

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

MID-TERM REVIEW FOR THE FOOD SYSTEMS RESILIENCE PROGRAMME (FSRP)

1. INTRODUCTION

The Centre for Coordination of Agricultural Research and Development for Southern Africa (CCARDESA) is a subsidiary organisation of the Southern African Development Community (SADC). It was established in 2011 and started its full operations in 2013. CCARDESA has a mandate of coordinating agricultural research and development and contributing to better food security and livelihoods in the region. In the SADC region, climate change and other related factors have been significantly affecting agricultural productivity with negative implications on food security, mainly among smallholder farmers. As part of the response, CCARDESA received a grant from the World Bank to coordinate the regional implementation of the Food Systems Resilience Programme (FSRP). The FSRP overall Programme Development Objective (PDO) is to increase the resilience of food systems and preparedness against food insecurity in the participating countries.

The FSRP is implemented in phases, with the first phase of 6-year duration focusing on Madagascar in Southern Africa and Ethiopia in East Africa. CCARDESA is coordinating the regional FSRP implementation at SADC level whereas the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) is focusing on East Africa.

The FSRP focuses on building resilience of food systems of countries and regions by using smart approaches that circumvent the effects of climate change on agriculture. The programme is to deal with and resolve the underlying structural challenges of food insecurity and reduce beneficiaries' sensitivity to unpredictable climate events, crises, and conflicts.

Overall, under FSRP, CCARDESA is expected to promote regional information and knowledge systems for adaptation planning and resilience building by strengthening capacities to implement early warning systems that provide timely climate services and support the preparation and dissemination of information to farmers.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Program Development Objective (PDO) of FSRP is to increase the resilience of food systems and preparedness against food insecurity in the participating countries. The FSRP has three PDO level indicators towards which the outputs of CCARDESA will contribute (Table 1).

Table 1: Results Framework for CCARDESA under FSRP

Indicator	Baseline	End target
Regionally harmonized policy frameworks and legislation facilitated by RECs through the program (number)	0	3
Strengthening or establishing Regional Centres of Leadership (RCoL) in participating countries (number)	0	1
Technical areas for which a regional knowledge sharing mechanism is put in place (number)	0	3
- <i>Health</i>	0	1
- <i>Digital</i>	0	1
- <i>Climate</i>	0	1

2.1 Project Components

To achieve the PDO, the project has five components whose implementation is facilitated by CCARDESA.

Component 1: (Re-) Building Resilient Agricultural Production Capacity

This component focuses and finances activities on building resilient agricultural production capacity by technically backstopping and coordinating the development of climate and other information systems. Joint research initiatives will be developed at the regional level to supplement the efforts made at the national level. CCARDESA will provide technical assistance, organize knowledge management and communication on innovations and technologies, and organize capacity building and training programs.

Component 2: Supporting sustainable development of natural resources in agricultural landscapes

CCARDESA supports and coordinates transnational and regional technical assistance, analytical and advisory work, and training efforts, especially on topics related to sustainable management of transboundary natural resources for climate resilience.

Component 3: Getting to markets

Component 3 supports the development of competitive agri-food value chains and well-functioning marketing infrastructure. The role of CCARDESA is to support SADC member states in taking full advantage of the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA) and other intraregional trade and value-addition opportunities.

Component 4: Promoting food systems resilience in national and regional policymaking

Under this component, CCARDESA supports national government agencies and regional organizations in ways that pertain to high-level policies, initiatives, institutional arrangements, and even budgeting decisions that have cross-cutting relevance to food systems resilience. CCARDESA supports participating countries and other SADC member states in harmonizing country policies with international and regional cooperation frameworks, agricultural quality standards, and food safety protocols.

Component 5: Project Coordination and Management

The day-to-day implementation is done by the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) established by CCARDESA. The PIU is supported by a Regional Coordination Committee, which provides advisory guidance on the progress of the project.

2.2 Project Outputs

The expected outputs by component and regional impact are summarised in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Expected Outputs by Component and regional impact

#	Component	Expected Outputs	Expected Regional Impact
1	(Re-) Building Resilient Agricultural Production Capacity	Improved regional agricultural information, research, digital advisory services to support decision making	Sub-regional coordination unlocks higher quality agricultural advisory services for users
2	Supporting sustainable development of natural resources in agricultural landscapes	Regional knowledge base for coordinated action at agricultural landscape level including in transboundary basins	Resilient livelihoods in strategic areas and improved productivity generates positive regional spillover effects on food and nutrition security
3	Getting to markets	Harmonized trade border controls and quality standards and improved regional market information	Regional food markets are better integrated, benefiting farmers and consumers, reducing food losses.
4	Promoting food systems resilience in national and regional policymaking	Harmonized regional food security policies and initiatives and strengthened regional institutions	Consolidation of regional institutional framework for food system governance and deepened cooperation among regional institutions on transboundary food systems issues
5	Project Coordination and Management	Operational monitoring and evaluation, financial management and procurement systems	

3. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE ASSIGNMENT

3.1 Overall Objective

The overall objective of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of FSRP is to conduct an assessment and take stock of achieved results at output and outcome levels and challenges encountered in the implementation of the project, document lessons learned and draw strategic recommendations to inform implementation of the remaining implementation period. Specifically, the MTR will review project achievements to date, identify challenges, recommend strategic reorientations, propose corrective measures where relevant, generate key lessons learnt, and provide decision makers with an independent objective analysis which can be used to make informed decisions on the project's future direction to improve attainment of FSRP objectives.

3.2 Scope of the Assignment

The review will assess the overall results of the programme to date and analyze them against the standard project performance evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability and potential impact-while considering the stage of the project as follows:

- (i) **Relevance:** Assess the extent to which the approach and outputs developed to implement FSRP remain valid and pertinent to the SADC region, the Member State's needs, and needs of development partners.

- (ii) **Effectiveness:** The extent to which the results achieved so far are contributing to the PDO objectives. The key issue here is the extent to which implementation of programmes have been effective in addressing the PDO objectives. The review will assess the likelihood of attaining the PDO objectives by the end of the project.
- (iii) **Efficiency:** How well resources or inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.), in general were utilised in line with the achieved results. The evaluation should also review the balance between the different activities and whether the resources allocated reflect their relative importance in achieving outputs.
- (iv) **Impact:** Analyze the direct and indirect contribution of FSRP implementation in the to the SADC regional objectives of food systems resilience in the region
- (v) **Sustainability:** The extent to which the results and impact are likely to be sustained at Member States level through assessment of the technical and financial capacity of the Member States to maintain these results. The Review should make an assessment and recommendations on the level of ownership of the interventions at Member States level.
- (vi) **Recommendations:** The review will also make recommendations on possible changes which the project might need to consider in order to achieve the development objective. The review will further provide recommendations regarding prioritization of project resources and activities to maximize impact and sustainability during the remaining life of the project, as well as to inform design and implementation of similar projects in the future.

3.2.1 Evaluation Questions

Relevance/Alignment

- Did the grant-financed activities align with a) the core mandate and/or the value proposition of your organization, b) relevant regional policy processes (RAIPs), and c) appropriate continental processes (CAADP)
- Could the activities be realigned to be more relevant to your institution's mandate and value addition? If so, how?
- Which technical themes are the priority focus for the grant-financed institution? Do these themes align with the components and priorities of the FSRP?
- Is the alignment between PDO indicators and project components clear and consistent?
- Is there evidence of alignment with Member State priorities or regional plans beyond

Efficiency/Institutional

- Is regional coordination (secretariat/REC) effective and adequately resourced?
- Is communication between the regional and national levels timely and efficient?
- Are resources and support distributed equitably across phases? Is the allocation of staff resources/knowledge expertise sufficient and appropriate to the delivery of the PDO indicators?

- Is cross-country learning actively facilitated? Are the mechanisms for institutional coordination sufficient?
- Did the original grant design sufficiently define the institutional expectations and relationship between your organization and the FSRP nationally financed programs?
- Are institutional reporting lines and accountability mechanisms clear and functional across regional and national levels?
- Have any institutional bottlenecks or delays affected implementation? If so, how were they addressed?

Effectiveness

- Is there evidence that grantees have strengthened regional cooperation or harmonization? If so, outline these activities
- Are regional institutions providing value to member states? If so, provide examples. Is cross-country learning actively facilitated?
- What outputs and outcomes have been achieved so far?
- Are the results measurable and visible? If so, at what level?
- What enabling or hindering factors exist?
- Have grant-financed activities led to policy uptake or reform at national or regional levels?

Coherence

- How compatible is FSRP with other interventions and programs in the region?
- How did CCARDESA help to strengthen and facilitate internal coherence (synergies and interlinkages among SADC countries) and external coherence (i.e. consistency of the program with other actors' interventions in the same context).

Impact

- To what extent has FSRP generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended, or unintended, higher-level effects, i.e food systems resilience?

Sustainability

- Are the activities supported by the grant aligned with the medium- to long-term institutional strategies?
- Are regional bodies building institutional capacity to sustain outcomes?
- Are regional bodies sufficiently flexible to respond to changing political opportunities/challenges?

Budget effectiveness

- How well resources or input (funds, expertise, time, etc.), in general, are being utilized in line with the achieved results
- Are resources and support distributed equitably across phases?
- Is communication between the regional and national levels timely and efficient?
- Have budgetary resource allocations been sufficient across the components?
- Is there a clear linkage between budget allocations and achieved outputs/outcomes?

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)

- Are regional-level indicators designed to capture the value added by grantee activities? If so, at what level?
- How is M&E information used to inform adaptive management and policy dialogue?
- What are the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of project objectives?
- Is there a need to change the indicators? If so, why?
- Are M&E systems harmonized across regional and national levels?

Social and Environmental Safeguards

- Have the safeguards been adhered to appropriately?
- Is there a need to adjust the instruments?
- Have any safeguard-related grievances or incidents been reported? How were they handled?

Procurement

- Assess the over procurement performance. Is there a need for changes?
- Have any procurement delays or irregularities affected implementation?

Financial Management

- Is there a need to adjust the financial allocations?
- Assess the overall financial management performance, what needs to be adjusted, if anything?
- Are financial reports timely, accurate, and aligned with programmatic progress?

4. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES

- a) Inception report detailing the methodology for achieving the assignment
- b) A draft MTR report that will be reviewed by stakeholders.
- c) Validation of the Draft Report by stakeholders
- d) Final MTR Report that incorporates comments from stakeholders.

The indicative schedule of deliverables is provided below. Modifications may be made during the Inception Phase, but this should not alter the quality of the proposal and substance of the delivery.

Key Deliverable	Indicative Timeline (calendar weeks)
Inception report	Maximum 2 weeks after contract award
A draft MTR report	Maximum 6 weeks after submission of Inception Report
Validation of Draft Report	2 weeks after submission of Draft Mid-term Report
Final Report	2 weeks after verification workshop
Total Period	12 weeks

5. CONSULTANCY APPROACH

The consultant will visit CCARDESA and SADC Secretariat and virtually meet key stakeholders to achieve the deliverables.

6. TIME FRAME

This assignment is planned for a duration of 30 working days over a period of 3 months. It will be carried out in 4 phases and the actual timing of the phases will be agreed to between the consultant and CCARDESA Secretariat at the time of contract negotiation and award.

Phase 1: This is the inception phase with kick off consultation whereby the consultants will meet with FSRP staff to fine-tune the proposed methodology. It is expected that the consultants will produce an Inception Report at this stage.

Phase 2: This is the data/information collection phase whereby the consultants will undertake documentation review and consultation with key stakeholders. The information gathered will feed into the Draft Report.

Phase 3: This is the data analysis and report writing phase. The consultants will carry out a detailed analysis of the data/information collected, identify key issues, achievements, challenges, risks and mitigation measures. The expected deliverable is the draft Mid Term Review Report.

Phase 4: Consultative workshops to present draft reports and solicit and incorporate stakeholders' views at regional level and produce the final report.

7. QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The consultant is expected to have:

- a) At least a Master's degree in Economics or Agricultural Economics or Development Economics or Social Sciences or Project Management or Monitoring and Evaluation or any other related qualification
- b) A minimum of 15 years' experience in leading complex evaluations and solid understanding of agricultural systems and institutional frameworks in sub-Saharan Africa.
- c) At least 5 years practical experience in working with World Bank funded projects or other donors as M&E expert
- d) Excellent analytical, writing and communication skills.
- e) Knowledge on the use of results impact monitoring system.
- f) Excellent practical skills in developing results framework, logical frameworks and theory of change.
- g) Good understanding of the hierarchical relationships of project impact, outcomes, outputs and activities.
- h) Familiarity with the work of SADC and CCARDESA in general will be an added advantage
- i) Working knowledge of other SADC languages will be an advantage.

8. ASSIGNMENT MANAGEMENT

The Consultant will report to the FSRP Regional Coordinator who will be responsible for daily technical and administrative issues for the assignment.

9. KEY DOCUMENTS FOR EVALUATION

The consultant is expected to identify and obtain any other documents worth analysing, through its interviews with people who are or have been involved in the design, management, and supervision of the project. The list of key documents includes but is not limited to the following:

- (i) Country strategies and policy documents
- (ii) FSRP Project Appraisal Document
- (iii) Project Implementation Manuals, including indicator reference guide
- (iv) Project semi-annual and annual progress reports
- (v) Implementation Support Mission Reports and Aide Memoirs