TERMS OF REFERENCE

EXTERNAL FINAL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

(Developing A Resilient Shea Agroforestry Farm Model)

Introduction

Nigeria shea growing regions are also the most affected by climate change in the country. Climate change impact in these areas is marked by higher temperature, lower rainfall, more droughts, reducing farm lands and impacting crop yields on farm. The most promising adaptation and mitigation pathways are the use of renewable energy, particularly from bio sources, reforestation, and increase in farm productivity. Strengthening traditional shea agroforestry systems to deliver their benefits to farms is an important pathway for smallholder farmers in shea growing areas in Nigeria.

The Problem

The shea value chain in West Africa produces carbon emission, related to processing and transport (0.53 and 0.21 million tons of CO2 annually), with a negative overall balance. Every year, shea parklands in West Africa capture about 1.5 million tons of CO2 – serving as a mitigation measure for climate change. The shea growing regions in Nigeria are amongst the poorest and most vulnerable in the country. For instance, the poverty headcount in Niger State is 66% as at 2019. The economic benefits derived from shea ranges about $20 millions annually, providing viable economic benefits from shea. Traditionally, income and related revenue from shea is controlled by women.

However, notwithstanding the economic and environmental benefits, shea tree populations have been on the decline throughout the West African region. Reasons for this decline include: lack of new planting, long gestation periods, reduced fallow periods, poor parkland management practices and tree cutting particularly for charcoal. It is estimated that, 7,929,417 million trees are lost every year across West Africa: with Nigeria having the largest population of shea trees globally, it also has the lion share of this decline.

Project Background

The most promising adaptation and mitigation pathways to the identified problems are the use of renewable energy, particularly from bio sources, reforestation, and increase in farm productivity. Strengthening traditional shea agroforestry systems to deliver their benefits to farms is an important pathway for smallholder. Although the shea value chain has been identified as key for climate mitigation in Africa by the FAO, little work in the area of shea-agroforestry has been undertaken to upscale climate resilience of farmers, for reference and replication. This intervention therefore, seeks to develop a simple whole-farm approach to increase climate resilience of smallholder farmers in West Africa.

The Global Shea Alliance in collaboration with Global Alliance against Climate Change Plus (GCCA +) West Africa - Intra-ACP program funded by the European Union, is implementing the project, Developing a Resilient Shea Agroforestry Farm Model, as part of the West African regional effort to implement the Paris Climate Agreement, through capacity building activities for ECOWAS and its regional institution, partners and member states. Through a consortium

of Public Private Partnership comprising project implementers such as Shea Origin Ltd and Salid Agriculture Ltd including Raw Materials Research Development Commission and PRI Global, the GSA is implementing this project in Niger and Oyo States of Nigeria.

Project display

Project Objectives

The overall aim and objective of the project is to Increase climate resilience of smallholder farmers across West Africa. The specific objectives of the project are as follows:

1. Set up two model climate-resilient farms.
2. Train 1,500 women in the communities of the project
3. Conduct economic and environmental evaluations of the farms
4. Share learning from the model farms for usage, replication and adaptation across the shea value chain.

Also, the project will measure the following key indicators at the end of the project life-span:

1. Number of households benefiting from pilot projects
2. Number of individual beneficiary producers
3. Number of direct and indirect beneficiary farmers (producers) adopting technologies and approaches for sustainable land management and resilience to climate change promoted by the pilot project.
4. Number of hectares impacted by activities, technologies and practices of sustainable land management and resilience to climate change resulting from the funding of the pilot project.

The details of these specific objectives and the expected outputs of the Project can be found in the Project Log frame, which is included in Appendix B

Study objectives

The specific objectives to be addressed by the evaluation are as follows:

1) Assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the outputs and achievements of the project;

2) Drawing lessons learned for better implementation performance and for possible scaling up;

4) Make recommendations to strengthen the impact and sustainability of achievements after the end of the project

The expected results are:

- The final values of the indicators mentioned (including mandatory standard indicators of the GCCA+AO) in the project's logical framework are calculated and the deviations from the targets analysed;

- The analyses should answer the evaluative questions below.

Evaluation questions

The main evaluation questions are essentially linked to the standard OECD / DAC evaluation criteria. Thus, the following key questions must have been answered at least:

Relevance and consistency
1) To what extent do project activities meet the needs of beneficiaries and to what extent are they aligned with national policies?

2) To what extent has the design and implementation of the project responded to the needs and risks related to climate change on Agriculture?

3) To what extent has the project established links and created synergies with other related actions, including other EU funding instruments and actions?

Effectiveness and impact
4) What is the performance of the project in carrying out the project activities?
5) What are the perceptible effects and impacts (planned and unplanned) realized or to be anticipated on the adaptive capacity of the direct and indirect beneficiaries through the project? More specifically:
   - To what extent have the target beneficiaries of the project improved their practices in adopting the climate-smart practices promoted by the project?
   - What carbon balance in the long term can we expect from the capitalization of the practices and technical know-how promoted by the project in the field?
   - What impact has the application of the knowledge acquired during the trainings on technical crop production and climate-smart agricultural practices, had in terms of yield, food security and income?

6) How and why did the observed changes occur? What is the success or failure factors?

7) What recommendations to strengthen the impact of the project's actions?

Efficiency
8) Could the project strategy have been more effective with fewer resources? and how?
9) What lessons have been learned from the project's adaptation to the impact of the COVID-19 crisis?

Sustainability

10) To what extent does the project ensure the sustainability of its achievements and investments made? What roles do the state and the private sector play?
11) What capitalization does the project ensure for the scaling up of the practices promoted?
12) What specific recommendations to strengthen the sustainability of the project's action?

Cross-cutting issues

13) To what extent does the project contribute to the good reputation and visibility of ECOWAS, EU and ACP actions in the fight against climate change?

14) What was the consideration of cross-cutting aspects in the implementation of the project: gender, environment, throughout the project cycle and how to improve it?

15) What lessons have been learned since the project design phase, to improve the relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the achievements of this type of project?

Methodology

This is an external end-of-project evaluation and will follow a mixed quantitative and qualitative approach.

By way of guidance on sampling, the samples (50-60 in all) for direct beneficiaries of the project must be taken from the women beneficiaries belonging to the Asumali and Ifeledon Women Cooperatives at Tufa (Niger) and Tede (Oyo) respectively. Additional sampling (if needed) could be drawn from neighbouring communities where the various trainings took place.

The external evaluation will calculate the values of the project performance indicators appearing in the logical framework, and provide explanations for the discrepancies observed with the planned targets.

Tasks expected from the consultant

Focus: The progress of the Project to date as against the Project's planned activities.

Coverage: The evaluation should measure the (i) relevance, (ii) effectiveness, (iii) efficiency, (iv) impact and (v) sustainability of the Project to date and what need to be done if improvements are necessary in replication; by way of developing an evaluation matrix (see details in the suggested draft Evaluation Matrix attached). There is also the need to help in

the identification of gender issue as well as the impact of this Project on the neighbouring communities of the project.

Timing: The final Project evaluation effective period of March 2021 to date (i.e., the lifespan of the Project).

Output-Products: The Project's final evaluation report is to judge the performance of the Project and also to guide the GSA in the dissemination and scale-up of the project learnings and best practices across the shea value chain for possible replication and adoption.

Usage: To help the GSA, in general, to facilitate replication of the project in shea producing communities in Nigeria and other ECOWAS countries. The report will be used to convince key stakeholders and decision makers on the benefits of scaling up the model farm. Also, it will help improve the GSA's activities, contributing to the lessons learnt to similar projects as well as acting as Project accountability to donors. The Consultant will be given GSA evaluation documents to enable him/her have a broader outlook of how the evaluation process should aim at and achieve.

Deliverables

The expected deliverables are:

-   Final Evaluation reports

-   In addition to the reports, an article of 1 to 2 pages maximum summarizing the report in the form of a one-page newsletter for decision-makers would be useful.

-   The updated logical framework containing the baseline values, targets and final values of each performance indicator

Consultant profile

The Consultant will undertake the assignment in consultation with the research partners of the project i.e., RMRDC and PRI Global. The GSA will provide all the necessary materials as required and/or needed by the Consultant. The Consultant should have a minimum of first degree and/or Master's degree in a relevant field; with 5 – 7 years of conducting project evaluation. Knowledge of the Shea and agricultural sector is required. In addition, he/she must be conversant with the intervention areas and must possess adequate facilities to discharge the tasks in terms of logistics and other working equipment. Touring parts of Niger and Oyo States in Nigeria and visiting partners and stakeholders are envisaged in the assignment.

Schedule

- Application deadline is 20th July; all applications to be sent to: **Cornelius Kakrabah c.kakrabah@globalshea.com**
- The contract for this consultancy is expected to be signed by 20th August, 2022
- The final report to be submitted by 30th October, 2022

Table below for details

Tasks	Start	Ending	Days
Receiving of applications	1st July 2022	20th July 2022	20 days
Initial contact, Discussion and appointment of consultant	25th July 2022	20th August 2022	25 days
Consultancy contract duration	20th August 2022	30th September 2022	41 days
Consultant submit his report to the GSA for review	30th September 2022	10th October 2022	10 days
Submission of final report to Expertise France	10th October	30th October 2022	20 days

APPENDIX A: Evaluation Matrix

ISSUES	QUESTIONS	DATA SOURCE

EFFECTIVENESS	• To what extent did the outputs (planned & unplanned) contribute to the Overall Objectives? Why? Why not?
	  - Capacities of project partners
	  - Availability & use of resources
	
	(Develop matrix of planned objectives, outputs etc.)
		• Project Document
		• Project Reports
		• Implementing Partners & Beneficiaries Reports
		• Project Managers
		• Agronomists
		• Community Leaders

EFFICIENCY	• Were the resources efficiently managed and utilised?
	  - Finances – procedures i.e., reporting, budgeting.
	  - Assets/farm equipment used
	  - Were the Outputs generated as expected - in quality and time?
	  - Were there any unforeseen problems? How well were they dealt with?
		• Project Document
		• Project Reports
		• PMs & Agronomists
		• Implementing Partners

RELEVANCE	• Establish whether or not the project design and approach was relevant in addressing the identified needs, issues and challenges facing people, and the environment? • To what extent does the project contribute to overall Key Results and strategies of the GSA?	• Situation Analysis Study (initial and updates) • Project Document • PMs & Agronomists • GSA Staff • Partner Organisations • Key Stakeholder Groups
IMPACT	What impacts did the project have – using the following indicators and parameters. A) Socio economic: Number of women beneficiaries and number of households benefiting from the project by way of income, crop yield, job creation, poverty reduction, knowledge acquisition and empowerment B) The Environment: Number of hectares impacted by activities, technologies and practices of sustainable land management and resilience to climate change, biodiversity, soil fertility etc. Were there any unintended positive or negative impacts arising from particular outcomes?	• Project Reports • Implementing Partners & Beneficiaries • Reports • PMs & Agronomists • Project Leas • Research Partners
SUSTAINABILITY	• Was the approach used likely to ensure a continued benefit and/or use of the outputs and outcomes after the end of the project? Why/ Why not? • Has measures been put in place to ensure continuity, replication and adaptation of the project	• Project Document • Project Reports • Implementing Partners and Beneficiaries Reports

ANNEX B: Project Logframe

Global Shea Alliance: Developing A Resilient Shea Agroforestry Farm Model

	Intervention Logic	Indicators	Baseline Reference (including reference year)	Target (including reference year)	Current value / Reference Date	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
General Objective : impact	Increased climate resilience of smallholder farmers in West Africa	% of farmers that state their yield has been impacted by climate events	NA	Baseline - 5%	NA	Research report	Irrelevant
	SO1: Demonstrated benefit of resilient shea agroforestry farm models	SO1: Percentage of Industry stakeholders with improved capacity on agroforestry farming models (industry ownership)	SO1: NA	SO1: Baseline + 70%	SO1: NA	Quarterly survey and data sheets	There is no mistrust between communities that prevent replication.
	SO2: Improved stakeholder capacity for easy replication	SO2: Number of beneficiary households	SO2:0	SO2: 1,500	SO2:0		Climate conditions and investment opportunities are similar within shea producing region.
	SO2: Improved stakeholder capacity for easy replication	SO2: Number of individual beneficiary producers	SO2:0	SO2: 1,500	SO2:0		
Results: Sub-effects	IR 1.1: Two resilient shea agroforestry demonstration farms set up	IR1.1: Number of demonstration farms set-up	IR1.1:0	IR1.1: 2	IR1.1:0	Quarterly	No extreme climate event or security issue will disrupt the impact and findings
	IR1.2: Economic & Environmental Evaluation	IR1.2: Number of evaluations conducted	IR1.2:0	IR1.2:2	IR1.2:0	Surveys and data sheets	No major disruption in shea market
	IR2.1: 1,500 women shea farmers with improved capacity in climate smart practices,	IR2.1: Number of women with improved capacity in climate smart practices	IR2.1:0	IR2.1:1,500	IR2.1:0		
	IR2.2: Improved stakeholder knowledge	IR2.2: Number of stakeholders with improved knowledge of climate smart practices	IR2.2:0	IR2.2:5,000	IR2.2:0		
Outcomes	O1.1.1 Demonstration farms set-up	O1.1.1: Number of farms set up	O1.1.1: 0	O1.1.1: 2	O1.1.1: 0	Quarterly	No security events or extreme climatic events will distort impact and findings.
	01.2.1 Evaluations conducted	01.2.1: Number of evaluations conducted	01.2.1: 0	01.2.1: 2	01.2.1: 0	Surveys and data sheets	
	02.1.1 Women trained in climate smart practices	O2.1.1: Number of women trained	O2.1.1: 0	O2.1.1: 1,500	O2.1.1: 0		
	02.2.1 Stakeholders reached	O2.2.1: Number of stakeholders reached	O2.2.1: 0	O2.2.1: 5,000	O2.2.1: 0		
Activities	A.1.1.1.1 Engage community		A.1.1.1.1 Two communities engaged				No security events or extreme climatic events will distort impact and findings. The two cooperatives will keep operating as cooperatives.
	A1.1.1.2 Obtain land		A1.1.1.2 Two land obtained				
	A.1.1.1.3 Assess farm		A.1.1.1.3 Two farm assessed				
	A.1.1.1.14 Conduct technical set-up		A.1.1.1.14 Two technical set-up conducted				
	A.1.2.1.1 Conduct Baseline Study		A.1.2.1.1 Economic Evaluation conducted				
	A.1.2.1.2 Conduct Economic Evaluation		A.1.2.1.2 Environmental Evaluation conducted				
	A.1.2.1.3 Conduct Environmental Evaluation						
	A.1.2.1.4 Conduct Final Evaluation						
	A.2.1.1.1 Conduct Technical trainings on crop production		A.2.1.1.1 1,500 women trained on crop production				
	A.2.1.1.2 Conduct Quality trainings for shea		A.2.1.1.2 1,500 women trained on Quality shea production				
	A.2.1.1.3 Conduct Technical trainings on apiculture,		A.2.1.1.3 1,500 women trained on apiculture,				
	A.2.1.1.4 Conduct Conservation trainings		A.2.1.1.4 1,500 women trained on conservation trainings				
	A.2.1.1.5 Conduct Market linkages		A.2.1.1.5 Market linkages conducted for 2 cooperatives				
	A.2.2.1.1 Produce Best Practice Manual		A.2.2.1.1 1 best practice manual produced				
	A.2.2.1.2 Produce Evaluation report		A.2.2.1.2 1 evaluation report produced				
	A.2.2.1.3 Organize Conferences		A.2.2.1.3 1 conference organized				
	A.2.2.1.4 Organize Workshops		A.2.2.1.4 1 workshop organized				
	A.2.2.1.5 Publish Success stories		A.2.2.1.5 5 success stories published				
	A.2.2.1.6 Engage Stakeholders		A.2.2.1.6 5,000 stakeholders engaged				