

SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE

Mid Term Review of KCEP-CRAL (FED/2013/329-234) and end term review of IPP-GAP (FED/2014/344-651)

FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT 1; Sustainable management of natural resources and resilience

EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi

CRIS reference number: 2019/407058

Contracting Authority: The European Union Delegation to Kenya

1	BACKGROUND	2
1.1	RELEVANT COUNTRY / REGION / SECTOR BACKGROUND.....	2
1.2	THE ACTIONS TO BE EVALUATED.....	3
1.3	STAKEHOLDERS OF THE ACTION.....	4
1.4	OTHER AVAILABLE INFORMATION	4
2	DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT	5
2.1	OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION	5
2.2	REQUESTED SERVICES.....	6
2.3	PHASES OF THE EVALUATION AND REQUIRED OUTPUTS.....	7
2.4	SPECIFIC CONTRACT ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY (TECHNICAL OFFER)	10
2.5	MANAGEMENT AND STEERING OF THE EVALUATION	11
2.6	LANGUAGE OF THE SPECIFIC CONTRACT	11
3	EXPERTISE REQUIRED	12
3.1	NUMBER OF EXPERTS AND OF WORKING DAYS PER CATEGORY	12
3.2	EXPERTISE REQUIRED	12
3.3	PRESENCE OF MANAGEMENT TEAM FOR BRIEFING AND/OR DEBRIEFING.....	13
4	LOCATION AND DURATION	13
4.1	STARTING PERIOD.....	13
4.2	FORESEEN DURATION OF THE ASSIGNMENT IN CALENDAR DAYS.....	13
4.3	PLANNING, INCLUDING THE PERIOD FOR NOTIFICATION FOR PLACEMENT OF THE STAFF.....	13
4.4	LOCATION(S) OF ASSIGNMENT	14
5	REPORTING	14
5.1	CONTENT, TIMING AND SUBMISSION	14
5.2	USE OF THE EVAL MODULE BY THE EVALUATORS.....	15
5.3	COMMENTS ON THE OUTPUTS	15
5.4	ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	15
5.5	LANGUAGE	15
5.6	NUMBER OF REPORT COPIES.....	15
5.7	FORMATTING OF REPORTS.....	15
	ANNEX I: SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	16
	ANNEX II: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM.....	17
	ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	18
	ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE.....	20
	ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID.....	21
	ANNEX VI: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED ACTION(S)	24

1 BACKGROUND

Over 50% of the Kenyan population lives below poverty line. The Agriculture sector contributes towards 26 per cent of the Kenyan Gross Domestic Product (GDP), accounts for over 65% of the exports, and is the second largest contributor to the economy after the service sector. However, Kenya has experienced acute and chronic food insecurity (both at national and household levels) during the last four decades, and this has continued to persist. This has been attributed to a nexus of factors ranging from natural phenomena related challenges, to policy and programmatic related aspects. Such have included (and not limited to); i) decline in food production with low diversity in sources of dietary energy consumption (48% in Kenya comes from cereals compared to 21% in Uganda and 29% in Ghana), ii) little growth in marketed production; gross marketed production of cereals, industrial crops, and livestock has stagnated, while only horticulture produce has increased over time, iii) Marketing and value addition related challenges, iv) drought related challenges, v) Uncoordinated response and distribution of available resources from government, development partners and non-state actors.

It is against this backdrop that the EU and Government of Kenya signed a Financing Agreement in 2011, from which emanated the Kenya Rural Development Programme (KRDP), as a sector wide initiative (funded under the 10th European Development Fund), geared towards addressing the aforementioned challenges. KRDP was designed to complement and integrate into other Agriculture and Rural Development actions financed by the Government of Kenya and development partners. Further, it was designed to directly contribute towards issues elicited in the Government of Kenya's main agriculture blue print, the Agriculture Sector Development Strategy (ASDS).

The "Kenya Cereal Enhancement Programme" (KCEP, FED/2013/324-939) is the biggest individual commitment/project under the KRDP: it was signed on 20/12/2013 and will end, after the addendum introducing the "Climate Resilient Agricultural Livelihoods" (CRAL) component, on 21/6/2021 (however, the project will continue until 2023 with IFAD/Government of Kenya funding).

The "Increased productivity and profitability of small holder farmers through promotion and up – scaling of GAP & CA in productive Semi-Arid areas of Kenya (IPP-GAP)" (FED/2014/344-651) was signed on 13/06/2014, and ended on 12/06/2019.

Both projects are part of result 1 of KRDP: "Improving food availability and access in Kenya": in particular, KCEP aims at reducing the gap in cereal production, around 30% of the needs at the time of its design. Both projects focus (KCEP through its CRAL window) on improving the production potential in semi-arid lands of Kenya, increasing resilience to climate change. With the design of the CRAL window, KCEP adopted a more holistic approach to cereal production, involving also a synergy with the IPP-GAP and of the WFP "Protracted Relief and Recovery Programme" (PRRP).

It is for this reason, therefore, that this assignment focuses not only on an assessment of the performance of the two projects (mid-term for KCEP-CRAL and end term for IPP-GAP), but also on the synergies established between the two under the CRAL window of KCEP.

1.1 Relevant country / region / sector background

The agriculture sector in Kenya is one of the priority sectors of the Kenya Government, contributing to 26% of GDP, accounting for over 62% of rural employment, and over 60% of the country's exports.

However, the sector has underperformed compared to its huge potential, both in terms of wealth creation and decent job creation: agricultural labour productivity has remained stagnant at a value addition of USD 1500 to USD 2000 per worker from the year 2000 to date.

The sector suffers is characterised by a strong dualism: a few number of export oriented sectors is relatively well organised (ie: horticulture, cut flowers, tea), while the majority of farmers are stuck in a

vicious cycle of low yield, low investments (especially in inputs and know-how) and low added value, resulting in poor and unreliable production. This has been exacerbated by the increasingly erratic rainfall patterns (especially in the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands – ASALs) caused by climatic change.

The agriculture sector, therefore, keeps getting marginalised, with average farmer age now being 60.

The public sector has constantly underinvested in the sector, well below the CAADP commitments (below 5% of budgetary allocation in Financial Year 2017/2018). With the approval of the 2010 Constitution, the agricultural sector was devolved, with responsibility for support of the sector shifting to the newly established County Governments.

Over the years of implementation of the KRDP, therefore, the policy environment for the agricultural sector changed radically, with the last most relevant policy orientations represented by the Food, Security and Nutrition pillar of the "Big 4 Agenda", and the newly developed Agricultural Sector Growth and Transformation Strategy (ASTGS).

Kenya's arid and semi-arid lands (ASALs) cover more than 80% of the country and account for approximately one-third of the human population, 70% of the livestock population (with pastoralism as the key livelihood activity), and with annual rainfall in these areas ranging between 150mm and 850mm per year. This region has historically been subjected to economic and political marginalisation, rendering it one of the most underdeveloped areas in Kenya with high levels of poverty.

This region has faced intense droughts, which have increased in frequency in recent years. Although drought effects are felt across the country, the pastoralists are the most affected, given that they traditionally derive their livelihood almost wholly from livestock, while living in a hostile climatic environment with poor linkage to inter alia, markets.

1.2 The Actions to be evaluated¹

Under the 10th EDF, a €86.4 million Financing Agreement (FA) was signed between the European Union and the Ministry of Finance. This FA (referenced Kenya Rural Development Programme (KRDP) overall objective is to contribute to improved food security and nutrition in Kenya. The purpose of the programme is to increase productivity and efficiency of food systems in Kenya with three expected results:

- Increased access to and availability of food in Kenya;
- Strengthened institutional capacity to manage droughts and improve food security and livelihoods in the ASALs;
- Strengthened sector coordination.

Two on-going 'Actions' from the aforementioned KRDP programme are envisaged for evaluation. The Kenya Cereal Enhancement Programme (KCEP) and Increased productivity and profitability of small holder farmers through promotion and up-scaling of good agricultural practices & conservation agriculture (IPP-GAP) in productive Semi-Arid areas of Kenya.

The overall objective of KCEP is "Income increased, and poverty and food insecurity of targeted rural smallholder households sustainably reduced".

The specific objective of KCEP (including the CRAL window) is a) the graduation of smallholder farmers to commercial farming, b) the graduation of smallholder farmers to commercial farming in ASAL counties is climate resilient and empowerment of county governments/communities for sustainable NRM and resilience to climate change.

¹ The term 'Action' is used throughout the report as a synonym of 'project and programme'.

The overall objective of IPP-GAP is "To contribute to reduced rural poverty and food insecurity among target farmers including female farmers".






The specific objective of IPP-GAP is "Increased graduation of small scale farmers, especially women farmers, of semi-arid areas to commercially orientated farming and climate – resilient agricultural practices through improvements in productivity, post-harvest production practices and market linkages for targeted value chains."

Further information regarding specific KRDP projects is as follows:

Titles of the Actions to be evaluated	Mid-term evaluation of "Kenya Cereal Enhancement Programme and its Climate Resilience Agricultural Livelihoods (KCEP-CRAL)" and an end of term evaluation of the "Increased productivity and profitability of small holder farmers through promotion and up – scaling of GAP & CA in productive Semi-Arid areas of Kenya (IPP-GAP)"
Budgets of the Actions to be evaluated	KCEP-CRAL EUR 27,100,000 (EU contribution, the total programme budget is EUR 124,552,000) IPP-GAP EUR 9,500,000
CRIS numbers of the Actions to be evaluated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ FED/2013/329-234 Kenya Cereal Enhancement Programme (KCEP) ✓ FED/2014/344-651 Increased productivity and profitability of small holder farmers through promotion and up – scaling of GAP & CA in productive Semi-Arid areas of Kenya (IPP-GAP)
Dates of the Action to be evaluated	KCEP – CRAL: Start: 20/12/2013 End:20/06/2021 IPP-GAP: Start: 13/06/2014 End: 12/06/2019

1.3 Stakeholders of the Action

With the final beneficiaries intended to be especially vulnerable and poor households in Kenya, the channel used was mainly development focused government and non-governmental organizations constituting of the following:

-  Farmers beneficiaries of the programme
-  The Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries and Irrigation of Kenya
-  County Governments of the 13 Counties where the projects are implemented
-  The direct implementing partners: IFAD and FAO (and WFP, being part of the overall KCEP-CRAL framework)
-  The other implementing partners: Equity Bank, Coop Bank, AgMARK, EAGC, KALRO, NDMA, CETRAD, etc.

1.4 Other available information

KCEP was the subject of a ROM mission, and of regular Joint Supervision Missions coordinated by IFAD, involving all the stakeholders. Both contracts changed their initial scope, budget and geographical target area following contract addenda.

A parallel study is being contracted by the EU to quantitatively assess the effectiveness at farmer level of the e-voucher component of KCEP-CRAL, measured in terms of yield, income, post-harvest losses. The consultant performing this evaluation will coordinate strictly with the team doing the study, if allowed by the contracting timing.

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

Type of evaluation	Mid term and End Term evaluation
Coverage	KCEP-CRAL and IPP-GAP projects
Geographic scope	Kenya
Period to be evaluated	Entire period of the Action to date (20/12/2013 to date for KCEP, 13/06/2014 to date for IPP-GAP).

2.1 Objectives of the evaluation

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority² of the European Commission³. The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the **quality** and the **results**⁴ of Actions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy with an increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the implementation of the SDGs**.⁵

From this perspective, evaluations should **look for evidence of why, whether or how these results are linked to the EU intervention** and seek to **identify the factors driving or hindering progress**.

Evaluations should provide an understanding of the **cause and effect links** between: inputs and activities, and outputs, outcomes and impacts. Evaluations should serve accountability, decision making, learning and management purposes.

The main objectives of this evaluation are to provide the relevant services of the European Union, the interested stakeholders with:

- an overall independent assessment of the past performance of the KCEP-Cral and IPP-GAP projects, paying particular attention to their intermediate results measured against their expected objectives; and the reasons underpinning such results;
- key lessons learned, conclusions and related recommendations in order to improve the design of future Actions and how to ensure sustainability of project results.
- an assessment on the validity of KCEP-CRAL assumptions, and the eventual recommendations for the remaining implementation period

² COM(2013) 686 final "Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation – improving evaluation" - http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf; EU Financial regulation (art 27); Regulation (EC) No 1905/200; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008

³ SEC (2007)213 "Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/eval_comm_sec_2007_213_en.pdf; SWD (2015)111 "Better Regulation Guidelines", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf; COM(2017) 651 final 'Completing the Better Regulation Agenda: Better solutions for better results', https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/completing-the-better-regulation-agenda-better-solutions-for-better-results_en.pdf

⁴ Reference is made to the entire results chain, covering outputs, outcomes and impacts. Cfr. Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 "Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action" - https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014_cir.pdf.

⁵ The New European Consensus on Development 'Our World, Our Dignity, Our Future', Official Journal 30th of June 2017. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2017:210:TOC>

- an assessment on the validity of the conservation agriculture approach of the IPP-GAP to improve resilience of smallholder farmers in the ASALs of Kenya, and of the synergies established between the IPP-GAP and the CRAL window of KCEP

The main users of this evaluation will be the Delegation of the EU to Kenya, IFAD, FAO, the Government of Kenya (NAO, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries and Irrigation - MoALFI, beneficiary County Governments) and the farmers targeted by the two projects. The findings could also form part of the ongoing debate about future strategies on input subsidies currently designed by the Government of Kenya at central (MoALFI) and County level.

2.2 Requested services

2.2.1 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will assess the Action using the five standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and early signs of impact. In addition, the evaluation will assess the following EU specific evaluation criteria:

- the EU added value (the extent to which the Action brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only);
- the coherence of the Action itself, with the EU strategy in Agriculture, Resilience and Job Creation in Kenya and with other EU policies and Member State Actions.
- lessons learned on the cost-effectiveness of the e-voucher system and in general of input subsidies as a tool to boost productivity in the target areas

The evaluation team shall furthermore consider whether gender, environment and climate change were mainstreamed. The team will also identify the relevance of the SDGs 1, 2 and 5 and their interlinkages. The principle of Leave No-One Behind and the rights-based approach methodology was followed in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the Action, its governance and monitoring.

2.2.2 Indicative Evaluation issues to be addressed

The specific issues to be addressed as formulated below are indicative. Based on the latter and following initial consultations and document analysis, the evaluation team will discuss them with the Evaluation Manager⁶ and propose in their Inception Report a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions with indication of specific judgement criteria and indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

Once agreed through the approval of the Inception Report, the evaluation issues will become contractually binding.

The key evaluation issues to be addressed comprise of the following:

- a. Assess progress with regard to on-going KCEP/CRAL project, and the validity of the main assumptions in project design, with particular reference to the impact on yield and the sustainability of the e-voucher input subsidy component.
- b. Assess achievements of the IPP-GAP project, and its synergy with the Climate Resilient Agricultural Livelihoods (CRAL) component of the KCEP-CRAL project

⁶ The Evaluation Manager is the staff of the Contracting Authority managing the evaluation contract. In most cases this person will be the Operational manager of the Action(s) under evaluation.

- c. Assess the cost effectiveness of the e-voucher model piloted by KCEP-CRAL, the appropriateness of the input kits delivered to farmers and the potential relevance for upscaling at national level
- d. Assess the efficiency of the KCEP-CRAL implementation modalities, and the added value of the partnership with County Governments
- e. Assess the cost effectiveness of the conservation agriculture approach, and the suitability to the Kenyan ASAL context
- f. Assess the likely future impact and sustainability of each project
- g. Indicate the lessons learned and suggest eventual recommendations for the remaining implementation period of the KCEP-CRAL project

2.3 Phases of the evaluation and required outputs

The evaluation process will be carried out in four phases:

- Inception
- Desk and Field
- Synthesis
- Dissemination

The outputs of each phase are to be submitted at the end of the corresponding phases as specified in the synoptic table in section 2.3.1.

2.3.1 Synoptic table

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted within each phase and lists the outputs to be produced by the team as well as the key meetings with the Contracting Authority and the Reference Group. The main content of each output is described in Chapter 5.

Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Outputs and meetings
<u>Inception Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial document/data collection • Background analysis • Inception interviews • Stakeholder analysis • Reconstruction (or as necessary, construction) of the Intervention Logic, and / or description of the Theory of Change (based upon available documentation and interviews) • Methodological design of the evaluation (evaluation questions with judgement criteria, indicators and methods of data collection and analysis) and evaluation matrix 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Kick-off meeting with the Contracting Authority and The Reference Group (key stakeholders including GoK and NGO representatives), at the EU Delegation or MoALFI</i> • Inception report • Slide presentation of the Inception Report • Present an Evaluation Design Matrix • Inception report.

Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Outputs and meetings
<u>Desk and field Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-depth document analysis (focused on the evaluation issues) Interviews as relevant Identification of information gaps and of hypotheses to be tested in the field phase Methodological design of the field phase Gathering of primary evidence with the use of the most appropriate techniques 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Meetings with Reference Group.</i> <i>Initial meetings at EU Delegation.</i> Slide presentation of key findings of the field phase <i>Debriefing with the Reference Group and EUD.</i>
<u>Synthesis phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final analysis of findings (with focus on the evaluation issues) Formulation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations Reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Final Report Executive Summary according to the standard template published in the EVAL module Final Report Slide presentation <i>Meeting with Reference Group and EUD.</i>
<u>Dissemination phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organisation of the final presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Final presentation seminar</i>

2.3.2 Inception Phase

This phase aims at structuring the evaluation and clarifying the key issues to be addressed.

The phase will start with initial background study, to be conducted by the evaluators from home. It will then continue with a kick-off session at the EU Delegation in Nairobi, between the EUD and representatives and the evaluators. Half-day presence of evaluators is required. The meeting aims at arriving at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility. It also serves to clarify expectations regarding evaluation outputs, the methodology to be used and, where necessary, to pass on additional or latest relevant information.

In the Inception phase, the relevant documents will be reviewed (see annex II). A strict coordination, whenever possible, will be ensured with the study on the effectiveness of the KCEP-CRAL e-voucher mentioned in paragraph 1.4.

Based on the Intervention Logic, the evaluators will develop a narrative explanation of the logic of the Action that describes how change is expected to happen within the Action, all along its results chain, i.e.

Theory of Change. This explanation includes an assessment of the evidence underpinning this logic (especially between outputs and outcomes, and between outcomes and impact), and articulates the assumptions that must hold for the Action to work, as well as identification of the factors most likely to inhibit the change from happening.

Based on the Intervention Logic and the Theory of Change the evaluators will finalise i) the Evaluation Issues with the definition of judgement criteria and indicators, the selection of data collection tools and sources, ii) the evaluation methodology, and iii) the planning of the following phases.

The methodological approach will be represented in an Evaluation Design Matrix, which will be included in the Inception Report. The methodology of the evaluation should be gender sensitive, contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and demonstrate how actions have contributed to progress on gender equality.

The limitations faced or to be faced during the evaluation exercise will be discussed and mitigation measures described in the Inception Report. Finally, the work plan for the overall evaluation process will be presented and agreed in this phase; this work plan shall be in line with that proposed in the present ToR. Any modifications shall be justified and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.

On the basis of the information collected, the evaluation team should prepare an **Inception Report** (its content is described in Chapter 5).

2.3.3 Desk and Field Phase

This phase is when the document analysis takes place. The analysis should include a brief synthesis of the existing literature relevant to the Action. Analysis of the KRDP Mid Term Review, any ROM evaluation findings, GoK strategies, project narrative reports, joint supervision reports prepared by IFAD, etc. will take place (see annex II). The analysis will especially include any preliminary findings (if already available) of the study mentioned in paragraph 1.4 above.

The analysis of the relevant documents shall be systematic and reflect the methodology developed and approved during the Inception Phase.

Selected phone and/or face-to-face interviews with the relevant stakeholders from the Government of Kenya, EUD Kenya and key partners may be conducted during this phase to support the analysis of secondary sources.

The Field Phase starts after approval of the Inception Report by the Evaluation Manager.

For the MTR of KCEP the evaluation team shall visit at least two counties from the KCEP (one in Western Region and one in the Eastern Region) and two from the CRAL component. On IPP-GAP, the team will select at least a county where synergies with KCEP-CRAL are being established.

During the desk and field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; with the relevant institutions and agencies. For the Field Phase, the detailed programme will be included in the Inception Report. Throughout the mission the evaluation team will use the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respect the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments.

At the end of this phase, the evaluation team will summarise its work, analyse the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present preliminary findings in a meeting with the EU, GoK and implementing partners. If possible, a joint presentation of the findings will be made with the team conducting the e-voucher effectiveness study indicated in paragraph 1.4, and involve in the reference group all stakeholders involved in input subsidies programmes in Kenya. If requested by the MoALFI, a specific presentation will be held for the KCEP-CRAL Steering Committee.

2.3.4 Synthesis Phase

This phase is devoted to the preparation by the contractor of two distinct documents: the **Executive Summary** and the **Final Report**, whose structures are described in the Annex III; it entails the analysis of the data collected during the desk and field phases to answer the evaluation questions and preparation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

The evaluation team will present, in a single Report with Annexes, their findings, conclusions and recommendations in accordance with the structure in Annex III; a separate Executive Summary will be produced as well, following the compulsory format given in the EVAL module (see Annex III).

The evaluation team will make sure that:

- Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic and clearly targeted.
- When drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.
- The wording, inclusive of the abbreviations used, takes into account the audience as identified in art. 2.1 above.

The evaluation team will deliver and then present in Nairobi the **Draft Final Report** to the Reference Group to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations. One day of presence is required of the evaluation team.

The Evaluation Manager will consolidate the comments expressed by the Reference Group members and sends them to the evaluation team for the report revision, together with a first version of the Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) assessing the quality of the Draft Final Report. The content of the QAG will be discussed with the evaluation team to verify if further improvements are required, and the evaluation team will be invited to comment on the conclusions formulated in the QAG (through the EVAL Module).

The evaluation team will then finalise the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary** by addressing the relevant comments. While potential quality issues, factual errors or methodological problems should be corrected, comments linked to diverging judgements may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluation team must explain the reasons in writing. After approval of the final report, the QAG will be updated and sent to the evaluators via EVAL Module.

2.3.5 Dissemination phase

The consultant will agree with the EUD Kenya, IFAD and FAO on a limited selection of lessons learned and case studies, and jointly prepare a communication tool that could be used to promote the two projects' approach to poverty reduction and contribution to the Kenya Government overall poverty reduction blueprint, and relevant Sustainable Development Goals.

2.4 Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology (Technical offer)

The invited Framework Contractors will submit their specific Contract Organisation and Methodology by using the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i and its annexes 1 and 2 (B-VII-d-ii).

The evaluation methodology proposed to undertake the assignment will be described in the Chapter 3 (Strategy and timetable of work) of the template B-VII-d-i. Contractors will describe how their proposed methodology will address the cross-cutting issues mentioned in these Terms of Reference and notably gender equality and the empowerment of women. This will include (if applicable) the communication action messages, materials and management structures.

2.5 Management and Steering of the evaluation

2.5.1 At the EU level

The evaluation is managed by the Evaluation Manager of the EUD Kenya; the progress of the evaluation will be followed closely with the assistance of a Reference Group consisting of members of EUD Kenya and of the main stakeholders of the two projects: the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries and Irrigation, the Council of Governors of Kenya, IFAD, FAO.

The main functions of the Reference Group are:

- To define and validate the evaluation questions/issues.
- To facilitate contacts between the evaluation team and the EU services and external stakeholders.
- To ensure that the evaluation team has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the Action.
- To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team. Comments by individual group members are compiled into a single document by the Evaluation Manager and subsequently transmitted to the evaluation team.
- To assist in feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation.
- To support the development of a proper follow-up action plan after completion of the evaluation.

2.5.2 At the Contractor level

Further to the Requirements set in the art. 6 of the Global Terms of Reference and in the Global Organisation and Methodology, respectively annexes II and III of the Framework contract SIEA 2018, the contractor is responsible for the quality of the process, the evaluation design, the inputs and the outputs of the evaluation. In particular, it will:

- Support the Team Leader in its role, mainly from a team management perspective. In this regard, the contractor should make sure that, for each evaluation phase, specific tasks and outputs for each team member are clearly defined and understood.
- Provide backstopping and quality control of the evaluation team's work throughout the assignment.
- Ensure that the evaluators are adequately resourced to perform all required tasks within the time framework of the contract.

2.6 Language of the Specific contract

The language of the specific contract is to be English.

3 EXPERTISE REQUIRED

3.1 Number of experts and of working days per category

The table below indicates the minimum number of evaluators and the minimum number of working days (overall and in the field), per category of experts to be foreseen by the Contractor.

Category of experts	Minimum number of evaluators	Total minimum number of working days (total)	(Out of which) minimum number of working days on mission
Cat I	1	35	15
Cat II	1	25	15

In particular, the Team Leader (to be identified in the Organisation and Methodology and in the Financial Offer) is expected to be a Cat I expert, possess a demonstrable senior evaluation expertise coherent with the requirements of this assignment and not provide less than 30 working days, out of which 20 in the field.

3.2 Expertise required

Minimum requirements of the team

Category I Expert (Team leader)

Minimum qualification

- Holds a Master degree or equivalent academic qualification (university or similar institution) in a relevant field (i.e. agricultural economics, agriculture, rural development or similar). If an expert does not have a Master's Degree, she/he should have equivalent qualification which is defined as: she/he must have at least a Bachelor's degree and an additional two years of relevant professional experience above the general professional experience.

Experience

- At least 10 years of experience in an area relevant to the assignment;
- At least 3 experiences in evaluation, of which at least 1 as team leader in evaluation of complex rural development programmes;
- At least 2 experiences in the last 10 years in projects/programmes on value chain development in Sub Saharan Africa, preferably in the crop sector

Desirable requirements of Cat. 1 expert

- At least 2 experiences in the management or monitoring or evaluation of agricultural input subsidy programmes in developing countries
- Experience in use of innovative ICT platforms in the delivery of input subsidies and/or agricultural extension
- Demonstrated knowledge of conservation agriculture approaches

Category II Expert – Agronomist

Minimum qualification

- Minimum Master's degree or equivalent academic qualification (university or similar institution) in agronomy or other relevant discipline, preferably with knowledge of environment conservation approaches. If an expert does not have a Master's Degree, she/he should have equivalent

qualification which is defined as: she/he must have at least a Bachelor's degree and an additional two years of relevant professional experience above the general professional experience;

Experience

- At least 6 years' experience, in the implementation of integrated agriculture or rural development programmes in a developing country.
- Demonstrated knowledge of conservation agriculture approaches in semi-arid areas of developing countries
- Proven experience having successfully been part of teams undertaking evaluations of rural development programmes
- Excellent written and oral communication skills in English.

Desirable requirements of Cat. 2 expert

- At least 2 experiences in the last 10 years of management or monitoring or evaluation of large (>10 million Euro budget) value chain developments in developing countries involving private public partnerships

Language skills of the team:

- English language at least all members shall possess a level C1 (Proficient user) expertise in understanding, speaking and writing.

Languages levels are defined for understanding, speaking and writing skills by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages available at <https://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/resources/european-language-levels-cefr> and shall be demonstrated by certificates or by past relevant experience.

The European Union pursues an equal opportunities policy. Gender balance in the proposed team, at all levels, is highly recommended.

3.3 Presence of management team for briefing and/or debriefing

The presence of member(s) of the management team is not required for briefing or debriefing purposes.

4 LOCATION AND DURATION

4.1 Starting period

Provisional start of the assignment is September 2019.

4.2 Foreseen duration of the assignment in calendar days

Maximum duration of the assignment: 120 calendar days.

This overall duration includes working days, week-ends, periods foreseen for comments, for review of draft versions, debriefing sessions, and distribution of outputs.

4.3 Planning, including the period for notification for placement of the staff

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill in the timetable in the Annex IV (to be finalised in the Inception Report). The 'Indicative dates' are not to be formulated as fixed dates but rather as days (or weeks, or months) from the beginning of the assignment (to be referenced as '0').

Sufficient forward planning is to be taken into account in order to ensure the active participation and consultation with government representatives, national / local or other stakeholders.

4.4 Location(s) of assignment

The assignment will take place in Nairobi Kenya, with field visits within a representative sample (to be proposed in the Organisation and Methodology according to criteria indicated in paragraph 2.3.3 and confirmed in the inception report) of the 13 target counties⁷ of KCEP-CRAL and IPP-GAP projects in Kenya.

5 REPORTING

5.1 Content, timing and submission

The outputs must match quality standards. The text of the reports should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables; a map of the area(s) of Action is required (to be attached as Annex).

List of outputs:

	Number of Pages (excluding annexes)	Main Content	Timing for submission
Inception Report	5 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intervention logic • Stakeholder map • Methodology for the evaluation, incl.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evaluation Matrix: Evaluation Questions, with judgement criteria and indicators, and data analysis and collection methods ○ Consultation strategy • Field visit approach and plan (including project sites to be visited) • Analysis of risks related to the evaluation methodology and mitigation measures • Work plan 	End of Inception Phase
Desk and field Report	20 pages maximum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary answers to each Evaluation Question, with indication of the limitations of the available information • Data gaps to be addressed, issues still to be covered and hypotheses to be tested during the field visit • Activities conducted during the field phase • Difficulties encountered during the field phase and mitigation measures adopted • Key preliminary findings (combining desk and field) 	End of the Desk and field Phase
Draft Final Report	50 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Cf. detailed structure in Annex III</u> 	End of Synthesis Phase
Draft Executive Summary – by using the EVAL online	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Cf. detailed structure in Annex III</u> 	End of Synthesis Phase

⁷ Bungoma, Kakamega, Nakuru, Nandi and Trans Nzoia, Embu, Kitui and Tharaka Nithi (KCEP) ; Embu, Kitui, Tharaka Nithi, Machakos, Makueni, TaitaTaveta, Kwale and Kilifi (CRAL); Machakos, Makueni, Kilifi, Kitui, Tharaka Nithi and Kwale, Meru and Laikipia for IPP-GAP, with preference to be given to IPP-GAP counties overlapping with CRAL

	Number of Pages (excluding annexes)	Main Content	Timing for submission
template			
Final report	50 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same specifications as of the Draft Final Report, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted 	2 weeks after having received comments to the Draft Final Report.
Executive Summary – by using the EVAL online template	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same specifications as for the Draft Executive Summary, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted 	Together with the final version of the Final Report

5.2 Use of the EVAL module by the evaluators

It is strongly recommended that the **submission of deliverables** by the selected contractor **be performed through their uploading in the EVAL Module**, an evaluation process management tool and repository of the European Commission. The selected contractor will receive access to online and offline guidance in order to operate with the module during the related Specific contract validity.

5.3 Comments on the outputs

For each report, the Evaluation Manager will send to the Contractor consolidated comments received from the Reference Group or the approval of the report within 10 calendar days. The revised reports addressing the comments shall be submitted within 10 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for not integrating certain comments, if this is the case.

5.4 Assessment of the quality of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

The quality of the draft versions of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager using the online Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) in the EVAL Module (text provided in Annex V). The Contractor is given – through the EVAL module - the possibility to comment on the assessments formulated by the Evaluation Manager. The QAG will then be reviewed following the submission of the final version of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary.

The compilation of the QAG will support/inform the compilation by the Evaluation Manager of the FWC SIEA's Specific Contract Performance Evaluation.

5.5 Language

All reports shall be submitted in English.

5.6 Number of report copies

Apart from their submission -preferably via the EVAL Module-, the approved version of the Final Report will be also provided in 4 paper copies and in electronic version at no extra cost.

5.7 Formatting of reports

All reports will be produced using Font Arial or Times New Roman minimum letter size 11 and 12 respectively, single spacing, double sided. They will be sent in Word and PDF formats.

ANNEX I: SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Request for Services No 407058/2019

FWC SIEA 2018 – LOT 1 Sustainable management of natural resources and resilience
EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi

1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Contracting Authority selects the offer with the best value for money using an 80/20 weighting between technical quality and price⁸.

Technical quality is evaluated on the basis of the following grid:

Criteria	Maximum
Total score for Organisation and Methodology	30
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Understanding of ToR and the aim of the services to be provided	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, appropriate mix of tools and estimate of difficulties and challenges	15
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Technical added value, backstopping and role of the involved members of the consortium	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Organisation of tasks including timetable	5
Score for the expertise of the proposed team	70
OVERALL TOTAL SCORE	100

2. TECHNICAL THRESHOLD

Any offer falling short of the technical threshold of 75 out of 100 points, is automatically rejected.

3. INTERVIEWS DURING THE EVALUATION OF THE OFFERS

During the evaluation process of the offers received the Contracting Authority reserves the right to interview by phone one or several members of the proposed evaluation teams.

Phone interviews could be tentatively carried out during the period from 26/08/2019 to 30/08/2019.

⁸ For more details about the 80/20 rule, please see the PRAG, chapter 3.3.10.5 - https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/funding/about-funding-and-procedures/procedures-and-practical-guide-prag_en

ANNEX II: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM

- *KRDP Action Document and Logical Framework (including addenda)*
- *KRDP Financing Agreement and addenda*
- *KRDP Mid Term Review and KCEP-CRAL ROM reports*
- *Individual projects documents, baseline and progress reports*
- *IFAD KCEP and KCEP-CRAL design papers*
- *KCEP-CRAL Financing Agreement between IFAD and the Government of Kenya*
- *Any relevant study/report commissioned by the KCEP/CRAL and IPP-GAP projects*

Note: The evaluation team has to identify and obtain any other document worth analysing, through independent research and during interviews with relevant informed parties and stakeholders of the Action.

ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The contractor will deliver – preferably through their uploading in the EVAL Module - two distinct documents: the Final Report and the Executive Summary. They must be consistent, concise and clear and free of linguistic errors both in the original version and in their translation – if foreseen.

The Final Report should not be longer than the number of pages indicated in Chapter 6. Additional information on the overall context of the Action, description of methodology and analysis of findings should be reported in an Annex to the main text.

The presentation must be properly spaced and the use of clear graphs, tables and short paragraphs is strongly recommended.

The cover page of the Final Report shall carry the following text:

“This evaluation is supported and guided by the European Commission and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the European Commission”.

Executive Summary

A short, tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations. It is to be prepared by using the specific format foreseen in the EVAL Module.

The main sections of the evaluation report shall be as follows:

1. Introduction

A description of the Action, of the relevant country/region/sector background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant.

2. Answered questions / Findings

A chapter presenting the answers to the Evaluation Questions, supported by evidence and reasoning.

3. Overall assessment (optional)

A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the Action. The detailed structure of the overall assessment should be refined during the evaluation process. The relevant chapter has to articulate all the findings, conclusions and lessons in a way that reflects their importance and facilitates the reading. The structure should not follow the Evaluation Questions, the logical framework or the evaluation criteria.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.3 Lessons learnt

Lessons learnt generalise findings and translate past experience into relevant knowledge that should support

decision making, improve performance and promote the achievement of better results. Ideally, they should support the work of both the relevant European and partner institutions.

4.1 Conclusions

This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.

In order to allow better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission, a table organising the conclusions by order of importance can be presented, or a paragraph or sub-chapter emphasizing the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.

4.2 Recommendations

They are intended to improve or reform the Action in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new Action for the next cycle.

Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, and carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure.

5. Annexes to the report

The report should include the following annexes:

- The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
- The names of the evaluators (CVs can be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
- Detailed evaluation methodology including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations; detail of tools and analyses.
- Evaluation Matrix
- Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated)
- Relevant geographic map(s) where the Action took place
- List of persons/organisations consulted
- Literature and documentation consulted
- Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures, matrix of evidence, databases) as relevant
- Detailed answer to the Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators

ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE

This annex must be included by Framework Contractors in their Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology and forms an integral part of it. Framework Contractors can add as many rows and columns as needed.

The phases of the evaluation shall reflect those indicated in the present Terms of Reference.

		Indicative Duration in working days ⁹		
Activity	Location	Team Leader	Evaluator ...	Indicative Dates
Inception phase: total days				
•				
•				
Desk phase: total days				
•				
•				
Field phase: total days				
•				
•				
Synthesis phase: total days				
•				
•				
Dissemination phase: total days				
•				
•				
TOTAL working days (maximum)				

⁹ Add one column per each evaluator

ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

The quality of the Final Report will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager (since the submission of the draft Report and Executive Summary) using the following quality assessment grid, which is included **in the EVAL Module**; the grid will be shared with the evaluation team, which will have the possibility to include their comments.

Action (Project/Programme) evaluation – Quality Assessment Grid Final Report

Evaluation data			
Evaluation title			
Evaluation managed by		Type of evaluation	
CRIS ref. of the evaluation contract		EVAL ref.	
Evaluation budget			
EUD/Unit in charge		Evaluation Manager	
Evaluation dates	Start:		End:
Date of draft final report		Date of Response of the Services	
Comments			
Project data			
Main project evaluated			
CRIS # of evaluated project(s)			
DAC Sector			
Contractor's details			
Evaluation Team Leader		Evaluation Contractor	
Evaluation expert(s)			

Legend: scores and their meaning

Very satisfactory: criterion entirely fulfilled in a clear and appropriate way

Satisfactory: criterion fulfilled

Unsatisfactory: criterion partly fulfilled

Very unsatisfactory: criterion mostly not fulfilled or absent

The evaluation report is assessed as follows

1. Clarity of the report

This criterion analyses the extent to which both the Executive Summary and the Final Report:

- Are easily readable, understandable and accessible to the relevant target readers
- Highlight the key messages
- The length of the various chapters and annexes of the Report are well balanced
- Contain relevant graphs, tables and charts facilitating understanding
- Contain a list of acronyms (only the Report)
- Avoid unnecessary duplications
- Have been language checked for unclear formulations, misspelling and grammar errors
- The Executive Summary is an appropriate summary of the full report and is a free-standing document

Strengths

Weaknesses

Contractor's comments

Contractor's comments

2. Reliability of data and robustness of evidence

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Data/evidence was gathered as defined in the methodology
- The report considers, when relevant, evidence from EU and/or other partners' relevant studies, monitoring reports and/or evaluations
- The report contains a clear description of the limitations of the evidence, the risks of bias and the mitigating measures

Strengths

Weaknesses

Contractor's comments

Contractor's comments

3. Validity of Findings

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Findings derive from the evidence gathered
- Findings address all selected evaluation criteria
- Findings result from an appropriate triangulation of different, clearly identified sources
- When assessing the effect of the EU intervention, the findings describe and explain the most relevant cause/effect links between outputs, outcomes and impacts
- The analysis of evidence is comprehensive and takes into consideration contextual and external factors

Strengths

Weaknesses

Contractor's comments

Contractor's comments

4. Validity of conclusions

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Conclusions are logically linked to the findings, and go beyond them to provide a comprehensive analysis
- Conclusions appropriately address the selected evaluation criteria and all the evaluation questions, including the relevant cross-cutting dimensions
- Conclusions take into consideration the various stakeholder groups of the evaluation
- Conclusions are coherent and balanced (i.e. they present a credible picture of both strengths and weaknesses), and are free of personal or partisan conclusions
- (If relevant) whether the report indicates when there are not sufficient findings to conclude on specific issues

Strengths	Weaknesses
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments

5. Usefulness of recommendations

This criterion analyses the extent to which the recommendations:

- Are clearly linked to and derive from the conclusions
- Are concrete, achievable and realistic
- Are targeted to specific addressees
- Are clustered (if relevant), prioritised, and possibly time-bound
- (If relevant) provide advice for the Action's exit strategy, post-Action sustainability or for adjusting Action's design or plans

Strengths	Weaknesses
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments

6. Appropriateness of lessons learnt analysis (if requested by the ToR or included by the evaluators)

This criterion is to be assessed only when requested by the ToR or included by evaluators and is not to be scored. It analyses the extent to which:

- Lessons are identified
- When relevant, they are generalised in terms of wider relevance for the institution(s)

Strengths	Weaknesses
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments

Final comments on the overall quality of the report

--

ANNEX VI: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED ACTION(S)

KENYA CEREAL ENHANCEMENT PROGRAMME AND CLIMATE RESILIENT AGRICULTURAL LIVELIHOODS WINDOW

Narrative Summary	Key Performance Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions / Risks
Goal			
Income increased, and poverty and food insecurity of targeted rural smallholder households sustainably reduced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 185,000 smallholders farmers targeted from the programme support, of which 120,000 are in ASAL target counties - 150,000 smallholder farmers taken out of poverty & food secure with improved nutritional status out of which about 95, 000 in ASAL target counties¹⁰ - National grain deficit reduced by 41,000T equivalent to 10% national deficit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National (KIHBS) household income & expenditure surveys - RIMS impact surveys - Baseline, mid-term and final food security & nutrition assessments - Livelihood and Ecosystem Resilience Assessment Tools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stable political/ macroeconomic environment - Successful public private partnership with FIs
Development Objective			

¹⁰ 80% of targeted farmers

Narrative Summary	Key Performance Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions / Risks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Graduation of smallholder farmers to commercial farming - Graduation of smallholder farmers to commercial farming in ASAL counties is climate resilient and empowerment of county governments/communities for sustainable NRM and resilience to climate change¹¹ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 150,000 smallholder farmers graduate to market-oriented commercial farming, of which 95,000 in the ASALs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Using improved inputs/agricultural practices autonomously o Engaged in commercial contracts o Selling grains at price 30% higher than farm gate price. o Engaged in financial services (investment loans) - 95,000 smallholder farmers in the ASALs are coping with the effects of climate change - 8 county governments implementing 100 ward level sustainable NRM and climate change resilience community plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Household income & expenditure surveys - Food security and nutrition assessments - RIMS impact surveys (baseline and end-term) - Programme M&E database - Programme evaluation report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Successful public – private - partnership
<p>Outcome 1</p> <p>Sustainable increase in production and productivity of maize, sorghum, millet and associated pulses among targeted smallholder farmers and, improved climate change resilience with sustainable NRM in targeted ASAL counties.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Productivity increase in Medium High Potential (MHP) areas : 100% for maize and sorghum; 75 % for millet and pulses (beans, pigeon peas, cowpeas and green grams) - Productivity increase in the ASALs : 80% for maize and sorghum; 50% for millet and pluses (beans, cowpeas, green grams and pigeon peas); - 80,000 ha under GAP/CA producing targeted cereals and pulses - 90% of participating farmers reporting yield increase 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Food security and nutrition assessments - Remote-sensing survey - Project activity report - Randomised control Trial - Household income and expenditure surveys - RIMS impact survey questionnaire (baseline/final) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National and county government adoption of CA policy for inclusion; - PPP in extension services

¹¹ For the purposes of this project, a working definition of a climate resilient community will be: "A community where project beneficiaries are engaging in climate resilient agricultural practices, are engaged in natural resource management, benefit from climate related extension messages and climate information and have contributed to ward level community resilience plans

Narrative Summary	Key Performance Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions / Risks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 80 % of participating farmers reporting adopting recommended technologies/packages - Improved vegetation index in programme area 		
<p>Outputs</p> <p>1.1 Targeted smallholder adopt climate resilient improved farming practices including GAP/CA and access to improved agricultural services and inputs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 150,000 smallholder farmers adopted improved inputs/agricultural practices autonomously - 95,000 ASAL smallholder farmers trained on CA/GAP and NRM adopt improved agricultural practices through e-voucher technical package and extension services including climate information for enhanced agricultural productivity - Capacity of 300 agro-dealers strengthened for agricultural services - 250 extension service providers and 360 agro-dealers capacity for provision of GAP/CA extension services and inputs strengthened; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Programme M&E - Participating bank data base/records - Programme baseline, mid- and end-term evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Private sector willingness to provide market-led incentives in adoption of CA
<p>1.2. Capacity of farmers' organizations to mobilize extension services, participate in local planning and value chains for improved and, targeted ASALs counties and communities adopt sustainable NRM adapted to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capacity of 5,000 farmer groups¹² in organizational management strengthened; - 8 county sustainable NRM and climate change adaptation plans developed (with 100 Ward level community resilience NRM plans); and county/community officials trained - USD 7.5m ASAP programme resources invested in watershed scale community assets with productive benefits up to 80,000 ha¹³ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Registers of farmer organisations - Programme M&E - Participating bank data base/records - Programme baseline, mid- and end-term evaluations 	

¹² 150,000 smallholder farmers organized in groups of about 30 members

¹³ Related to RIMS 1.1.7

Narrative Summary	Key Performance Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions / Risks
climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 8 County Adaptation Funds operational with ward plans and associated NRM activities funded on 80,000 ha with productive benefits - 8 County climate information services functional and providing regular climatic information to ward groups to refine farm/ agronomic plans 		
<p><u>Outcome 2</u></p> <p>Post-harvest management of smallholder farmers in targeted VCs improved</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Post-harvest grain losses reduced from 30% to 5% for 80% of targeted smallholder farmers - Improved grain drying technologies adopted by 150,000 smallholder farmers - Improved grain storage technologies adopted by 150,000 smallholder farmers - Operational self-sufficiency attained for 60 warehouses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Programme M&E - Programme baseline, mid- and end-term evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bill on WRS is passed into law to provide effective regulatory framework
<p><u>Outputs</u></p> <p>2.1 Targeted smallholder farmers adopt improved post-harvest management of grains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 150,000 smallholder farmers of which 95,000 from the ASALs organized in groups; trained on harvest-and post-harvest management; and receive basic equipment for improved post-harvest management of grains. - 250 threshing/shelling service providers trained and their capacity to provide services to smallholder farmers enhanced - 137 warehouses certified and offering WRS services - 312 collection centres operational 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Programme M&E - Programme baseline, mid- and end-term evaluations - Household surveys on levels of production and income generated from sales of agricultural produce 	
<p>2.2 Market access for participating smallholder farmers improved</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 95,000 smallholder farmers in ASALs organized in groups with established linkages with bulk buyers - 250 production cluster-level farmer associations established and linked to a structured grain trading system comprising 250 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Programme M&E - Programme baseline, mid- and end-term evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bill on WRS is passed into law to provide effective regulatory framework

Narrative Summary	Key Performance Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions / Risks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - collection centres and 137 certified warehouses with WRS services - 100 road spot improvements completed linking production clusters to grain aggregation centres - At least 150,000 smallholder farmers trained in business partnership - 60 initiatives of commercial partnership implemented - 20 spot improvement of access roads completed 		
<p>Outcome 3</p> <p>Financial inclusion of targeted smallholder farmers improved</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 140,000 smallholder farmers of which 120,000 in ASALs access financial services¹⁴ - Total amount of savings by target group (by gender) – target to be defined at start up - Number and type of new products implemented by partner FIs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Programme M&E - Participating financial institutions data base/records and reports - Programme baseline, mid- and end-term evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partner financial institutions mobilize sufficient resources for programme goals
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>3.1 E-voucher financing system for smallholder farmers and use of financial tools and services developed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 140,000 smallholder farmers of which 120,000 in ASALs access e-voucher scheme¹⁵ - 140 000 smallholder farmers of which 120,000 from the ASALs trained on financial literacy and have accessed inputs subsidy (through e-voucher scheme) - 360 agro-dealers trained and accredited as 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Programme M&E - Participating financial institutions data base/records and reports - Programme baseline, mid- and end-term evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sufficient number of agro- dealers to ensure proximity and competitive services - Insurance

¹⁴ All targeted smallholder farmers accessing the e-voucher scheme (140,000 farmers) have access to financial services

¹⁵ All targeted smallholder farmers in the ASALs receive the e-voucher scheme

Narrative Summary	Key Performance Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions / Risks
	agents by participating FI - 200 entrepreneurs trained in advanced financial training - Targeted farmers access certified WRS		companies willing to offer adapted agricultural insurance products
3.2 Financial services to other key players /access to value chain financing improved.	- 360 agro-dealers, 2,000 agricultural services providers, and 100 value addition enterprises access value chain financing - 100 value chain financing ventures initiated	- Programme M&E - Participating financial institutions data base/records and reports - Programme baseline, mid-and end-term evaluations	- Interest of private sector in value chains maintained.

Increased productivity and profitability of small holder farmers through promotion and up – scaling of GAP & CA in productive Semi-Arid areas of Kenya (IPP-GAP)

Narrative Summary	Indicators	End of project target	Source of verification	Assumptions
<i>Impact</i> To contribute to reduced rural poverty and food insecurity among target farmers including female farmers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % change in income among project farmers • Coping Strategy Index • Food Consumption Score • Employment opportunities created for women and youth as a result of GAP and CA intervention 		Baseline and outcome surveys	
<i>Outcome</i> Increased graduation of small scale farmers, especially women farmers, of semi-arid areas	1 % Change in yield by project farmers 2 % change in unit target crop prices	1 50% increase 2 ≥ 15 %	- Baseline and outcome survey	- Farm level extension work to develop lead

<p>to commercially orientated farming and climate – resilient agricultural practices through improvements in productivity, post-harvest production practices and market linkages for targeted value chains.</p>	<p>at the farm gates a result of developed market linkages. 3 % change in trade volumes of partner private sector companies.</p>	<p>3 ≥ 50 % increase</p>	<p>- MIS</p>	<p>farmers and demo plots start from year 1; - Farmer cooperatives identify and cover the costs of suitable extension workers</p>
<p>Outputs 1 Improved CA and GAP knowledge among farmers and farmers group Target farmers successfully practice CA and GAP to increase productivity and benefit from improved extension system</p>	<p>1.1 No of farmers acquired knowledge of GAP and/or CA by participate in GAP/CA field days segregated by gender 1.2 No of farmer reached through extension segregated by gender</p>	<p>1.1 At least 62,500 farmers will acquire knowledge on GAP or CA by participating in GAP/CA field days. 1.2 At least 30,000 project farmers with at least 30% women are given GAP and CA extension.</p>	<p>1.1 MIS 1.2 Random sampling test</p>	<p>- Political influence in selecting target farmers is minimal. - Women and female headed households have access and control over farming land.</p>
<p>2. Functional e-agricultural platform being utilised amongst small holder farmers and farmer groups Target farmers successfully practice CA and GAP to increase productivity and benefit from improved extension system</p>	<p>2.1 No of farmers reached by e-platform segregated by gender 2.2. No of project farmers who practice GAP or CA segregated by gender.</p>	<p>2.1 At least 90,800 farmers will receive e-platform extension services. 2.2 At least 25,000 project farmers practice GAP or CA.</p>	<p>2.1 MIS 2.2 Random sampling test</p>	
<p>3.. Institutionalised CA and GAP Support Capacity of Government, private sector and NGO extension workers, as a result of conventional training, on-the-job-training, and e-learning platform and policy development. A responsive and enabling policy environment that provides effective support to project</p>	<p>3.1 Number of extension workers trained segregated by gender. 3.2 Number of extension workers who acquired knowledge of CA and GAP segregated by gender. 3.3 % change in number of private sector extension</p>	<p>3.1 100 Government Extension workers and more than 125 Private and NGO Extension workers trained. 3.2 80% of all extension workers who received training pass the knowledge test on CA and GAP. 3.3 20% increase in numbers of</p>	<p>3.1 MIS 3.2 Knowledge test after 2 years in CA and GAP extension. 3.3 MIS</p>	

<p>farmers and stakeholders facilitating effective support and expansion</p>	<p>workers. 3.4 A draft contract farming and CSA policies prepared that incorporates GAP/CA 3.5 Number of service providers with improved knowledge and skills on CA and aligned to KCEP-CRAL</p>	<p>private sector extension workers. 3.4 A draft contract farming and a CSA policy which incorporates GAP/CA prepared and contract farming with the support from the CAWT Task Force 3.5 200 service providers capacities strengthened in CA service provision. 50 linked to financial services for equipment credit</p>	<p>3.4 A contract farming and a CSA Policy document 3.5 A documented report confirming linkage to kcep-cral</p>	
<p>4. Market linkages Developed: Project supported farmers have a formal agreement with private sector companies and benefit from financial services.</p>	<p>4.1 No of farmers with some sales agreement with private sectors segregated by gender. 4.2 % Change in volumes of trade between project farmers and private sector companies under a formal agreement. 4.3 Proportion of project male and female farmers who receive financial and / or insurance services.</p>	<p>4.1 At least 30,000 project farmers 4.2 ≥50% 4.3 ≥50% of project farmers who receive extension services (30,000)</p>	<p>4.1 MIS 4.2 MIS and Report from the companies 4.3 MIS 4.4 MIS, contract documents</p>	