EUROPEAN COOPERATIVE FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE FINAL EVALUATION OF THE KENYA SORGHUM VALUE CHAIN DEVELOPMENT PROJECT 2012-2015

I. Background and Evaluation Rationale

European Cooperative for Rural Development; hereafter referred to as EUCORD; is a not for profit organization based in Brussels but with offices in project countries in African continent. EUCORD has vast experience in implementation of value chains using the Public-Private-Partnership Model. In Kenya, EUCORD is implementing the Kenya Sorghum Value Chain Development Project of contract number EuropAid/132230/L/ACT/K; funded by the European Union under the Kenya Rural Development Programme (KRDP) and supervised by the National Drought Management Authority under the Ministry of Devolution. The action, targeting 18,000 households and funded to the tune of Euro 895,913.00, is a three year intervention that started in December 2012 and comes to an end by November 2015.

The overall objective of the action is to achieve a sustainable rural development and agricultural growth in semi-arid counties in Kenya; with specific objectives of improving the level of food security and living standard of farmers in the semi-arid areas by a quantitative and qualitative increase in sorghum production, increasing agricultural production and incomes of farmers to reduce food dependency and support producer organizations through the establishment of public-private partnerships. The project is implemented in the following counties; Meru, Embu, Tharaka Nithi, Kitui and Makueni; by partners that are based in the target communities and are assigned different duties including trainings, mobilization, and aggregation, market linkage, capacity building, group formation, recruitment of intermediary agents, facilitating access to seed, sensitization to capacity building.

Specifically, the project aims at achieving the following:

1. To improve the level of food security and living standards of sorghum farmers in semi-arid areas by a quantitative and qualitative increase in sorghum production.
2. To increase agricultural production and income of farmers to reduce food dependency in semi-arid areas.
3. To support the structuring of producer organizations and their integration into the sorghum value chain and strengthen marketing capacity of producers through the establishment of public-private partnerships.

The project has the following Key Result Areas;

1. The productivity of the sorghum sector has been improved by conducting trainings on new sorghum varieties, aspects of quality and quantity and the efficient use of conducive technology and inputs.
2. Sorghum producer groups have been organized and strengthened in terms of organizational development, access to savings and credit facilities and marketing
3. Market linkages are strengthened in close collaboration with the local private sector and the producer groups
4. Market linkages are strengthened by capacity building of local input and service providers along the sorghum value chain.

Partners involved in the action are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Contact person</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMEHA</td>
<td>Meru</td>
<td>Ruth Gacheri</td>
<td>+254723151405 <a href="mailto:rucherk@yahoo.com">rucherk@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwailu Investment</td>
<td>Makueni</td>
<td>Johnson Gachuhi</td>
<td>+254726673348 <a href="mailto:gachuhi.johnson@yahoo.com">gachuhi.johnson@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSA</td>
<td>Embu</td>
<td>Lydia Omamo</td>
<td>+254713446975 <a href="mailto:lomamo@clusakenya.org">lomamo@clusakenya.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARITAS-Meru</td>
<td>Meru</td>
<td>Morris Kirimi</td>
<td>+2540721355650 <a href="mailto:morriskirimi2004@gmail.com">morriskirimi2004@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAAC</td>
<td>Kitui</td>
<td>Lucy Muchoki</td>
<td>+254722510210 <a href="mailto:lmuchoki@panaac.org">lmuchoki@panaac.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entrepreneurs involved in the action are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entrepreneur</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Contact person</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum Pioneer Agencies</td>
<td>Tharaka Nithi</td>
<td>Beatrice Nkatha</td>
<td>+254724597502 <a href="mailto:beatricekannz17@gmail.com">beatricekannz17@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shalem</td>
<td>Meru</td>
<td>Ruth Gacheri</td>
<td>+254723151405 <a href="mailto:rucherk@yahoo.com">rucherk@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwailu Enterprises Ltd</td>
<td>Makueni</td>
<td>Johnson Gachuhi</td>
<td>+254726673348 <a href="mailto:gachuhi.johnson@yahoo.com">gachuhi.johnson@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Enterprises</td>
<td>Kitui</td>
<td>Pennina Mwendwa</td>
<td>+254727307755 <a href="mailto:pmenterprises75@gmail.com">pmenterprises75@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARITAS-Meru</td>
<td>Meru</td>
<td>Morris Kirimi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:morriskirimi2004@gmail.com">morriskirimi2004@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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II. Purpose of the Evaluation

The main purpose of the external evaluation is to determine the effectiveness of the project implementation strategy in
achieving the overall objective and the specific objectives and the result areas in the project areas. The evaluation purpose includes:

a) To determine whether project has been successful in achieving its objectives and out puts established in the project log-frame.
b) Determine how far the project has been able to address the issues of sustainability of the installed facilities through local capacity building initiatives.
c) To determine the effectiveness of the project in addressing the issues outlined under risk and assumption in the project document.
d) Determine the capacity of the EUCORD project team in planning, implementing and monitoring the project progress and activities.
e) To improve the level of food security and living standards of sorghum farmers in semi-arid areas by a quantitative and qualitative increase in sorghum production; recommend the effective ways to replicate the successful approaches in other Counties and Provinces.
f) To documents the project achievements, successes and learnings from the implementation

g) To identify the project challenges and develop strategies to address these challenges

h) To advise on possible changes to project approaches for development of future interventions.

The project log frame:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of the Action: The Sorghum Value Chain Development Project in Kenya</th>
<th>Lot 2 Semi-arid lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Objective</td>
<td>To achieve sustainable rural development and agricultural growth in semi-arid counties in Kenya.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logic</th>
<th>indicators of achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Development Index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty headcount ratio at rural poverty line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Objectives</th>
<th>1. To improve the level of food security and living standards of sorghum farmers in semi-arid areas by a quantitative and qualitative increase in sorghum production.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. To increase agricultural production and income of farmers to reduce food dependency in semi-arid areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. To support the structuring of producer organizations and their integration into the sorghum value chain and strengthen marketing capacity of producers through the establishment of a public-private partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volume of sorghum sold by small holder households thru aggregation centers; Post-harvest losses reduced to 20% in the project area; Number of smallholders consolidating and marketing sorghum production; Number of farmers using improved storage facilities; Number of farmers selling staple crops through the aggregation centre’s; Number of viable business partnerships established and fully operational; Number of commercial sorghum seed suppliers and sorghum bulking points in operation; Number of private sector staff trained (M/F) by topic and type of training;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects reports; FAO reports; Mid-term evaluation report; Final evaluation report; National statistics; Listing of participating farmers, producers associations and processors; List of commercial contracts between producers’ organizations and input suppliers; List of commercial contracts between producers’ organizations and food processing industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social and political environment are stable; Government support in the agricultural sector; Adequate rainfall is available in the project area;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Results</td>
<td>Expected Result I. The productivity of the sorghum sector has been improved by conducting trainings on new sorghum varieties, aspects of quality and quantity and the efficient use of conducive technology and inputs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Expected Result III. Market linkages are strengthened in close collaboration with the local private sector and the producer groups

- 18,000 farmers trained on structured marketing
- 10 intermediate buying agents trained
- 5 bulk buyers linked to smallholder producer groups
- 220 bulking/collection points

Sources:
- Site visits
- Project reports
- Minutes of meetings with the private sector
- Minutes of meetings for the preparation of contingency plans
- Aggregation centre records
- Producer organizations records
- Buyer records
- Workshop materials
- Training reports
- Business plans
- Out-grower scheme agreements /Contract with potential buyers

### Expected Result IV. Market linkages are strengthened by capacity building of local input and service providers along the sorghum value chain.

- 15 120MT sorghum delivered
- 20 Small and Medium Agro-based Enterprise (SMAEs) facilitated to develop bankable business plans
- 10 SMAEs accessing credit services
- 10 SMAEs trained on quality and warehouse management

Sources:
- Financial institution records
- Project reports
- Training reports
- SMAE records
- Periodic reports
- Producer organizations records
- Minutes of meetings with service and input providers
- Stakeholder mapping
- Contracts with service and inputs providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Pre-conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1. Improving the productivity of the sorghum sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.1 Rapid appraisal of sorghum cultivation practices</td>
<td>Project staff time; Gender specialist; Communication specialist Trainers; Training manuals; Curriculum development expert; Awareness workshop; Facilitators; Office space; Transport &amp; fuel; Flipcharts; Agricultural inputs; Project equipment such as vehicles, motorbikes; Workshop materials; Stationery;</td>
<td>Introduced new varieties and associated technologies will promote sorghum production; The private sector input distribution system is able to make seed and fertilizer available at reasonable prices; Financial institutions are willing to provide short-term credit at market rates; Commercial farmers and producer associations will produce and develop high quality malted sorghum that will carry a price premium;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.2 Identification and introduction of new sorghum varieties and technologies including soil and water conservation practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.3 Training of farmers on best sorghum production and postharvest handling practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.4 Economic analyses of alternative cultivation practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activity 2. Capacity building of farmers associations, nucleus farmers and credit groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 2.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.2.1 Identification and mobilization of groups and farmers</td>
<td>Project staff time; Curriculum development expert; Gender specialist; Financial services specialist; Communication specialist; Trainers; Training manuals; Disaster preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2.2 Strengthen the technical and organizational capacity of farmer groups and nucleus farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2.3 Identification, formation and training of village level credit groups</td>
<td>expert; Agriculture innovative expert; Office space; Demonstration equipment;</td>
<td>Introducing and setting quality trade standards will enhance quality and competitiveness;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2.4 Improving access to seed, fertilizers and other inputs</td>
<td>Facilitators; Transport &amp; fuel; Communication costs; Flipcharts; Agricultural inputs; Project equipment such as vehicles, motorbikes; Stationery; Workshop materials;</td>
<td>Sufficient agricultural extension capacity is available to support farmers in adopting new cropping systems;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2.5 Support communities for contingency plans preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate NGO and department of agriculture capacity exists to support farmers’ groups;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activity 3. Introducing out-growers schemes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.3.1 Develop and test contract templates for the relationships intermediary agent and nucleus farmer, nucleus farmers and out-growers, nucleus farmers and input providers</th>
<th>Project staff; Financial services specialist; Gender specialist; Communication specialist; Facilitators; Office space; Stationery; Transport &amp; fuel;</th>
<th>NGO organizations have credibility with farmers;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.3.2 Assist nucleus farmers with the development of business plans through workshops and individual counseling</td>
<td>Communication costs and Equipment; Workshop materials; Project equipment such as vehicles, motorbikes;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.3.3 Facilitate access to short-term credit for input delivery and long-term credit for equipment

Activity 4. Strengthening private sector partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.4.1 Broker contract discussion between agro-processors, agro-dealers and/or whole sale traders /intermediary purchasing agents and producers associations in order to identify long-term contract mechanisms between actors in the sorghum supply chain</th>
<th>Project staff; Communication specialist; Facilitators; Office space; Stationery; Transport &amp; fuel; Communication costs and Equipment; Workshop materials; Project equipment such as vehicles, motorbikes;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.4.2 Assist agro-dealers and intermediary buying agents in developing business plans and facilitate access to credit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4.3 Introduce warehouse receipt procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Evaluation Questions
The evaluator will follow the questions raised as guidelines, but he/she can choose to focus on the more relevant and add his/her own questions if needed. He/she will put a particular attention to the questions raised by EUCORD during the implementation of the project. Based on his/her answers, the evaluator will provide recommendations.

1. Relevance and adequacy of the programme
   - To what extend does the programme answer the needs?
     a. Is the quality of the need assessments sufficient?
     b. Is the analysis of the context sufficient and accurate?
     c. Is the definition of target groups and stake-holders appropriate?
     d. Is there enough hierarchy amongst identified needs? Are the priority need targeted?
     e. Is there a direct relation between the assessed needs and the project objectives?

   - To what extend are the strategies coherent with the objectives?
     a. Do the designed strategies correspond to the objectives?
     b. Are the planned activities coherent with the objectives?
     c. Are the strategies coherent/complementary/coordinated with the local agriculture ministries?
     d. Are the coherent/complementary/coordinated with other structures working in this field?

2. Efficacy and impact
   - To what extend are the programme objectives reached?
     a. Are the planned activities implemented?
     b. Are the overall objectives realised?
     c. Are the specific objectives reached?
     d. What are the positive or negative unexpected effects of the action?
     e. Which target group can be identified as the ones who benefit the more/the less from the action?
     f. Were the strategies efficient enough to create an impact at individual level and at the collective levels for each target group?
     g. Is the programme responsible of any changes at policy level?
     h. Is the programme significant among other local actors partly responsible of positive changes in issues addressed?
     i. Is the impact of the programme recognised by the diverse stakeholders?

3. Efficiency and methods’ coherency
   - Are the achievements sufficient compared to the consumed resources?
     a. Do the staffs have an efficient management of the timeframe and calendar?
b. What is the cost the programme’s realisation in terms of human, material, financial resources, in expenses and values?
c. Do the results match the resources involved?
d. What are the unexpected elements that impacted the ratio results/resources?

- How relevant and strong are the methods?
  a. Does the project utilise all possible synergies and “cost reduction in chain”?
  b. Is cost-effectiveness monitored adequately?
  c. Is the project result-oriented enough at the management/operational level?
  d. Are the project management system and the monitoring sufficient?
  e. Important question: Is the programme gaining from lessons learnt/ best practices? What are they?
  f. Do the methods used in the project log-frame allow the objectives’ realisation?
  g. Do the methods allow realization the results at the cheapest cost?
  h. Are the chosen methods sufficiently flexible to get adapted to remote management (in case of restricted access to territory)?
  i. What were the external or internal factors, which help or hinder the realisation of the objectives?
  j. And were the planned strategies adaptable to these factors?

4. Sustainability
- What mechanisms and tools make the project sustainable?
  a. What are the multiplier effects of the action?
  b. Was there any efficient experience sharing or capacity building process (EUCORD/other partners)?
  c. Was there a start for a transfer of competencies between direct partners
  d. Does the project encourage capitalization of experience?
  e. Does the project formalize models or guidelines for stake-holders to encourage mechanisms’ replication?
- What sustainable indicators can be observed?
  a. Does the project encourage the state responsiveness?
  b. Does the project encourage a reaction at other levels?
  c. Does the project increase the collaboration amongst its partners and other structures they cooperate with?
  d. Does the project reinforce the cooperation between EUCORD/partners and the stake-holders?
  e. Does the project allow the involvement of beneficiaries?
  f. Does the project allow the empowerment of beneficiaries?

IV. Methodology
Potential evaluators will submit a methodological offer and a quotation to EUCORD and will be evaluated before selection and award;
At the end of the contract, he will submit to EUCORD a final report including recommendations and the specific required documents.

Depending on the results of the evaluation, an official restitution might be organised and followed by a discussion in with the contractor (EUCORD) and NDMA and other players to capitalize experience and envisage the future of the programme.

The actual evaluation process will involve:

a. Review of project documents and reports
b. Surveys
c. Focused Group Discussions
d. Key informant Interviews
e. Field visit to observe the work done at community level
f. Meet the county directors of agriculture and NDMA officers to determine the usefulness of the approach applied by the project and their commitment to replicate the successful approaches in other Counties.
g. Visit a representative sample of households in each county to determine the effectiveness of the project in addressing its immediate needs and the likely impact on livelihoods and in health and development.

V. Scope

The evaluation will capture widespread data on smallholder farmers involved in the project, partners selected by EUCORD to carry out specialized tasks, entrepreneurs developed by the project and actions and position of the ministry of agriculture and industrialization together with other actors in the value chain. Information will be obtained through means deemed necessary by the evaluator with focus on key areas that address data and information needs of the evaluation.

VI. Deliverables and schedule

The evaluator will make available the following documents;

These documents should be provided in hard and soft copy, written in simple English without technical jargon. All primary data collected and analyses conducted for the purpose of the evaluation will remain the property of EUCORD and must be submitted electronically and in a clear and comprehensible format in Microsoft Excel or IMB SPSS Statistics format (sav).

a. Interim: within **21 working days after the start of the evaluation**. The consultant will present preliminary findings for discussion to the project team. All raw data, including GPS coordinate information will also be submitted at this point in a separate Excel worksheet for review and provision of comments by EUCORD.

b. Final Report: The final output of the study will be specific figures for all the projects indicators, disaggregating the results, wherever possible by project intervention, location and gender. The final study report should
incorporate specific, practical and feasible recommendations for improving the projects delivery and impacts as well as replication in other counties and for learning purposes.

c. The content of the report will contain; an Executive Summary of no more than 3 pages; outline and rationale for methodology; the main findings; conclusions and recommendations

d. A table summarizing of key Project Indicators highlighting key EUCORD and donor requirements. All data collection tools used in the survey should be included as Annexes to the report.

VII. Management and Implementation Responsibilities

The evaluator will report directly to the Project Coordinator and M&E Officer and shall also be expected to have sufficient and regular consultations with the project team and field staff during the assignment.

EUCORD will provide:

a. Guidance and technical support as required throughout the survey;
b. Logistical coordination for respondents during the survey;
c. Copies of all key background resources identified;
d. Introductory meetings with key government staff and other stakeholders.
e. Comments and feedback on, and approval of, all deliverables within agreed timelines.

The consultant will be responsible for:

a. Developing a detailed household survey methodology
b. Developing survey tools (questionnaires and checklists)
c. Conducting all data collection and cater for all his/her expenses and those of the team of enumerators
d. Regular progress reporting to the project coordinator and M&E Officer, including responding to any comments or technical inputs wherever necessary
e. Production of deliverables within agreed timelines and in accordance with quality requirements from project team.
f. Seeking comments and feedback from EUCORD through the project manager insufficient time to discuss and incorporate those into the final report.

VIII. Qualification of Evaluator/Evaluation Team

Applications from individuals or teams are welcome and will be assessed on their ability to demonstrate the following qualifications and competencies:

Essential

a. Previous experience in carrying out project reviews, with a key focus on agriculture-related interventions implemented by development organizations. Demonstrate academic and practical experience in quantitative and qualitative research methodology, evaluations design and implementation.
b. Strong analytical, facilitation and communication skills.
a. Good understanding of rural development and agriculture-based enterprises and value chains approach.
g. Excellent reporting and presentation skills.

h. All team members should be fluent in spoken and written English and Kiswahili;

i. The lead researcher should possess an advanced degree in Statistics, Agricultural Economics, Agriculture, Sustainable Development, Business Development or related subject.

Desirable

a. Previous knowledge of conducting surveys/value chain studies.

b. Experience working in arid and semi-arid areas is an added advantage

c. Previous experience with EU funded projects will be an added advantage.

IX. Expressions of Interest

Interested consultants or firms are requested to submit

a. An Expression of Interest (EOI) detailing their interpretation of the TORs, proposed methodology including sampling framework, work schedule and detailed plan of activities. The proposal should ideally not exceed 10 pages.

b. A proposed budget (in Kenya Shillings); propose a realistic cost estimate for this activity, including a breakdown of the budget and justification of expenses.

c. The budget should include only those costs that can be directly attributed to the activities proposed with explanation of line items.

d. A capability statement demonstrating how they meet the required qualifications and competencies;

e. Copies of all relevant Curriculum Vitae;

f. Two references (including one from your last client/employer).

All documents must be submitted by email to conyango@eucord.org and copied to pmuthangya@eucord.org by COB 12th October, 2015.