



Terms of Reference

Evaluation of the Land for Life programme implementation in Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Liberia, Sierra Leone and Germany

On behalf of Welthungerhilfe

Final version, 22 August 2019

1. Introduction and context

Country:	<i>Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Liberia, Sierra Leone and Germany</i>
Project title:	<i>Land for Life – making policies work for food security (MAP)</i>
Project No.:	b2188, INT1088
Project holder:	Welthungerhilfe
Total budget:	EUR 2,0 Mio.
Evaluation budget:	EUR 35.000
Co-financer:	BMZ
Project period:	30.06.2017-30.04.2020

Deutsche Welthungerhilfe e.V. is one of the largest Non-Governmental Organisations in Germany operating in the field of Humanitarian Assistance and Development. It was established in 1962, as the German section of the "Freedom from Hunger Campaign", one of the world's first initiatives aimed at the eradication of hunger. Welthungerhilfe's work is still dedicated to the following vision: All people have a right to a self-determined life in dignity and justice, free from hunger and poverty.

By 2018, Welthungerhilfe and its partner organisations ran 404 international projects in 37 countries with an overall financing volume of 184 Million Euros, comprised of private donations, public national and international funds.

In addition, Welthungerhilfe operates a marketing and fundraising department in Germany in order to engage and educate a wider public in development related topics and mobilize funds from currently more than 57.000 permanent private donors.

Programme object of the evaluation: background on the Land for Life initiative

In 2017, Welthungerhilfe launched the Land for Life initiative in four African countries: Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Liberia and Sierra Leone. The initiative aims to strengthen or respectively facilitate the formation of multi-actor-partnerships (MAP), bringing together different stakeholders to contribute to the formulation and implementation of land governance policies and responsible agricultural investments in line with international standards, in particular the Right to adequate Food (RtF) and the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Tenure of Land and other resources (VGGT).

The initiative's strategic approach, which aims at influencing the formulation and implementation of land policies and legislations through the promotion and facilitation of inclusive multi-stakeholder policy dialogue in the four target countries, identifies four pillars:

1. The development of civil society actors' capacities both in terms of multi-stakeholder policy engagement and in terms of theme-specific expertise;
2. The support to civil society actors in the development and implementation of joint advocacy strategies in line with MAP country-specific policy priorities;
3. The facilitation of and support to informed participation by civil society actors in multi-actor policy dialogue meetings; and
4. The improvement of dialogue structures and dynamics between German civil society actors and policy makers, based on evidence generated through the Land for Life-intervention.

For each of the target countries, a preliminary context analysis has been carried out looking at the status of food security and the underlying causes in terms of national land governance and agricultural investments and their adherence to international standards and guidelines, such as the VGGT and the principles on responsible agricultural investments (RAI). Moreover, civil society organizations have been identified in each country based on their expertise and engagement in national MAP and relevant policy processes, to act not only as national implementing partners but also and above all to be primary beneficiaries of the initiative itself.

These partners work closely with WHH country offices and the international management team and are the primary implementers and facilitators of national processes under the Land for Life.¹

As the first phase of the Land for Life initiative is coming to its end, an external assessment becomes a key step to learn from in order to define the next steps and in refine the approach. The assessment therefore seeks to carry out an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the processes it has put in place in the four countries, of the strategic approach and strategic components it has used and of the results it has achieved.

2. Evaluation purpose

The evaluation has three purposes:

- 1.) Informing the design of Land for Life phase 2:

The evaluation is an integral part of Land for Life's first phase, which in Welthungerhilfe's view is to be considered as the pilot phase of a new approach to its operations in the field of policy engagement in the land sector. As such, besides being a specific requirement in the donor agreement for accountability purposes, the evaluation's primary purpose is to document 'lessons

¹ Additional information on the national context and on national partners can be found in the programme document in the annex.

learnt', the successes and limitations of the MAP approach, in order for it to be useful for Land for Life phase 2 programme planning in other countries, as well as for trainings design².

The evaluation and its results will come at a time when the design of the Land for Life's second phase will be in its final stage and before the new proposal will be submitted for funding. Hence, it is expected to provide key recommendations that can be used to inform various aspects of the new programme design, including the theory of change itself, the strategic approach and the weighting of the strategic components it will support, the capacity needs at different levels and the management and accountability systems within country processes and between national and international levels.

Moreover, implementation level differs significantly across countries. An analysis of strengths and weaknesses of most advanced processes, as well as of best practices, may provide key insights to be integrated in the strategies of the less advanced ones.

2.) Building Land for Life staff capacity

The evaluation shall also function as a tool for reflection and learning for all staff involved, contributing to strengthening their capacities for the further implementation of the initiative (formative intent).

3.) Assessing validity of the MAP approach

Given that this is the first initiative within Welthungerhilfe that employs the MAP approach, there is a strong interest to understand the validity of this approach also with a view to its application in future interventions. Thus, the evaluation shall also provide evidence of impact / early outcomes to judge the validity of this approach in comparison to others, especially in fragile / weak policy environments and – if possible – the necessity to employ complementary approaches to MAP in order to achieve the intended policy outcomes. For this purpose, the evaluation may also integrate comparative elements, drawing lessons from other platforms (e.g. ILC NES) and integrating corresponding recommendations.

3. Scope of the Evaluation

Despite being the final evaluation of the current phase, it needs to be framed as a mid-term review within a longer-term intervention. It will look at the programme as a whole in terms of the strengths and limitations of the support it provides to national processes, and to national actors to effectively engage in national policy processes. Nevertheless, it will primarily look at the four single national processes in Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Liberia and Sierra Leone and their ability to deliver the expected results.

More specifically, the evaluation will look at:

1. *Assessing achievements towards the expected results as defined by the Land for Life programme document (pages 17-19, English Version) (country level);*
The Land for Life programme document contains a logframe with objectives, basic baselines, targets and specific activities. The evaluation should therefore start by assessing the level of implementation, the success stories and the failures, analyse the reasons and identify the bottlenecks. This is the most objectively verifiable part of the evaluation, which should therefore start from there.
2. *Assessing outcomes that are directly linked to the results (country level)*
The Land for Life initiative aims at influencing the policy and legal frameworks in the four target countries. Considering the political nature of such processes and the multi-stakeholder and inclusive approach embedded in the initiative, the evaluation should also

² As defined by the programme document under section 5.8.

be able to capture intermediate outcomes associated with the goal. To what extent do civil society actors feel better equipped with technical capacities to effectively engage in policy dialogue? What is the outcome of the national and international learning opportunities provided by the initiative? Do they feel they have improved tools and mechanisms available? Do they feel they have better and more informed access to policy makers and other key players? To what extent have the perceptions among actors changed? Has the level of trust improved? Has sufficient knowledge been produced, and information flows been improved? And to what extent have the activities promoted by the initiative contributed to that? What are the key lessons learned from each country context in working on the various outcomes?

3. *Assessing the pertinence and effectiveness of the overall Land for Life approach and strategic components in support of the achievement of country level results (general level);*
The Land for Life initiative phase 1 builds on four pillars (see above) and on a number of more specific interventions. Do the underlying theory of change and strategic efforts prove to be effective in delivering the expected results or should they be reconsidered? And why? Are there “change narratives” that can be captured that demonstrate linkages between the intervention and the overall change objective?
4. *Identify challenges that have impeded the effectiveness and achievement of results, taking into account external factors and limitations and remedy measures adopted (country level);*
A number of challenges may have arisen during the implementation, preventing intended results to be fully achieved. These may range from wrong assumptions, different levels of understanding of the MAP approach across the Land for Life-teams in-country and beyond, different perspectives on how to facilitate the MAP approach (e.g. should it start with CSOs and then only later involve others constituencies? or should the process evolve by building separate containers across the spectrum of all actors? what is the value added of each approach?), to managerial challenges, lack of capacities, lack of interest, insufficient efforts, etc. The evaluation should also assess to what extent the in-country MAP formation/ strengthening processes haven taken into account similar existing interventions, e. g. FAO VGGT MSPs (have linkages been established? has the existence of such processes rather had negative or positive implications for Land for Life MAP? what lessons have been learned?). The evaluation should identify and analyse those in the view of enable learnings and formulating concrete recommendations.
5. *Recommend actions to be taken for the second phase of the initiative (2020-2023) in addressing the identified challenges and gaps (all levels)*
Taking a very pragmatic approach, the evaluation should formulate concrete recommendations in terms of project design and strategic approach, management model, human resources, specific actions to feed into the new phase design.

The evaluation will cover the entire implementation period, from the start of activities in June 2017 to the moment the evaluation will be carried out (October-November 2019).

4. Users of the evaluation

Coherently with the intended use of the evaluation, the primary users are the international programme manager, the HoPs/ key WHH Country Office staff and coordinators at country level and the training partners. The financial partner (BMZ) is also to be considered among the users of evaluation outcomes.

- **International programme manager:** the international programme manager is responsible for the re-design of the initiative’s phase 2 as well as for overall management of the initiative. Evaluation outcomes will be used to inform the new theory of change (i.e. how the

initiative will support the achievement of national level results), to reconsider and improve the overall management model and to improve the effectiveness on the use of available resources;

- **Country level WHH's Heads of Project and key WHH Country Office staff:** as part of WHH's country offices, HoPs are responsible for the national level management and implementation of the Land for Life initiative. They work closely with the implementing partners and will use evaluation outcomes to improve the collaboration model, to make more strategic decisions on the use of resources and to better assist implementing partners both technically and financially; they are supervised and assisted through the key programme staff in WHH Country Offices, including the Country Directors;
- **Coordinators from within national partner organizations:** as responsible entities for the coordination and enhancement of the initiative, for the mobilisation of national civil society actors and for the facilitation of the political dimension of the initiative, they will use evaluation outcomes to identify and address bottlenecks and to make more strategic decisions;
- **Training partners:** as responsible entities for the MAP training – and as training experts on aspects such as leadership, management and business models among others – they will use the evaluation outcomes to develop ad-hoc training opportunities addressing specific weaknesses as emerged from the evaluation; furthermore, the evaluation results shall be used to define their role beyond the facilitation of trainings during phase 2;
- **Financial partner:** given the particular approach of the intervention, its non-linear nature, as well as its strong political dimension, the financial partner will use the evaluation outcomes to assess the potential, challenges and needs of such interventions to inform its future programmes and decisions.

Beyond the immediate users, the evaluation shall also inform Welthungerhilfe leadership about the strength and weaknesses of the MAP approach in achieving the intended policy change and necessary measures that need to be put in place in order to facilitate such an approach successfully.

5. Evaluation design, methodology and criteria

A detailed methodology will be developed by the evaluators and agreed upon with Welthungerhilfe staff. Considering the nature of the intervention, the evaluation approach requires a blend of desk review of existing documentation to verify and evaluate objectively verifiable data, and semi structured interviews with all parties involved, with a specific focus on beneficiary groups, to evaluate perceptions related to programme's outcomes.

Interviews will be carried out face to face with beneficiaries and other parties involved in the MAP at country level during the field phase, and from distance with the international team and international training partners.

Other general criteria for the evaluation:

- The evaluation methodology has to allow for sex-disaggregated data, showing how males and females are involved in the country-level MAP processes;
- The methods and data sources should be triangulated for enhancing the validity of evaluation findings;
- Existing data (e.g. baselines, endlines, secondary data, data stemming from the project feedback) has to be included into the evaluation where appropriate to the evaluation purpose and scope.

A final agreement on the evaluation design and methodology will be discussed on the basis of the submitted offer and the inception report.

6. Evaluation questions

6.1 Relevance

- 1. To what extent is the initiative relevant in its design and approach in relation to stakeholders and beneficiaries' needs?**
2. To what extent is the initiative, both in its civil society and MAP components, addressing existing gaps?
3. To what extent is the initiative's approach addressing stakeholder's capacity and informed policy dialogue needs?
4. Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
5. To what extent is the emerging MAP structure relevant to the country contexts (considering individual country's specific characteristics)?
6. To what extent should the initiative's approach be modified to better address existing beneficiaries' needs?

6.2 Effectiveness

1. To what extent are the international and national objectives clear and focussed?
2. To what extent will the initiative achieve its objectives?
3. To what extent have the intended outputs and targets been achieved, or are they likely to be achieved within the timeframe of the initiative?
4. To what extent the planned outputs prove to be instrumental to the achievement of the intended objectives?
5. To what extent has the strategic planning been able to support the achievement of the intended results?
6. Are all stakeholders equally benefitting from the initiative (within CSO constituency and across different stakeholders)?
7. To what extent have internal factors positively or negatively influenced the achievement of intended results?

6.3 Efficiency

1. To what extent are the international and national management systems re appropriate to the achievement of intended results?
2. To what extent are the financial and human resources appropriate to the achievement of intended results?
3. How efficient is the overall management set-up at national level?
4. To what extent is the national support structure efficient in delivering intended results?
5. To what extent are the capacities within the management and coordination teams appropriate to the achievement of the intended objectives? Are there specific strategic resources and capacities that are not adequately represented?
6. Within the existing overall management model, to what extent is the initiative (through its international team) addressing the needs of national staff and structure?
7. To what extent are the MAP (both technical and governance) structures effective in delivering the national strategies and work plans?
8. To what extent has the initiative benefitted from the expertise, capacities and collaboration of involved stakeholders?
9. To what extent have the initiative's activities been coordinated and harmonised with those of other initiatives/actors?
10. To what extent is the distribution of roles, tasks and responsibilities between national and international teams efficient?

11. To what extent are the existing planning, monitoring, implementation tools and cycles appropriate to the achievement of the intended results?

6.4 Outcomes

1. To what extent have the intended outcomes been achieved?
2. Is there any evidence of improvement in terms of civil society actors' capacity to engage in multi-stakeholder policy dialogue?
3. To what extent has the information flow on land related processes improved among land actors involved in the initiative?
4. To what extent has the level of collaboration among different stakeholders improved as a result of the MAP approach? What have been the limiting/success factors?
5. To what extent has the level of collaboration among civil society actors improved as a result of the MAP approach? What have been the limiting/success factors?
6. To what extent has the level of trust and openness to collaboration improved among the different actors as a result of the MAP?
7. To what extent are MAP actors actively engaged in the MAP (e.g. participation in existing bodies, contributing to activities, to planning and to overall functioning, etc.)
8. To what extent has the MAP been able to engage in/influence policy processes?
9. Have there been unintended outcomes?

7. Timeframe, Deliverables and Reporting Deadlines

Timeframe

Evaluation results are expected to be available by beginning of December 2019, hence within 3 ½ months from the call of applications.

Activity	Deadline	Expected deliverable
Call for applications issued	August 22, 2019	
Closing date for applications	September 9, 2019	Offer
Decision on offer	September 10, 2019	
Contracting	September 11, 2019	
Kick-off meeting	September 16, 2019	
Submission of inception report draft	September 27, 2019	Inception report (draft)
Comments on inception report	October 2, 2019	
Final version inception report	October 4, 2019	Inception report (final)
Desk review	By October 11, 2019	
CFS in Rome with possible side event on the proposed Community of Practice for MSP Facilitators	October 14-18, 2019	
Field phase	October 14-November 11, 2019	Country notes
CSA-facilitated MAP workshops in SLE and ETH	October 28-November 8, 2019	
Submission of draft report	November 29, 2019	Evaluation report (draft)
Presentation of draft in Joint on-line meeting with all parties involved	December 4, 2019	PowerPoint summarising key findings and recommendations
CLPA in Abidjan with possible pre-event and side-	November 24-28	

event on MSP/MAP harmonization		
Comments on evaluation report	December 6, 2019	
Submission of final report	December 13, 2019	Evaluation report (final)

Grey rows identify activities and events that may be relevant to the evaluation.

Deliverables

The following deliverables are expected to be produced by the evaluators:

1. **Inception report** (5-7 pages for the main text without front page, table of contents and annexes).
The inception report should set out the planned design and methodology to meet the above-mentioned objectives and to answer the evaluation questions which, based on preliminary exchanges with Welthungerhilfe, will be further refined and unpacked.
It should also reflect the limits of the suggested design and methodology and could explore the feasibility for answering the evaluation questions and reflect on the ToR, describe the overall approach of the evaluation and how data will be collected by providing an evaluation matrix, drafts of suggested data collection tools such as questionnaires and interview guidelines as well as a tentative evaluation schedule.
2. **Country notes** outlining the most important preliminary findings and recommendations by country (2-4 pages).
3. **Evaluation report as draft and final** (English, 30-40 pages main text, including the executive summary excluding the front page, table of contents, and annexes). The evaluation report has to contain an executive summary of a maximum 5 pages and several mandatory annexes. A standard outline for the evaluation report will be provided to the evaluators.

The final report needs the approval of the Contracting Party. In case of dissent, there has to be a documentation of the matter.

8. Resources and Available Data

Financial resources

The budget available for the evaluation is of 35,000 EUR (approx. 38,800 USD at current exchange rate). The amount is intended to cover all costs of the evaluation, including evaluators' fees and any other cost related to field work or travels.

Human resources

Welthungerhilfe international and national staff will provide support with the logistics, by providing all available materials and documentation by identifying key informants and by facilitating contacts with the selected interviewees.

Availability of data and sources for desk review

Key sources to inform the evaluation may include: country strategies, country assessments, workplans/roadmaps, communication and advocacy products, planning and training workshop reports, core group/steering committee meetings minutes, monthly reports, and activity reports.

9. Confidentiality

All documents and data acquired from documents as well as during interviews and meetings are confidential and to be used solely for the purpose of the evaluation.

The deliverables as well as all material linked to the evaluation (produced by the evaluators or the organisation itself) is confidential and remains at all times the property of the contracting party.

10. Expertise of the evaluators

The evaluators must have a specific and extensive expertise in (participative) evaluation methodologies in the development sector, and specifically in the land and natural resources governance sector. Given the nature of the initiative under evaluation, the evaluators should also have specific expertise in the field of multi-stakeholder policy processes and platforms and advocacy.

They should have a record of accomplishment of previous experiences at international level and with civil society actors, possibly in the African context. The evaluator(s), must be able to cover both Anglophone and Francophone countries.

11. Technical and financial offer

Applicants have to provide:

- A technical and financial offer;
- The technical part of the offer should include reference to the perceived feasibility of the ToR (including suggestions for specific evaluation questions). It should also include a brief description of the overall design and methodology of the evaluation and an adaptation (if strictly required) to the workplan at hand (maximum 4 pages);
- The financial part includes a proposed budget for the complete evaluation. It should state the fees per working day (plus the respective VAT, if applicable), the number of working days proposed and other costs (e.g. visa costs). Proof of professional registration and taxation is also required (e.g. by providing the evaluator's tax number)
- CV with references
- Proof and examples of previous assignments

In developing the financial offer, the applicant should take into account the following:

- The financial part needs to include estimated travel and accommodation costs; WHH HQ and Country Offices will support the corresponding logistics.
- All insurances are of the responsibility of the evaluators.
- Soft copies of relevant documents will be provided by Welthungerhilfe.
- Welthungerhilfe and partner organization staff will facilitate community entry and contacts to other interviewees.
- Translators and local transport, as required, will be provided by Welthungerhilfe.
- Laptops need to be provided by the evaluators.

Offers have to be signed or have to include the phrase "valid without signature":

Offers will be accepted by individual consultants, commercial companies, NGOs and academics until **September 9, 2019**.

Contact details

Offers shall be submitted via e-mail to Welthungerhilfe to the e-mail addresses below.

Contact person: Constanze vonOppeln, Land for Life programme manager - Constanze.vonOppeln@welthungerhilfe.de

Please cc the offer to: Pamela Schaub, Procurement Officer - pamela.schaub@welthungerhilfe.de

Annex

Project Proposal “Land for Life – making policies work for food security”