



ALLIANCE FOR FOOD SOVEREIGNTY IN AFRICA

Terms of Reference

End of Project Evaluation

1. Project Title and Number and duration

“Strengthening continental networking and advocacy for food sovereignty and agroecology in Africa” A-AFK-2017-3120. Project duration is 01/07/2017 – 30/06/2020.

2. About AFSA

The Alliance for Food Sovereignty in Africa (AFSA) is a continental network of network organisations working for Africa's food sovereignty by promoting agroecology. AFSA's vision is **“Africa developed in harmony with nature, harnessing its traditional knowledge and systems, and her people controlling natural and other resources and related decisions.”** The Mission is **“to influence policies and to promote African solutions for food sovereignty.”** AFSA serves as a continental platform for consolidation of issues about food sovereignty and together marshal a single and louder voice on issues and tabling clear workable solutions.” AFSA currently has 37 members working in 50 of the 55 countries on the African continent. There are 3 categories of membership that is core members¹, associate members² and friends³ of AFSA. AFSA has offices in two countries, a secretariat located in Kampala, Uganda and since 2017 a regional office in Thies Senegal.

2. Background and content of the Project

Food, Climate change and land management are among the biggest challenges facing Africa. Africa's food systems are under threat from industrial agriculture that seeks to control production, distribution and consumption of food. Characterised by the use of agrochemicals (pesticides and synthetic fertilisers), hybrid and GMO seeds and monoculture farms ran on a large scale, the industrial food system seeks to take control

¹ Core Members are regional networks with members in more than one country

² Associate members are network organizations with their membership in one country.

³ These are usually organization that are not networks and may be located outside Africa

of Africa's food systems. With governments grappling to address issues of food security and nutrition, they turn to industrial agriculture with its promise of "increased yield" to address this problem. As a result, this has led to farmers and communities having their land taken over by foreign farms, draconian seed laws that strip farmers and breeders of their rights to seed, monopoly of seed and other farm inputs sold to farmers or supplied by through government programs as farm input subsidies.

Concurrently, governments are grappling with climate change that is threatening to human existence especially farmers and pastoralists, both for production and their livelihoods. The proposal made for adaptation and mitigation in the agriculture sector focuses on conservation and climate-smart agriculture which is based on the industrial agriculture model.

AFSA has organised its members into working groups to address the above issues that have an impact on food sovereignty in Africa. There are four working groups, Seed and Agroecology; Land and Agroecology; Climate change and Agroecology and; Citizens and Agroecology.

3. Project Expected Outcome and Impact

AFSA with support from Bread for the World (BFW), Packard Foundation, Swift Foundation, Tudor Trust and Marin Community Foundation(MCF) is implementing a three-year project whose overall goal is to **"contribute to a strengthened food sovereignty movement in Africa influencing a transition to agroecology"**. The objectives of the project are;

1. The AFSA-network has an improved communication structure.
2. AFSA members strengthened their competences to effectively influence national, regional and continental policies on agriculture, seed and land, as well as practices on the local level.
3. The voice of AFSA for the promotion of the agroecology narrative, seed sovereignty and land rights is increasingly heard by regional bodies such as SADC, COMESA, EAC, ECOWAS and continental bodies like the AU

These objectives are to be assessed by five indicators.

For objective 1 the following indicator was set:

- 1.1 A comprehensive communication strategy which is inclusive and involves the member basis is established and being implemented.

For objective 2, the following indicators were set:

- 2.1 At least 60% of AFSA-members use acquired advocacy-knowledge and materials to influence relevant political stakeholders on the national, regional and continental level.
- 2.2 At least 60% of AFSA-members provide information and material of AFSA to local constituencies who use these to promote agroecology, seed sovereignty and responsible land management.

For objective 3, the following indicators were set:

- i. By June 2020, at least 3 regional or continental bodies such as RECs or AU have mentioned the work of AFSA on agricultural, seed, and land policies in official speeches, statements or publications (at least one reference for each focal area)
- ii. By June 2020, AFSA has been invited by at least 3 regional/continental policy-making bodies such as RECs or AU to present AFSA's position on agricultural, seed and land policies.

AFSA is engaging policymakers at continental and regional levels on Farmer Managed Seed Systems (FMSS) which are under threat of corporate takeover and control. This is being done through participating in the policy process at the regional and continental level, developing advocacy material to influence seed policies and organising of regional capacity building workshops for members and policymakers on seed policy and FMSS

AFSA has also taken the advocacy for community land rights being cognizant that many communities especially women are either having their land grabbed by individuals, corporate institutions or given away by governments in favour of industries like extractives and “commercial farms.” Denying anyone access to this resource condemns them to poverty and malnutrition, making them more vulnerable.

AFSA is also lobbying for the adoption of agroecology and agroecological practices across the continent. This is through taking part in research and publishing evidence on agroecology and its benefits to farmers, climate change and communities at large. The goal is to have governments and regional policy bodies adopt agroecology, support and fund initiatives such as research, financing, local markets, innovation and how to leverage technology for the benefit of small-scale farmers.

AFSA has also been strengthening its communication function through updating and popularising its website and social media sites, capacity building of members on communication, producing materials in both French and English inline with AFSA's membership.

4. Purpose of the evaluation

This is an end of project evaluation and the purpose is to;

- a) Access the performance and achievements of the project vis a vis the set objectives.
- b) Provide accountability to stakeholders on what worked (went well) and why, what did not work and why.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are;

1. Review and analyse the quality and relevancy of the design and the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the project
2. Examine and document the key lessons learned from the implementation of the project and how these can be used to improve future projects.
3. Make recommendations based on the findings of the evaluation for improvement of future projects (design and implementation)
4. Identify and analyse any unintended outcomes (both positive and negative) arising out of implementing the project.

5. Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will cover the entire project July 2017 – June 2020. The evaluation should have a continental outlook, capturing input from AFSA members. Field visits will be conducted in at least 3 countries to represent the regions Eastern, Southern and Western Africa. Key stakeholders who will participate in the evaluation include AFSA members, the board, the Secretariat and some of our funders.

6. Intended users

While other stakeholders may benefit/learn from this evaluation, the primary intended users are AFSA (Members, Secretariat and the board), BfW and other partners.

The findings of this evaluation will inform BfW and AFSA on the conceptual design of future funding and therefore should provide insights on the effectiveness of the project concept, design, approach, management and implementation.

7. Evaluation questions

Relevance:

- To what extent are project objectives, planned activities and planned outputs consistent with the intended outcome and impact?
- To what extent are the project intervention strategies and project objectives relevant in addressing the needs of AFSA members and their constituencies (grassroots; farmers, etc.)?
- Are the objectives and design relevant given the political, economic and financial context?
- Is the project's design adequate to address the problem(s) at hand?
- What internal and external factors have influenced the ability of target groups to meet the objectives?
- To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid?
- In how far do project objectives align with AFSA's strategy?

Effectiveness

- To what extent were the objectives achieved/are likely to be achieved?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- Were approaches and activities appropriate to lead to the objectives?
- Examine the effectiveness of project implementation against the planned outputs, including an appraisal of the methods and approaches used;
- How effective has the project been in responding to the needs of the target group - AFSA members and their constituencies?
- Which most significant and visible changes can be seen for the target groups as a result of the project?
- To what extent were the target groups reached? What were the main factors influencing this?
- To what extent has the project played its role to actively engage stakeholders (both within the network and outside the network)?
- How effective is the working group strategy in mobilising and engaging members for joint action around issues of land, seed and agroecology?
- Is the M&E system adequate? To what extent did the project's M&E system contribute to assessing the project results? How effective is the monitoring system? How could the project's impact have been improved?

Efficiency:

- Assess the efficiency in the use of resources to achieve project objectives, including the strategies for implementation and approach of the project
 - Were activities cost-efficient?
 - Were objectives achieved on time?
 - Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
 - How efficient are the management and accountability structures of the project?
 - What kind of actions has been taken when facing/realizing difficulties?
 - Were there any difficulties in the execution of the project (planning, implementation, monitoring etc)?

Impact

- What has changed for the target groups as a result of the project's intervention - intended or unintended, positive or negative, short term and long term? To what extent has the project contributed to building the capacity of AFSA members?
- What real difference has the activities brought about for the beneficiaries?
- What would have happened without the activities? To what extent did the project contribute to the overall goal?
- Are there non-visible changes (e.g. attitude, behaviour etc)?
- To what extent will the positive impacts of the project be likely to continue?

Sustainability

- To what extent will the positive impacts or changes of the project (be likely to) continue?
- Which measures are implemented in order to support sustainability?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?
- What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve the prospects of sustainability of project outcomes?

Organisational issues:

- Is the organisational structure fit for purpose?
- Are the management and governance structure adequate and functioning?
- What is the added value of AFSA membership for members and members constituencies (grassroots)? What do members expect of AFSA and how has AFSA fulfilled this role up to now?
- How effective is AFSA in the planning and implementation of strategies and policies?

- Does the selection of working groups reflect the needs of the members and their constituencies?
- Which measures have been taken to ensure institutional sustainability?
- How does the management work, how does internal decision-making process work? To what extent did other management factors such as capacity, working relationships within the team, working relationships with partners, stakeholders and donors, learning processes such as self-evaluation/appraisal, coordination and exchange with related projects, internal and external communication systems influenced the performance of the project?

8. Evaluation Design

The consultant shall describe in his proposal a detailed methodology they intend to use to conduct the evaluation. The evaluation design selected by the evaluator MUST comply with the OECD DAC Evaluation Quality Standards and it should be comprehensible in the evaluation. The evaluation shall conduct a desk review and use other appropriate methods (both qualitative and quantitative) to collect the necessary data required to provide information for the evaluation. The principles that will guide the evaluation and to which the evaluator must adhere include transparency, independence, gender-sensitive, participatory Below are some of the data sources

Information sources and procedures

- AFSA policy documents, strategy documents, plans and reports
- Project proposal and Program monitoring data
- Program records
- Stakeholders and beneficiaries (AFSA members, board members, African Union, Regional Economic Communities and other direct and indirect target stakeholders)
- Interview of key informants
- Websites
- Social media
- News articles

9. Evaluator Qualifications

The evaluator should have a post-graduate qualification in Public Policy, international development, Economics, Statistics, Monitoring and Evaluation or relevant field. The

evaluator should have experience evaluating projects of network organisations, evaluating policy advocacy programs and knowledgeable on organisational development. The Evaluator must be knowledgeable on different evaluation methodologies and preferably familiar with issues of food sovereignty and agroecology. Fluency in English and excellent writing skills with good analytical knowledge and communication skills are required. Fluency in French is a MUST.

10. Budget

The consultant shall submit a budget that should include among other professional fees, communication and travel costs.

11. Timeline and milestones

The consultant shall within 5 working days of signing the contract submit to AFSA an inception report including a work plan. The evaluation is to be done within 45 working days including a data collection, analysis, drafting of the report and a validation meeting with the AFSA team. The evaluation is expected to run starting mid-October through mid-December 2019.

	Milestone	Deliverable	Duration (days)
1	Evaluation Plan, Inception Meeting	Inception Report	05
2	Data collection, desk review, field visits	Draft evaluation Report	25
3	Incorporate feedback in the final report, develop a PowerPoint presentation of key findings, prepare an implementation plan	Final evaluation report PowerPoint presentation of evaluation (methodology, findings and recommendations) Implementation plan	15

12. Expected Deliverables

The consultant shall produce the following deliverables;

1. Inception Report
2. Work plan with clear timelines and activities.
3. A first draft of the evaluation report.
4. Final evaluation report.
5. PowerPoint presentation of evaluation methodology, main findings and recommendations
6. Preparation of an implementation plan with all recommendations made in the final report

13. Final evaluation report

The final report must be written in English and shall have the following contents.:

- i. **Executive summary:** a strongly crafted, to-the-point, free-standing document (about 5 pages), including the key issues of the evaluation, main analytical points, conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations.
- ii. **Introduction:** the purpose of the evaluation, evaluation scope and key questions. Short description of the project to be evaluated and relevant frame conditions
- iii. Evaluation design/methodology
- iv. Key results/findings: with regard to the questions pointed out in the TOR
- v. Conclusions based on evidence and analysis.
- vi. Recommendations regarding future steps/activities/follow-up – carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, relevant and feasible (if possible, for each conclusion a recommendation).
- vii. Lessons learnt (generalizations of conclusions applicable for wider use).
- viii. Annexes (ToR, list of persons/organizations consulted, gender distribution and social representation of the respondents, literature and documentation consulted etc.)

14. Application Process and Requirements

The following are the requirements that should form part of the application for this consultancy;

1. A technical proposal including an evaluation plan
2. A detailed budget proposal
3. Information on the team composition– including updated curriculum vitae that clearly spell out qualifications and experience.

Interested and qualified consultant(s) or firms should send their application by email as a single pdf file (Maximum 15 pages including CVs and Budgets) addressed to million.belay@afsafrica.org and copy to joshua.mwesigwa@afsafrica.org by 11th October 2019. Indicate in the subject line **Evaluation Proposal**.

Address:

Alliance for Food Sovereignty in Africa Secretariat

Plot 3433 Ntinda Kiwatule Road

P.O. Box 571, Kampala Uganda.