt

v) Provide recommendations for future improvements of similar interventions and way forward

vi) Partnerships Analysis

* Examine the partnership among UN Agencies and other donor organizations in the relevant field: What partnerships have been formed? What has been the role of UNDP? What has the level of stakeholders’ participation been?
* Determine whether or not there is consensus among project actors, partners and stakeholders on the partnership strategy;
* Determine whether project’s partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective;
* Analyse how partnerships have been formed and how they performed;
* Examine how the partnership affected the achievement of progress towards the intended Outcome.

4. Evaluation questions

This evaluation seeks to answer, but is not limited to, the following questions, focused around the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability:

**Relevance -** *the extent to which the activities designed and implemented were suited to priorities and realities*

* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards the intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the projects design?
* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the project document.
* Review how the project address countries priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country?
* Review the decision-making processes – were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during the project design processes.
* Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.
* If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

**Effectiveness *-*** *the extent to which the programme has achieved its intended outputs and objectives*

* Review overall effectiveness of project management structure as outlined in the Project Document. Are responsibilities and reporting lines well defined? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Give recommendation for improvement.
* Review the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.
* Critically analyse the Multi Year Results and Resources Framework included in the project document.
* Has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?
* Has the project approach produced demonstrated successes?
* In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what has been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
* In which areas does the project have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they be overcome?
* What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project’s objectives?
* Has the project made strategic use of coordination and collaboration with other national institutions and with other donors in the country/region to increase its effectiveness and impact?
* Are the projects objectives and outcomes clear, practical, and feasible within its frame?
* How have stakeholders been involved in project implementation? How effective has the project been in establishing national ownership? Is project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives? Has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
* Review the quality of execution of the implementing partners and recommend areas for improvement.
* Are the project partners using the outputs? Have the outputs been transformed by project partners into outcomes?
* How do the outputs and outcomes contribute to the UNDP’s mainstreamed strategies?
* How do they contribute to gender equality?
* How do they contribute to the strengthening of the social partners and social dialogue?
* How do they contribute to strengthening the influence human rights standards?

**Efficiency**

* Has UNDP’s project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective?
* Has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
* Have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective? In general, do the results achieved justify the costs? Could the same results be attained with fewer resources?
* Have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
* How has the steering or advisory committee contributed to the success of the project?
* Does project governance facilitate good results and efficient delivery? Is there a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?
* Are the monitoring and evaluation systems that UNDP has in place helping to ensure effective and efficient project management?

**Sustainability**

* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?
* What is the risk that the level of stakeholder’s ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
* Are the current stakeholders in support of the long term objectives of the project?
* Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
* Do the current legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize the sustenance of the project benefits?
* Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize the sustenance of the projects outcomes?
* Do the UNDP interventions have well designed and well planned exit strategies?
* What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?
* What changes if any should be made in the current partnership (s) in order to promote long term sustainability?

**Partnership strategy**

* Has UNDP’s partnership strategy in the inclusive growth and sustainable livelihood pillar been appropriate and effective?
* Are there current or potential overlaps with existing partners’ programmes’?
* How have partnerships affected the progress towards achieving the outputs?
* Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and indirect stakeholders?
* Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in the project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
* To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?
* Review the internal project communication with stakeholders – is it regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms in place? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project results?
* Review the external project communication – are there proper means of communicating the impact of the project to the public?
* Summarize the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to the SDGs.

The evaluation should also include an assessment of the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration:

**Human rights**

* To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from UNDP Tanzania’s work in inclusive growth, particularly in an agricultural development context?

**Gender Equality**

* To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project? Is gender marker data assigned this project representative of reality?
* To what extent has UNDP Tanzania’s inclusive growth and private sector development policies and strategy support promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects? Information collected should be checked against data from the Results-oriented Annual Reports (ROAR) during the period under review.

Based on the above analysis, the evaluators are expected to provide overarching conclusions on the project results in this area of support, as well as recommendations on how the UNDP Tanzania Country Office could adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, and capacities to ensure that the intervention fully achieves planned outputs.

5. Methodology

The terminal evaluation will be carried out by two evaluators, one national and one international, and will engage a broad range of key stakeholders (see annex 1) and beneficiaries, including government officials, donors, civil society organizations, etc. in order to utilize existing information, examine local sources of knowledge and to enhance awareness about and mainstreaming results-based management. The evaluation exercise will be wide-ranging, consultative, and participatory, entailing a combination of comprehensive desk reviews, analysis and interviews. While interviews are a key instrument, all analysis must be based on observed facts to ensure that the evaluation is sound and objective. This precludes relying exclusively upon anecdotes, hearsay and unverified opinions. Findings should be specific, concise and supported by quantitative and/or qualitative information that is reliable, valid and verifiable.

An overall guidance on evaluation methodology can be found in the *UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results* and the *UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators*. The evaluators are expected to come up with a suitable methodology for this evaluation based on the guidance given in the above mentioned document. The terminal evaluation shall provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator shall review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase.

The consultants, in summary, are expected to use the following proposed methodologies:-

1. **Desk work**: This involves but not limited to literature review, review of project and relevant government documents, findings of which will be presented in the **inception report.**
2. **Key informant interview**: The consultant, guided by a checklist of issues and a questionnaire, will conduct interviews to gather key stakeholder comments on various issues regarding the project and its progress, and submit a field report.
3. **Field Visit**: The consultant will visit a few areas where project interventions were done and hold **Focus Group Discussion** with beneficiaries.
4. **Debrief session**: The consultant will hold a number of debriefing sessions with but not limited to relevant UNDP, SAGCOT Centre, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries –Ministry Delivery Unit (MDU), Rufiji Basin Development Authority (RUBADA) officials and any other relevant stakeholders.

6. Evaluation products (deliverables)

The following reports and deliverables are required for the evaluation:

1. Inception report
2. Draft Project Terminal Evaluation Report
3. Draft Lessons Learned Report
4. Presentation of Draft Project Terminal Evaluation Report at the validation workshop/meeting with key stakeholders, (partners and beneficiaries)
5. Final Project Terminal Evaluation report and Lessons Learned Report

The Evaluator upon signing the contract will also sign a ‘*Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the UN System*’, which may be made available as an attachment to the evaluation report. One week after contract signing, the evaluation consultants will produce an inception report. The inception report should include an evaluation matrix (see annex 3) presenting the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods to be used. The inception report should detail the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables, and propose specific site visits and stakeholders to be interviewed. Protocols for different stakeholders should be developed. The inception report will be discussed and agreed with the SAGCOT centre and UNDP country office before the evaluator proceeds with site visits.

The draft evaluation report will be shared with stakeholders, and presented in a validation workshop or meeting that the UNDP country office and SAGCOT centre will organise. Key partners and stakeholders will participate in this meeting among others. Feedback received from these sessions should be taken into account when preparing the final report. The evaluator will produce an ‘audit trail’ indicating whether and how each comment received was addressed in revisions to the final report.

A lessons learned report will also be discussed during the validation workshop. Feedback received should be taken into consideration when preparing the final lessons learned report. This reports should be annexed in the main evaluation report.

All deliverables will be elaborated in English and must be submitted in digital form together with all supporting documentation including tables, graphs and diagrams in its original format.

The suggested table of contents of the evaluation report is as follows:

Title

Table of contents

Acronyms and abbreviations

Executive Summary

Introduction Background and context

Evaluation scope and objectives

Evaluation approach and methods

Data analysis

Findings and conclusions

Lessons learned

Recommendations

Annexes

7. Evaluation team composition and required competencies

The terminal evaluation will be undertaken by two evaluators, one national and one international, hired as consultants. The international consultant will be the lead evaluator.

Required Qualifications

* Advanced (Master or PhD) degree in agricultural economics, economics, public or business administration or a development-related subject. Having a PhD in the same field of study will be an added advantage.
* **International consultant** - A minimum of 10-15 years relevant professional experience;  
  **National Consultant** - A minimum of 7 years relevant professional experience;
* Knowledge of/experience with UNDP monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures;
* Proven experience with agriculture related projects (inter alia policy analysis, dialogue, negotiation, research, monitoring and assessment) and in the implementation of agricultural policies;
* Experience in evaluation of international donor driven development projects will be an advantage
* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to agriculture development; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;

*Corporate Competencies:*

* Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
* Treats all people fairly without favouritism.

*Technical Competencies:*

* Demonstrated ability to coordinate processes to collate information and facilitate discussion and analysis of material;
* Technical competencies in undertaking complex evaluations which involve a variety of stakeholders;
* Demonstrated strong research and analytical skills.
* Strong facilitation and collaborative skills
* Strong report writing and communication skills

*Professionalism:*

* Demonstrated ability to meet deadlines and work under pressure;
* Demonstrated excellent organizational skills.

*Language:*

Fluency in English is essential, knowledge of Kiswahili is a bonus.

8. Evaluation ethics

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. The Consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The Consultants must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorisation of UNDP and partners.

9. Implementation arrangements

The UNDP Tanzania Country Office will select the evaluator through an open process in consultation with the SAGCOT Centre and Prime Minister’s Office (PMO). UNDP be responsible for the management of the Consultant and will in this regard designate focal persons for the evaluation and any additional staff to assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key informants, etc.) The UNDP will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report in liaison with the PMO and SAGCOT centre.

The designated SAGCOT centre and PMO focal point will assist the Consultant in arranging introductory meetings with the relevant parties in the UNDP, PMO, SAGCOT centre, civil society etc. The Consultant will take responsibility for setting up meetings and conducting the evaluation, subject to advanced approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report. The UNDP Country Office will develop a Management Response to the evaluation within six weeks of report finalization.

While UNDP and the SAGCOT centre will provide some logistical support during the evaluation, for instance assisting in setting interviews with senior government officials, Rufiji Basin Development Authority (RUBADA) etc., it will be the responsibility of the Consultant to logistically and financially arrange their travel to and from relevant project sites and to arrange most interviews. Planned travels and associated costs will be included in the Inception Report.

The Programme Specialist of the project will convene an Advisory Panel comprising of technical experts from SAGCOT centre, PMO and UNDP to enhance the quality of the evaluation. This Panel will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report to provide detail comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. The Panel will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards. The evaluator is required to address all comments of the Panel completely and comprehensively. The Evaluator will provide a detail rationale to the advisory panel for any comment that remain unaddressed.

The consultants will receive direct technical supervision by the UNDP Programme Specialist responsible for Inclusive Growth & PSD/Trade, and overall guidance by the UNDP-Tanzania Head of Programme. The consultant shall work cooperatively with the CEO and the Deputy CEO for the SAGCOT Centre.

10. Time-frame for the evaluation process

The evaluation is expected to take 25 working days. A tentative date for the stakeholder workshop will be set in the inception meeting and the final draft evaluation report will be due after 25 working days from the commencement of the assignment. The following table provides an indicative breakout for activities and delivery:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Responsible party** | **Timeframe/Deadline** |
| Desk review, Evaluation design and work plan (Inception report) | Evaluation team | 3 days |
| Field visits, interviews with partners, and key stakeholders | Evaluation team | 10 days |
| Drafting of the evaluation reports & lessons learned reports | Evaluation team | 5 days |
| Debriefing with UNDP | Evaluation team | 1 day |
| Debriefing with partners | Partners and the Evaluation team | 1 day |
| Finalization and submission of the evaluation reports and lessons learned reports (incorporating comments received on first drafts) | Evaluation team | 5 days |
| **Total No. of Working Days** |  | **25** |

11. Cost

Interested consultants should provide their requested fee rates when they submit their expressions of interest in USD for international consultant and TZS for national consultant. The final agreed contract sum will be approved by the procurement unit responsible for recruitment of consultants. Fee payments will be made, based on the following payment schedule:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Inception report | 10% |
| Draft Evaluation Report | 20% |
| Draft Lessons Learned Report | 20% |
| Final Evaluation Report | 30% |
| Final Lessons Learned Report | 20% |

Annex 1: List of key stakeholders and partners

Academic Institutions

Ministry of Agriculture, Land, and Fisheries (MALF)

Ministry Delivery Unit (MDU)

Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs)   
Prime Minister’s Office (PMO)

Rufiji Basin Development Authority (RUBADA)

Southern Agriculture Growth Corridor of Tanzania (SAGCOT)

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Annex 2: Documents to be consulted

National Strategy for Growth and Poverty Reduction (MKUKUTA II)

The United Nations Development Assistance Plan (UNDAP) 2011-2015

Project Document

Project Annual Work Plans

Project Quarterly Progress Reports

Project Financial Reports in form of FACE

Project Steering Committee / Project Boards Minutes

Tanzania National Vision 2025

Zanzibar Vision 2020

Long – Term Perspective Plan, Annual Work Plans and Budgets of Trade Related Ministries

Annual Implementation Project Report

Various technical study reports

Mid-term Evaluation

Audit Reports

PME Handbook

UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results

UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluator

Annex 3 - EVALUATION MATRIX

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EVALUATION MATRIX** | | | | | | |
| **Relevant evaluation criteria** | **Key Questions** | **Specific Sub- Questions** | **Data Sources** | **Data collection Methods/Tools** | **Indicators/ Success Standard** | **Methods for Data Analysis** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**TOR Approval**

Reviewed by: Ernest Salla, Programme Specialist, Inclusive Growth & Private Sector Development

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Approved by: Amon Manyama, Deputy Country Director - Programme

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_