## Terms of Reference

**Terms of Reference for**

**Terminal Project Evaluation for**

**Support for Development of Inclusive Markets in Agriculture and Trade (DIMAT) Project**

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The agriculture sector in Uganda is characterized by a large number of smallholder producers, where over 80% of farmers operate on plots between 1 and 5 acres. The sector contributes to over 20% of GDP and employs over 70 % of the population. However, over the past decade, the sector’s growth has been below the target of 6% set by the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP). Government of Uganda’s Agriculture Development Strategy and Investment Plan 2010/2015 (DSIP) emphasizes the need to transform the agriculture sector from small-scale production/subsistence agriculture to commercialization, listing 17 priority commodities.

The Support for Development of Inclusive Markets in Agriculture and Trade (DIMAT) project aims to contribute to the transformation of the agriculture sector from small-scale production/subsistence agriculture to commercialized production in line with DSIP’s Programme 2 on “Market Access and Value Addition.”

The project, which begun in the last quarter of 2011 and ends in June 2015, is intended to improve the competitiveness of markets in selected commodities, namely, cassava, rice and beans, enhancing the participation of low-income smallholder farmers as producers, consumers, employers and employees in the selected value chain.

Its objectives is to enable the poorest and most vulnerable segment of the population to actively participate in agricultural value chains so as to increase their income, improve livelihood and build resilience at the household and community level.

More specifically, the project is expected to achieve the following outputs:

* 20 business linkages established and operationalized
* Capacity of small holder producer groups and Business Support Associations (BSAs) strengthened
* Innovative pro-poor business concepts developed and operationalized
* MSME’s access to productive assets (finance, inputs, market information and technology) increased

The total project budget is USD 2.6 million funded by UNDP’s core resources. Its implementing partner is Enterprise Uganda and the Responsible Parties are Kilimo Trust, Eastern Private Sector Development Center (EPSEDEC), Acholi Private Sector Development Company Limited (APSEDEC), and Private Sector Development and Consultancy Centre (PRICON). The project has been carrying out activities in Northern, Eastern, Western and Central Uganda.

The outcome level evaluation (CPAP evaluation) was conducted at the end of 2014 but there has been no project evaluation conducted for this project.

1. EVALUATION PURPOSE

The main purpose of the evaluation is to find out what worked, why and in what context and the extent to which, intended and unintended results are achieved, and their impact on stakeholders. The evaluation results will primarily be used by UNDP and its partners to improve future project design and implementation; to inform decision on allowing for scaling-up or to re-direct future projects in agriculture value chain and inclusive business; and to examine replicability.

1. EVALUATION SCOPE

The terminal evaluation will cover all activities undertaken by the project in the four geographic regions covered by the project. The evaluation should cover at minimum, three general areas, which are ***project formulation, project implementation and project results.*** The project results in particular will be evaluated in terms of at least five criteria, which are ***relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.***

1. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The key evaluation questions are listed below according to the evaluation area. The list is by no means exhaustive and to be discussed, flexibly adjusted and finalized at the inception meeting.

**4.1 Project formulation (Ask these questions across all respondents?)**

* Was the project design informed by a well-researched situation and problem analysis?
* Were the project’s objectives and components clear and feasible within the time frame? (Results and Resource Framework)
* Were the stated assumption and risks logical and robust?
* Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?
* Were management arrangements clear at the start of the project and appropriate for the nature of the project?
* Were the project’s activities in line with UNDP’s comparative advantage?
* Were there linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector?
	1. **Project Implementation (EUg and RPs?)**
* Were baseline conditions, methodology and roles and responsibilities well-articulated in the M&E plan at the project start up?
* Was the M&E plan articulated sufficiently to monitor results and track progress toward achieving objectives?
* Was the M&E plan sufficiently budgeted and funded during project preparation and implementation?
* Were progress and financial reporting requirements/schedule, including quality and timeliness of reports compliant with UNDP policies and procedures?
* Were field monitoring visits carried out sufficiently and quality monitoring reports produced? Is there evidence that these were discussed with stakeholders and project staff?
* To what extent did follow up actions and/or adaptive management taken in response to monitoring reports?
* To what extent have the project’s monitoring activities been efficient and effective?

**Project Results (Farmer Groups?)**

* + 1. Relevance

The extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and UNDP.

* Are the project’s outputs consistent with the focal areas/operational programme strategies and country priority areas?
* Are intended outcome and outputs of the project relevant to national and community needs and priorities?
* Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the County Programme Document (CPD) and Country Programme Action Plan’s (CPAP) outputs and outcomes?
	+ 1. Effectiveness (All Respondents?)

A measure of the extent to which an activity attains its objectives.

* To what extent were the outputs and outcomes stated in the project document achieved?
* What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the outputs and outcomes?
* What were the factors beyond UNDP’s control that influenced performance and success of the projects (including opportunities and threats)?
* To what extent has the project’s interventions successfully reached the target groups and met their needs through project design and implementation?
* To what extent has the project’s interventions engaged youth?
* To what extent has the project’s interventions mainstreamed cross-cutting issues such as gender and environment?
	+ 1. Efficiency (All respondents?)

Efficiency measures the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which signifies that projects use the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted.

* Were project activities cost-efficient?
* Were project objectives achieved on time?
* Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost-efficiency?
* Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
	+ 1. Impact (All respondents?)

The positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This involves the main impacts and effects resulting from the activity on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators. The examination should be concerned with both intended and unintended results and must also include the positive and negative impact of external factors, such as changes in economic and financial conditions.

* What has happened as a result of the project?
* What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?
* How many people have been affected and to what extent?
	+ 1. Sustainability (All respondents?)

Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has ended. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.

* Are the results sustainable? (Will the outputs and outcome lead to benefit beyond the lifespan of the existing project?)
* To what extent will the benefits of the project continue after the project ends?
* What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?
1. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful and combine a mix of quantitative and qualitative analysis. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office, project team, beneficiaries and key stakeholders.

Below are the suggested methodologies to be used, however, final decision about the specific design and methods should be agreed during the inception meeting upon review and discussion of the proposal submitted by the evaluation team.

* Desk review of the relevant project documents and reports
* Field visit
* Key informant interviews
* Triangulation

The evaluators will review all relevant sources of information, such as the documents listed below, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this assignment.

1. Project Document
2. Work Plans
3. Progress Reports
4. Financial Reports
5. Monitoring Reports
6. Minutes of board meetings, TAC meetings and project meetings
7. Documentary outputs and tools produced under the project
	1. Value chain analysis
	2. Situation analysis (base line study)
	3. Tools developed for capacity building
	4. Etc.
8. Results Oriented Annual Report (ROAR)
9. County Programme Action Plan (CPAP) terminal evaluation
10. Country Programme Document (CPD)
11. United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
12. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES
13. ***An Inception Report*** should detail the evaluators’ understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. It should include an evaluation matrix summarizing the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data sources, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated. The inception report should also include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report should be submitted at least a day before the inception meeting to provide ample time for review by UNDP and its partners.
14. ***A Draft Terminal Project Evaluation Report*** should be submitted in the agreed timeframe, so as to provide ample time for UNDP and its partners to review before the debriefing meeting.
15. ***A PowerPoint Presentation*** covering the key points of the terminal evaluation with the main findings and recommendations.
16. ***A Final Terminal Project Evaluation Report*** of approximately 40 pages, excluding annexes, adhering to the reporting standard outlined in the UNEG Standards. The report will be in English and will be prepared and submitted in MS Word, with tables in Excel where necessary. The final report should include an executive summary, conclusion, recommendations, and lessons learned. The conclusion should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths and weakness of the project. They should be well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the terminal evaluation findings. The recommendations should be feasible and directed to the intended users of the evaluation about the actions to take and decisions to make. The report should also include lessons that can be learned from the evaluation, including best (and worst) practices that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstances (programmatic, evaluation method used, partnership, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other UNDP projects and evaluations.

If there are any significant discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the evaluation team and stakeholders these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

1. ***A Popular Version of the Final Terminal Project Evaluation Report*** summarizing the final evaluation report to 2-4 pages.
2. TEAM COMPOSITION AND COMPETENCIES

The team will be composed of 1Team Leader (national or international consultant) and 2 national consultant. The competencies expected from the consultants are as below.

 **Team Leader (national/international consultant)**

* Master’s degree and at least 10 years of experience in agriculture, agri-business, economics, socio-science or related fields.
* Substantive knowledge and experience in participatory M&E processes and evaluation of technical assistance projects, if possible with UNDP or other UN development agencies and major donors, is required.
* Experience in agriculture value chain and/or inclusive business projects in Sub-Saharan African countries, either through managing or evaluating donor-funded projects.
* Familiarity with agriculture input market, finance, market information, technology, cooperative development, and market access.
* Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to analyze critical issues succinctly and clearly and draw forward-looking conclusions.
* Experience in leading small multi-disciplinary and multinational teams to deliver quality products in high stress and short deadline situations.
* Excellent English writing and communication skills.

**National Consultants**

* Bachelor’s degree and at least 5 years of experience in agriculture, business administration, economics, project management, socio-science or related fields.
* Knowledge and experience in participatory M&E processes and evaluation of technical assistance projects.
* Substantive knowledge of the agriculture sector in Uganda, including policies, regulation, key issues affecting the sector and latest developments to address the problems.
* Familiarity with agriculture value chains in Uganda, particularly, beans, rice and cassava.
* Familiarity with Area Cooperative Enterprises and Rural Producer Organizations in Uganda.
* Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to analyze critical issues succinctly and clearly and draw forward-looking conclusions.
* Experience working with a multinational team to deliver quality products in high stress and short deadline situations.
* Excellent English writing and communication skill and knowledge of local languages.
1. EVALUATION ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in UNEG Norms and Standards and the Ethical Guidelines.

1. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS
* UNDP is the Commissioner of the evaluation and will safeguard the independence of the exercise, allocate adequate funding and human resources, and appoint an Evaluation Manager.
* The Evaluation Team (consultants) will liaise and report directly to the Evaluation Manager. The Evaluation Manager will provide the Evaluation Team with administrative support and required data, connect the Evaluation Team with the wider programme unit, senior management, and key evaluation stakeholders.
* The Evaluation Team is responsible to fulfil the contractual arrangement in line with the UNEG norms and standards and ethical guidelines; this includes developing an evaluation matrix as part of the inception report, drafting reports and briefing the commissioner and stakeholders on the progress and key finding s and recommendations, as needed.
* A Reference Group consisted of key evaluation stakeholders will assist in collecting required data, oversee progress and conduct of the evaluation and review the draft evaluation report and ensure final draft meets quality standards.
* Quality Assurance Panel Members, external to the evaluation exercise, will review documents as required and provide advice on the quality of the evaluation and options for improvement.
1. TIME FRAME FOR EVALUATION PROCESS

The total duration of the evaluation will be 20 days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Activity
 | 1. Timing
 | 1. Completion Date
 |
| 1. Desk review of documents
2. Briefing of evaluators
3. Preparation and submission of Inception Report
 | 1. 3 days
 |  |
| 1. Inception Meeting (presentation of Inception Report)
 | 1. 1 day
 |  |
| 1. Fieldwork
 | 1. 6 days
 |  |
| 1. Preparation and submission of Draft Terminal Evaluation Report
 | 1. 5 days
 |  |
| 1. Debriefing Meeting (presentation of the Draft Terminal Evaluation Report)
 | 1. 1 day
 |  |
| 1. Preparation of Final Terminal Evaluation Report
 | 1. 3 days
 |  |
| 1. Submission of Final Terminal Evaluation Report and Popular Version of the Final Terminal Evaluation Report by Lead Consultant to UNDP
 | 1. 1 day
 |  |

1. Payment terms

This will be a lump sum contract payable as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Estimated duration** | **Percentage** |
| 1. Inception report
 | 4 working days | 30% |
| 1. Final Report
 | 16 working days | 70% |