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**SUPPORT TO THE MINISTRY OF LANDS AND RURAL RESETTLEMENT 2014 TO 2016 ACTION PLAN**

**Terms of Reference for Evaluation of the Project.**

1. **BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT**

## The then Ministry of Lands and Rural Resettlement (MLRR), which has been renamed the Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement (MLARR) received support for the Start-up Programme for the National Land Audit from the EU through UNDP during 2010-2012. MLARR implemented the Start-up activities under the financing agreement between the Ministry of Finance, UNDP and the EU. The activities undertaken were:

##  a) *Land category verification:* the land registry has been updated after reconciling about 70% of the land transactions that have occurred since the land reform on all types of land.;

## b) Development of the National Land Audit (NLA) methodology: Work on data collection instruments was done and eleven sets of questionnaires were produced.

## c) Regional and international best practices on land reform and land administration:

## A visit to Brazil by the Permanent Secretary and nine senior officers of MLARR improved the understanding of issues around security of tenure and bankability, as well as addressing land reform issues avoiding conflict. Another visit was also undertaken to Kenya to understand the same issues. Activities not completed include:

## a) Evaluation of land policies specifically: security of tenure, compensation to farmers, and land administration;

## b) Stakeholder consultation on land audit methodology.

 At the conclusion of this phase the MLARR recognised the need for a comprehensive approach to the land issues in Zimbabwe. It was agreed that the main goal of the programme is to consolidate the land reform programme in a number of key areas that include:

1. **Finalising the adoption and implementation of land tenure security policies and regulations:** MLARR has continually reviewed the land tenure policies. In October 2010 the MLARR held a evaluation workshop in Kadoma on the issue and the Ministry currently has recommendations for a multi-form tenure system for Cabinet’s consideration. As these are to be finalised and adopted there is need to clarify who has the right to own farming land and under what conditions for each of the tenure categories.
2. **Evaluating and streamlining the land administration structures and regulations:** The committee structures used in the fast track land redistribution (FTLR) were appropriate then for land redistribution but now interfere with the ability of the MLARR to carry out its mandate professionally. There is need for clarity as to who administers the land and how to avoid multiple-authority allocations and access to land without consideration of security of tenure. In addition, the MLARR needs to strengthen capacity for:
	1. Planning and enforcing orderly settlements;
	2. Management and enforcement of lease provisions;
	3. Beneficiary selection and support systems that are fair and gender sensitive on land made available for resettlement in future;
	4. Development of a land revenue collection policy and systems.
3. **Completing the backlog on land valuation and compensation** for the past acquisitions; and streamlining policies and procedures for future acquisitions;
4. **Evaluation and strengthen the dispute and conflict resolution systems, structures and procedures:** There is need to upgrade the land arbitration system so as to ensure commitment to resolve past conflicts, including a way forward on compensation and a framework to avoid/addressing future conflicts. Since investments on A2 and A1 farms are largely dependent on a resolution of conflict the conflict resolution system should provide enough guarantees that there will be a Government commitment and a mechanism/framework in place to address all forms of land disputes.
5. **Strengthen service delivery capacities of the MLARR:** The MLARR has already identified need for capacity development in the following areas: land administration and land tenure security management; re-building capacity for land use planning and surveys; managing land related data for access by different stakeholders at the district and provincial levels; specialised training in land information management e.g. offered in Kenya; and continuing international best practices learning tours in Africa and Asia

The then MLARR determined that the main goal of a new Project is to consolidate the land issues in the following key areas:

* 1. Updating of the inventories of the immovable improvements on the former commercial farms
	2. Development of a consensus based compensation mechanism
	3. Adequate survey control network established
	4. Surveyed A2 farm units and updated land information database
	5. Establishment of a land information management system (LIMS) within the ministry strengthened, effectively managed and coordinated.
	6. A dispute resolution framework developed
	7. Evaluation of the land tenure systems and policy recommendations
	8. The Zimbabwe Land Commission is capacitated.

Strengthening of which are in line with the government policies, the Zimbabwe Agenda for Sustainable Socio-economic Transformation (ZIM-Asset) and the MDG commitments and other national performance indicators.

The Project was in response to the request submitted to UNDP by the then Ministry of Lands and Rural Resettlement (MLARR), now Ministry of Lands Agriculture and Rural Resettlement (MLARR) in 2013 to mobilise resources to capacitate it in the implementation of the MLARR 2014 to 2016 Action Plan. The UNDP and European Union made available resources as follows: US$750 000 and the EU €4 738 495. The UNDP is the Fund Manager for the EU resources and also provides technical support to the MLARR. The MLARR is the government implementing partner.

1. **EVALUATION PURPOSE**

The Project has been implemented between 2013 and 2018. The overall objective of the evaluation is to generate knowledge from the Project experience in collaboration and support with the Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement. This is being conducted as an end of Project Evaluation and will focus at the entire implementation period. The key stakeholders of this evaluation are the Zimbabwe Government through the MLARR, the Zimbabwe Land Commission (ZLC), the Department of the Surveyor General, the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, the Project Board, the UNDP, EU, FAO and World Bank, the famers (through farmer organisations), land surveyors and real estate evaluators. The overall purpose of the evaluation is to assess the processes and achievements made to draw lessons that will inform on the progress made and possibly the development of a successor Project.

This evaluation provides a strategic opportunity to evaluate the progress that has been made so far towards the achievement of outcomes, outputs, targets and indicators in the Project. The evaluation will identify the gaps in all the aspects of the Project and where necessary, highlight areas of strength and opportunities for a successor Project. It will capture the effective lessons learned while also identifying challenges, gaps and areas that need strengthening. It will also provide an opportunity for a possible successor Project to further integrate any emerging and contemporary programming aspects that are relevant for the work of the MLARR.

The evaluation is supposed to be forward looking which will capture the lessons learnt and provide information on the nature, extent and where possible the effect of the Project to the Zimbabwe Government through the MLARR. The emphasis on lessons learnt will speak to what has worked and what has not worked as a guide for future planning.

1. **EVALUATION SCOPE and OBJECTIVES**

|  |
| --- |
| Firstly, the evaluation will assess the effectiveness of the implementation strategy to ascertain whether the specific and overall interventions and approaches including the theory of change were appropriate and effective. This will include:1. The implementation modalities, in particular the effectiveness of the funding approach between the UNDP and the EU;
2. Partnership arrangements, institutional strengthening, and beneficiary participation
3. Replication and Scalability;
4. Cost effectiveness and efficiency as well as sustainability of the Project; and
5. Linkages, synergies and coordination with other Projects.

Secondly, the evaluation will also assess the Project design and assumptions made at the beginning of the Project and the development process. In this regard, the evaluation will place emphasis on:1. The extent to which the Project results have been achieved, partnerships established, capacities built, and cross cutting issues such as gender equality have been addressed.
2. Whether the Project implementation strategy has been optimum and recommend areas for improvement and learning.
3. Further, the evaluation will investigate the specific activities relating to each of the Project objectives/outcomes listed above including training and technical support through co-located team members.
4. The capacity building approach including training design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation initiatives will also be evaluated.
5. The extent to which gender equality issues have been addressed, integrated, implemented and monitored in the programme
6. Programme accountability in as far as communication and visibility is concerned.

The evaluation will assess and make recommendations on further support to the programme post 2018.  |

1. **EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

The Project evaluation will be undertaken based on the UNDP quality standards which are elaborated below. The following questions will guide the Project evaluation:

1. Relevance: Assess the design and focus of the Project:
	* To what extent did the Project achieve its overall objectives?
	* Were the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
	* Were the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended outcomes and effects?
	* Did the outputs and outcome address the specific development challenges of the Country and the intended beneficiaries? Were there any unintended consequences (positive or negative) that have implications to the human development goals of the country?
	* To what extent were the results (impacts, outcomes, and outputs) were achieved?

Were the inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? To what extent has MLARR’s selected method of delivery been appropriate to supporting the current project and the overall development context?

1. Effectiveness: Describe the management processes and their appropriateness in supporting delivery to the MLARR.
	* Was the Project effective in delivering the desired or planned results?
	* Were the stated outputs achieved? Did they contribute to the stated outcomes? What are the key development and advisory contributions that UNDP has made/is making towards the outcomes, if any?
	* If not fully achieved, was there any progress? If so, what level of progress towards outputs has been made as measured by the output indicators presented in the results framework. What evidence is there that UNDP support has contributed towards an improvement in the country’s capacity, including institutional strengthening?
	* To what extent did the M&E mechanism of the Project contribute in meeting the Project results?
	* How effective were the strategies and the tools used in the implementation of the Project?
	* How effective has the Project been in responding to the needs of the beneficiaries, e.g. the MLARR, farmers etc. what results were achieved?
	* What are the future intervention strategies and issues to be addressed? To what extent has the project supported domestication of key regional frameworks, experiences and international best practices through national development plans and strategies?
2. Efficiency of the Project implementation
	* Was the process of achieving the results efficient? 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?
	* 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 project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
	* Did the Project activities overlap and duplicate other similar interventions (funded nationally or by other donors)? Are there other efficient ways and means of delivering more and better results with available inputs?
	* How was the Project’s collaboration with the UNDP, the EU, FAO, The World Bank, the farmers, the Zimbabwe Government and the Project Board?
	* 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?
	* What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the Project’s implementation process?
3. Sustainability:
	* To what extent are the benefits of the Project likely to be sustained by national capacities after the completion of this Project? If not why?
	* Has the project generated the buy- in and credibility needed for sustained impact.
	* What is the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of the Project outcomes and benefits after the completion of the Project?
	* Is there an exit strategy to phase out the assistance provided by the Project including contributing factors and constraints?
	* What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve the prospects of sustainability of the Project outcomes and potential for replication of approach?
	* Provide the main lessons that have been learnt.
	* What are the recommendations for similar support in future?
4. **METHODOLOGY**

The evaluation will be carried out by an independent evaluator, and will engage a broad range of key stakeholders and beneficiaries, including government officials, donors, civil society organizations (were appropriate). The evaluation will take a “theory of change’’ (TOC) approach to determining causal links between the interventions that UNDP Zimbabwe has supported, and observed progress at the country level.

The evaluation exercise will be, consultative, and participatory ensuring representation of both women and men, entailing a combination of comprehensive desk reviews, analysis and interviews. While interviews are a key instrument, all analysis must be based on observed facts, evidence and data. 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 and valid.

The evaluation methodology must be explained in detail and be appropriate and of sufficient rigor to produce valid results. Limitations to the evaluation with particular attention to the limitations associated with the evaluation methodology (selection bias, recall bias, unobservable differences between comparator groups, etc.) must be disclosed in the evaluation report.

The evaluation team will be expected to:

* Employ study techniques that ensure internal validity of study results
* Utilize social science methods and tools that reduce the need for evaluator-specific judgments.
* Employ standardized recording and maintenance of records from the evaluation (e.g., focus group transcripts).

Further 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 evaluation will provide quantitative and qualitative data through the following methods:

* Desk study and evaluation of all relevant Project documents, annual work plans, Project progress reports, annual reports, Minutes of the Project Board.
* In depth interview to gather primary data form key stakeholders using structured methodology.
* Focus group discussions with Project beneficiaries and other stakeholders.
* Interviews with relevant key stakeholders
* Field visits/observations.
1. **DURATION OF THE EVALUATION**

The evaluation is estimated to be done in thirty (30) days. This will include desk reviews, field work, interviews and report writing.

1. **EVALUATION PRODUCTS (Deliverables)**

The following deliverables are expected:

* 1. **Evaluation Inception report**

An Inception report, outlining the scope of the work and intended work plan of the analysis and the evaluation questions, shall be submitted after ten (10) days of commencing the assignment. The Inception report will provide the UNDP, MLARR, EU and the Project Board the opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding of the evaluation objectives and assignment. The Inception report should detail the consultant’s understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each of the evaluation question will be answered by way of proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The Inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables. The inception report will be discussed and agreed upon by key stakeholders.

* 1. **Draft evaluation report**

A draft report that will inform the following stakeholders:

* The MLARR
* The Project Board
* The farmers organisations

The report should provide options for strategy and policy as well as recommendations.

The MLARR and UNDP are responsible for ensuring timely arrangement for the Project Board meeting to provide comments within ten (10) days after receiving the Draft Report. The evaluation of the Draft Report ensures that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria.

* 1. **Final evaluation report**

The final report will be submitted ten (10) days after receiving comments from the Project Board members. The content and structure of the final analytical report with the findings, recommendations and lessons learnt should meet the requirements of the UNDP M&E Policy and should include the following:

* Executive summary
* Introduction
* Description of the evaluation methodology
* Situational analysis with regard to the outcome, outputs, and partnership strategy
* Analysis of opportunities to provide guidance on future programming/Projects
* Key findings including best practices and lessons learnt
* Conclusions and recommendations.
* Annexes may include: Charts, terms of reference, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed.
1. **REQUIRED EXPERTISE AND QUALIFICATIONS**

The consultant shall have the following qualifications and expertise:

* At least an advanced degree in any of the following: Programme Management, Agricultural Economics, Development Studies, Land and Agrarian Reforms.
* Extensive expertise, knowledge and experience in the field of aid effectiveness and aid management processes related issues.
* At least ten years experience working with international organisations and donors
* Knowledge and understanding of international and country-level implementation of aid effectiveness
* Extensive experience in UNDP and EU mandates, policies, procedures, and project management
* Experience in Project formulation and evaluation
* An understanding of land and agrarian reforms
* Fluent in English and
* Excellent written and verbal communication skills in English
1. **MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS**

The UNDP Head Unit Poverty, Environment and Climate Change and the UNDP M&E Specialist will provide technical guidance on the evaluation and ensure independence of the evaluation process and that policies are followed.

The Project Coordinator will manage the evaluation process and provide logistical support.

1. **ANNEXES**
	1. Terms of Reference
	2. List of documents reviewed
	3. List of people interviewed