

Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR)

Terms of reference for the Midterm Review of **Productive landscapes for inclusive growth in Tanzania and Mozambique (SUSTAIN Pro)**

Evaluation Terms of Reference
October 2024

1. Evaluation context

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for an International Firm/Consultant, for the IUCN Midterm evaluation (MTE) of the project titled “**Productive landscapes for inclusive growth in Tanzania and Mozambique (SUSTAIN Pro)**” implemented by the IUCN Water and Wetlands Team and executed by its Regional Office for East and Southern Africa (ESARO). The project started on December 8th 2021, and is ending on December 31st, 2025. The project was however originally designed as a 10-year initiative with an operational plan for the first three years from 2022 to 2024 (now extended to 2025). It is thus expected that the project will continue after this initial phase and that the findings and recommendations of this MTR play an important role in the design of the next phase. The project is funded by Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad).

The Sustainability and Inclusion Strategy for Growth Corridors in Africa (SUSTAIN-Africa) was conceived as a multi-year initiative focused on catalysing climate-resilient development that balances economic growth with ecosystem stewardship and social prosperity. Running from 2014 to 2020, the first phase of SUSTAIN established a solid foundation of partnerships between businesses, government agencies, local communities, farmer groups, and others in the landscape to deliver on this vision. Building on these networks, and the achievements of the initial phase, IUCN initiated a second phase of SUSTAIN through two complementary programmes: SUSTAIN Pro and SUSTAIN Eco - both underpinned by equity and inclusion, and both striving to accelerate a shift from business-as-usual to development paradigms that build resilience in economies, people and nature. Together, SUSTAIN Pro and Eco form the continuation of SUSTAIN-Africa, building on its successes and learning from the challenges that were encountered during the first five years of the programme. The geographical footprint and partnerships established in the first phase of SUSTAIN make up the lion’s share of interventions in these two complementary programmes, ensuring continuity and aiming at long-term sustainability.

While SUSTAIN Eco focuses on the need to protect and restore ecosystems to secure the services needed for sustainable livelihoods, **SUSTAIN Pro** aims for sustainable food systems and healthy productive landscapes in Mozambique and Tanzania through (i) upscaling solutions for sustainable agricultural production; (ii) restoring land health through multi-stakeholder partnerships, and; (iii) investing in sustainable and inclusive value chains to drive systemic change. More specifically, the SUSTAIN Pro project aims to achieve the following outcomes:

Outcome 1 - Solutions for sustainable agricultural production are scaled up: focuses on organizations, initiatives and projects demonstrating successful agricultural solutions that could be replicated and scaled up. It is about building coherence between farm/operations-level interventions and governance structures for land and water and addressing the institutional barriers preventing this from happening.

Outcome 2 - Land health restored using landscape partnerships: This outcome focuses on strengthening the linkages between dialogue and action, through the formation or strengthening of inclusive multi-stakeholder landscape partnerships to apply a wide range of solutions that improve

land health and maximise benefits for local people and future generations, including Nature-based Solutions (NbS), as well as strengthening the governance and mechanisms needed to mobilise NbS.

Outcome 3 - Investments in sustainable value chains accelerate the transition to sustainable food systems: This outcome focuses on vertical integration of on-farm and broader landscape solutions, through establishing linkages to value chains, agribusiness, and apex and business associations as well as financial institutions to mainstream change.

2. Rationale and Purpose

This Midterm evaluation fulfils IUCN requirements to conduct an independent evaluation for the purpose of learning and reflection on project management and early results, it is also a contract requirement under the agreement with Norad to conduct a late MTR. It is thus expected that the findings and recommendations of this Midterm evaluation will not only help to identify any needed course corrections in the Project's approach and activities but also inform the design of the next phase of the programme.

3. Audience, key stakeholders and use

The primary intended users of this Mid Term Review are:

- The SUSTAIN Pro implementation team including task manager, national and landscape managers and technical officers in IUCN's Regional Office for East and Southern Africa for the purpose of managing the Project, and in particular, for making adjustments to improve delivery of outcomes;
- The Head of Water and Wetlands Team, for the purpose of gathering lessons to inform future project design and implementation of other projects under the Water and Wetlands Team;
- The IUCN Monitoring and Learning team, for the purpose of improving the Project monitoring and learning approach;
- Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad) will use information especially on achievements and challenges for learning purposes as well as guidance for a tentative decision-making process on future funding.
- The report will also be shared with Swedish Embassy/SIDA for information purpose

4. Objectives and evaluation questions

This Mid Term review will be carried out in conformity with IUCN Evaluation Policy (2023) and use a subset of the widely accepted OECD DAC Evaluation criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

The Mid Term Review should explore the Project's work and achievements with the aim of assessing progress so far and providing guidance on how to maximize the potential for achieving the intended results and improve learning in its remaining time, as well as for structuring the next phase of work. Through the assessment of the performance and lessons learnt, the Mid Term Review will also contribute to both learning and accountability.

The specific objectives of the Mid Term Review are:

- To assess the **relevance** of the Project in terms of aligning and responding to the objectives of the current IUCN Programme and other IUCN needs and priorities in relation to water and land management;
- To assess its **coherence** with the situational analysis and how well the Project fits in its context and its compatibility with other interventions led by IUCN;
- To assess the **effectiveness** of the Project in achieving its objectives and provide clear insights about what has and has not worked and why. It will also analyse key underlying risks, assumptions and constraints which have affected intended results, highlighting how external factors might have affected the Project and how the project adapted to this situation.

- To assess the **efficiency** in terms of use of resources and value for money through the delivery of the Project;
- To assess whether measures put in place by the project ensure **sustainability** of results in the longer term, including how synergies with SUSTAIN Pro for delivering on the broader vision of SUSTAIN-Africa;
- To identify **lessons** and provide set of **actionable recommendations** on how the Project and the project coordination/management could be adjusted to strengthen delivery of results and for informing the design of the next phase of work.

Three additional lines of inquiry should be addressed: contribution to the **IUCN One Programme Approach; Gender and youth and Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS)**

An initial set of questions that should guide the Midterm Review in assessing the Project against each given criterion have been developed as follows:

Relevance

1. How appropriate and relevant is the project approach and intervention logic in terms of its objectives and anticipated outcomes, and within the broader context of the SUSTAIN initiative?
2. Is the project Theory of Change (ToC) and logic for interventions realistic?
3. To what extent is the project aligned to national/subnational strategies and priorities?
 - Has there been any change (i.e policy changes) that affected the relevance of the Project since it has started?
- If so, how well did the project adapt to the changing environment and how well has the design adjusted to emerging circumstances?

Coherence

- To what extent were the capabilities of different implementing partners and other stakeholders considered in the design of the Project? How strategic are the partnerships established under the project considering their ability to influence and their current level of commitment and capacity to deliver?
- To what extent does the Project align to or contribute to other interventions carried by IUCN in Mozambique and Tanzania?
- To what extent does the Project align to or contribute to interventions implemented by other organizations in the specific project areas in Mozambique and Tanzania?
-
- To what extent did SUSTAIN Pro harmonize its interventions with government priorities and other stakeholders?
- To what extent have synergies between SUSTAIN Pro and Eco been realised during implementation? What can be improved to maximise synergies in the future?

Effectiveness

- To what extent has the Project delivered on its outputs and outcomes?

Outcome 1

- How successful has the project been in integrating economic, environmental and social criteria in sustainable and productive agricultural practices, approaches and technologies?
- To what extent have governance institutions and processes been strengthened and contributed to build an enabling environment?
- To what extent did market-based approaches supported by the Project help smallholders and farmers transition toward sustainable agricultural systems?

Outcome 2

- How effective has the project been in promoting and prioritizing Nature-based Solutions to improve land health into Multi-stakeholder landscape visions?
- How effective has the project been in facilitating the establishment of landscape partnership agreements for action and investment in Nature-based and other solutions?

Outcome 3

- How useful are the business cases for sustainable commodities developed by the project in terms of making progress toward increased investments in sustainable value chains and accelerating the transition to sustainable food system?
 - To what extent did the project progress toward the establishment of funding mechanisms to catalyse the transition for sustainable food systems?
 - To what extent did the project help Growth corridor secretariats, apex institutions and industry associations adopt targets and roll out sustainability with agribusiness and investors
- To what extent not having SUSTAIN Eco implemented in Mozambique has an impact on SUSTAIN Pro when compared to the benefit of having the two projects implemented in Tanzania?
 - Are there any unintended consequences as a result of the actions of the Project?

Efficiency

- To what extent is the project governance (coordination and decision-making structures and processes) system conducive to results achievement?
- Has the management approach promoted by the Project led to the most effective use of the resources, costs savings and to efficiencies of scale in the provision of coordination and technical support? More specifically:
 - Are accounting and financial systems adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?
 - Have progress reports been produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements?
 - In terms of periodic update meetings, what worked and what didn't in ensuring effective communication and project alignment, and why?
 - In terms of building synergies with SUSTAIN Eco, to what extent the project has leveraged on activities implemented by SUSTAIN Eco to maximise its impact.
- To what extent has the Project been able to adapt to any changing conditions to improve the efficiency of project implementation?
- To what extent are the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) strategy and tools adequate and effective? In particular:
 - To what extent are the selected indicators and targets appropriate to determine whether SUSTAIN has achieves its objectives?
 - To what extent did the MEL strategy detect any needed course corrections in the Project's approach and activities for better progress towards results?
 - To what extent did supervision missions aid or delay the project's progress, and why?

Sustainability

- Is there evidence of 'country ownership' of the project initiatives? What evidence exists that shows that the enabling condition are in place to continue what was initiated by the project?
- To what extent have the mitigation measures identified to address the risks been implemented? Were these measures effective?
- Are there new risks that have arisen that can impact the permanence of the results achieved that were not foreseen?

In addition to the above criteria and questions, the evaluator(s) will also ensure that the following topics are addressed in the evaluation:

One Programme Approach:

- To what extent did the project engage relevant constituents of the Union in its design or implementation so far (Government, IUCN Members and Commission Members with experience in Tanzania and Mozambique)?

Gender, youth and human rights:

- To what extent do the project's objectives and design promote and advance gender equality and/or gender responsive strategies? Also, to what extent has the project monitored its progress with gender responsive and sex-disaggregated monitoring data?
- To what extent do the project's objectives and design respond to youth needs and priorities, or promote youth participation and/or leadership or intergenerational exchange? Also, to what extent has the project monitored its progress with age-disaggregated monitoring data?
- Has there been any negative effects for women from project interventions and if so how has these been handled?
- Has there been any human rights challenges arising from project interventions and if so how has these been handled?

Environment and Climate

- Has there been any negative effects on environment and climate from project interventions and if so how has these been dealt with?

Anti-corruption

- What measures are put in place to avoid corrupt practices?

Science/policy/action interface:

- To what extent is the knowledge or science produced or disseminated by the Project likely to influence policy or actions in the future?

5. Methods and sources

This evaluation will be carried out in conformity with the IUCN Evaluation Policy (2023)¹, which sets out IUCN's institutional commitment to evaluation, and the criteria and standards for the evaluation and evaluation of its projects, programmes and organizational units.

I. Scoping Phase - Framing the boundaries of the evaluations

The evaluator(s) will review key project documents and engage with IUCN to finalise the evaluation objectives, questions, criteria and methodology. Against the above, the evaluator(s) will identify appropriate evidence that needs to be gathered and synthesized to fully inform the evaluation process – as well as sources of information including key individuals to be interviewed. The output of this phase will be an **inception report** which will include a **methodological note** and an **evaluation matrix** presenting how each evaluation questions will be addressed, data sources and data collection methods that will be used to gather additional information needed and a set of criteria to rate the strength of the evidence collected. The evaluation matrix will be reviewed and should be approved by IUCN. Adequately addressing the key evaluation questions will be the basis for IUCN to sign off on the completeness of the inception report.

II. Further data collection and analysis; development of draft evaluation report

In this phase, the evaluator(s) will work with IUCN and other key stakeholders to gather and consolidate the necessary information to address the evaluation questions. It will also include field visits for onsite observations and meetings with key partners and beneficiaries in Tanzania and Mozambique. It is expected

¹ https://www.iucn.org/sites/default/files/2023-07/iucn_evaluation_policy_june-2023.pdf

that the team leader travel to the field but can be assisted by local consultant. The Evaluator(s) will present their preliminary findings during a short webinar in order to collect feedback from key target audience. The link between the evaluation questions, data collection, analysis, findings and conclusions must be clearly made and set out in a transparent manner during the presentation. Following the webinar, the evaluator(s) will submit a ***draft evaluation report*** for further review by the target audience.

III. Finalising the evaluation reports and presenting findings to key stakeholders

Once the draft reports have been circulated, IUCN will undertake a final review of the reports and provide their comments in written to the evaluator(s). The comments will be integrated by the evaluator(s) in the **final version of the report** and serve to finalise recommendations and to develop lessons learned. The evaluator will submit a final evaluation report in word and PDF and will include a separate document highlighting where/how comments were incorporated. The final report should clearly and transparently demonstrate links between review questions, data collection, analysis, findings and conclusions. The conclusion and recommendations presented in the final report should be underpinned by a strong set of evidence and will be further explained during the final webinar.

Finally, evaluator(s) will produce a short but concise summaries that can be disseminated to the wider public for general information on the project's results and performance

A. Methods, sources and analysis

The evaluator(s) is expected to use mixed methods to allow a degree of triangulation and synthesis, including:

- Desk review of relevant documentation from the project;
- Interviews (individual or in Focus group) of key stakeholders across the two landscape;
- Survey of additional stakeholders;
- Field visit. It is expected that the evaluator will visit at least one of the areas where the project is implemented both in Tanzania and Mozambique;
- Other methods may be proposed as needed and as project resources allow.

B. Stakeholders to be consulted

The evaluation will adopt a consultative approach, seeking and sharing opinions with stakeholders at different stages throughout the evaluation process. Stakeholder categories include, but are not limited to: IUCN project staff, project executing partners and external stakeholders involved in the delivery of the project activities. External stakeholders may include national and local government representatives, private sector representatives and community members, including youth and women.

The list of stakeholders that will be consulted will be presented and validated through the inception report. The total number of stakeholders to be consulted in the different landscape where the project is implemented is however estimated to approximately 50 individuals. IUCN will provide a suggested list of stakeholders in different categories during inception. The evaluation team may propose changes or additions.

6. Evaluation deliverables

The evaluator(s) will be accountable for producing the following products for this Mid Term Review:

- ✓ **Draft inception report** and **Inception report** on proposed evaluation methodology, work plan and structure of the report including a detailed evaluation matrix;
- ✓ **A Draft Preliminary Mid-Term Review report and presentation**, to be presented at a debriefing meeting with SUSTAIN Pro partners

- ✓ **Final Mid-Term Review report**, including key findings, a set of limited and strategic recommendations (not to exceed 10 recommendations total), and response addressing issues raised during presentation of draft.
- ✓ A **Final presentation** targeted to evaluation key audiences in which the key finding and recommendations from the Mid Term Review will be presented.
- ✓ A **two-page executive summary** of key findings, lessons, recommendations and messages from the Mid Term Review report.

The Inception Report should be in English and include the following structure:

- A. Identification of the subject of the review, and relevant context
- B. Purpose and scope of the evaluation: why is the evaluation being conducted at this time, who needs the information and why? What aspects of the project will be covered, and not covered, by the evaluation
- C. Theory of change and results. A one-page diagram and explain it with a narrative, including a discussion of assumptions and drivers. This section should also confirm the formulation of planned results so that the evaluand can be assessed against its intended results
- D. An evaluation matrix presenting how each evaluation criteria and questions will be addressed, the indicators, the data sources and the data collection methods and tools that will be used to gather the information needed for the Mid Term Review and a set of criteria to rate the strength of the evidence collected.
- E. Methodology including approach for data collection and analysis, and stakeholder engagement, a rationale for selection of the methods, and selection of data sources (i.e. any sites to be visited, stakeholders to be interviewed)
- F. The evaluation workplan and schedule, as well as a description of roles and responsibilities for the management of the evaluation
- G. Potential limitations of the evaluation
- H. If any, a short summary of key improvements/modifications suggested from the original ToR.

The **final Mid-Term Review report** should be in English and include the following structure:

- A. Title page including project identification details
- B. Executive Summary (including at a minimum the methodology, findings and recommendations)
- C. Table of Contents
- D. List of Abbreviations and Acronyms
- E. A short introduction to project/programme – context and description
- F. Purpose of the Evaluation
- G. Evaluation Issues and Questions
- H. Methodology (including approach to data analysis)
- I. Findings - organized according to the key evaluation questions
- J. Conclusions and lessons learned
- K. Recommendations – actionable recommendations clearly linked to findings and lessons
- L. Annexes

7. Travel requirements

For this MTR, it is expected that the evaluator(s), including the team leader, visit each of the countries where the project is implemented (Kilombero landscape in Tanzania and Manica province in Mozambique). Travel will have to be organised in accordance with IUCN Travel Policy and Procedures for Non-Staff². All the cost related to travel need to be clearly and transparently reflected in the financial proposal.

² https://www.iucn.org/sites/default/files/2022-07/iucn_travel_policy_for_non-staff_v1.2_july2019.pdf

8. Schedule

It is expected that evaluator(s) will submit their deliverables according to the following schedule in Table 1. The starting date for the Mid-Term Review is 13th January 2025. Expected end date is 15th June 2025.

Outputs and deliverables	Proposed schedule and deadlines	Roles and responsibilities
Introductory call	Within 1 week of signing the service agreement	Evaluator(s), IUCN
Draft inception report submitted	Within 2 weeks of the introductory call	Evaluator(s)
Comments on inception report	Within 1 week after the submission of the inception report	IUCN
Final inception report and approval	Within 1 week after the submission of comments	Evaluator(s) and IUCN
Data collection and analysis phase completed	Within 8 weeks after the approval of the inception report	Evaluator(s)
Preliminary findings presentation	Within 1 week after the completion of the data collection	Evaluator(s)
Draft report delivery	Within 2 weeks after presentation of preliminary findings	Evaluator(s)
Comment on draft report	Within 2 weeks after the submission of the draft final report	IUCN, AWF and SNV
Final report delivery and approval	Within 2 week after the submission of comments	Evaluator(s), IUCN
Final presentation	Within 1 week after the approval of the final report	Evaluator(s)
Two pagers summary document	Within 1 week after the approval of the final report	Evaluator(s)

9. Roles and responsibilities

This Mid Term Review is commissioned by IUCN and Day-to-day management and coordination will be done by its Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning unit. This evaluation will be undertaken by an independent evaluation team, selected through IUCN's procurement process.

10. Qualifications of the Evaluators

IUCN requires a person or a team of evaluators with experience in assessing change in complex systems and with extensive expertise and knowledge in at least one of the following fields: Governance, Organisation capacity building, Nature-based Solutions, Agriculture, Water management, Innovative finance, Natural resources management and climate change or a combination thereof, applied to policy instruments and practice.

In addition, the Lead team member will meet the following technical requirements:

- At least 10 years of relevant experience in supporting, designing, planning and/or conducting development evaluations; with demonstrated quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis skills, with proven record of conducting formative, process and impact evaluation;
- Proven experience in evaluating similar projects; Prior experience in conducting evaluation in areas where the Project is implemented would be an asset;
- English language fluency in both speaking and writing; additional fluency in Kiswahili and/or Portuguese from team leader would be considered as an asset. However, the team leader and/or one team member should have fluency in Kiswahili for conducting the field work in Tanzania and fluency in Portuguese for conducting the field work in Mozambique
- Gender balance: Women are strongly encouraged to apply as team leader and gender balance will be considered as an asset for evaluators applying as a team.

The evaluation team members should be completely independent from any organisation that have been involved in designing, implementing, executing or advising any aspect the project.

11. Cost

The maximum available budget for this review, including travel, is 624,000 NOK (~EUR 50K³) The evaluator(s) shall be paid upon completion of the following milestones:

- ✓ 30% upon signing of the contract
- ✓ 30% after presentation of the draft report (noting that acceptance of the inception report is a required milestone)
- ✓ 40% after the approval of the final report

12. Appendices

- Evaluation Matrix

³ This is subject to currency fluctuation

Annex 1: Evaluation Matrix

1. Relevance:				
<i>Key evaluation questions</i>	<i>Sub-questions</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Source of Information</i>	<i>Data Collection Tools</i>
<i>[These are the overall general questions that will facilitate analysis of the evaluation issues (as identified in part 5 of the ToR).</i>	<i>[List the specific questions that are needed to answer the key questions. s as required]</i>	<i>[An indicator is a measuring device that clarifies and measures a concept: in this case, the sub-questions. Indicators make these sub-questions more tangible and give something concrete to measure. They may be qualitative or quantitative signals that help to decide whether something has changed. There can be multiple indicators for one sub-question.]</i>	<i>[In this column, identify possible sources of data needed to answer the sub-questions. These sources may include people, different kinds of documents such as situation analyses, trends analyses, other research, observation, or other types of information. Be as specific as possible when citing these.]</i>	<i>[What data collection tools will be used?]</i>
<i>[Add rows as required]</i>				
2. Coherence				
<i>Key evaluation questions</i>	<i>Sub-questions</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Source of Information</i>	<i>Data Collection Tools</i>
<i>[Add rows as required]</i>				
3. Effectiveness:				
<i>Key evaluation questions</i>	<i>Sub-questions</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Source of Information</i>	<i>Data Collection Tools</i>
<i>[Add rows as required]</i>				
4. Efficiency:				
<i>Key evaluation questions</i>	<i>Sub-questions</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Source of Information</i>	<i>Data Collection Tools</i>
<i>[Add rows as required]</i>				

5. Sustainability:				
<i>Key evaluation questions</i>	<i>Sub-questions</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Source of Information</i>	<i>Data Collection Tools</i>
<i>[Add rows as required]</i>				
6. Other:				
<i>[Add rows as required]</i>				