PEACE THROUGH ECONOMIC ACTION AND COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT (PEACE) IN MOZAMBIQUE
TERMS OF REFERENCE (ToR) for
Mid Term Review
2023

November 2023

Contents

I. INTRODUCTION 3
Project Rationale 3
The Theory of Change 3
Project goal and expected outcomes 3
Geographical Scope 3
II. OBJECTIVES OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW 4
III. SCOPE OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW 4
Progress towards Results 4
Changes in development: 4
Measurement of change: 5
Project strategy: 5
Performance: 5
Sustainability: 5
Gender perspective: 5
The Project's Adaptive Management Framework 6
Monitoring Systems 6
Risk Management 6
Work Planning 6
Underlying Factors 6
Partnership Strategy 6
IV. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE MID-TERM REVIEW 6
Main products: 6
Indicative outline of the review report: 6
V. REVIEW METHODOLOGY 6
VI. IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT 7
The Mid-term review timetable 7

I. INTRODUCTION and rational for the review

,

The PEACE project is a 5-year project (2021-2026) of a value of up to CAD 5 million. It aims to create sustainable human development improvements for communities in the Cheringoma district, with a strong focus on empowering girls and women. This will be achieved by supporting value chains, strengthening education and health services, and creating structures through which residents can actively participate in decisions surrounding community life and development.

The project is funded by Global Affairs Canada (GAC), implemented by the Gorongosa Restoration Project (GRP) applying an integrated approach to conservation and human development. Key government collaboration institutions include the Cheringoma District Administration, and the District Service for Education, Youth and Technology (DSEYT), District Service for Health, Women and Social Action (DSHWSA), District Service for Planning and Infrastructure (DSPI) and District Service for Economic Activities (DSEA).

In light with the Contribution Agreement between GAG and GRP two evaluations are required during the project implementation, one at the mid-term and the other at the end of the project. Considering that the project was approved in March 2021, effectively launched in September 2021, a join decision was made to make an independent review of the project by first quarter of 2024.

The Theory of Change

The Theory of Change (ToC) described in the Project Implementation Plan states that, the ultimate goal is to reduce rural poverty and promote the inclusion of communities to post-conflict stability in central Sofala is ensured. To achieve this goal, investing in (i) access to quality education and health, (ii) improving economic opportunities for women and men and (iii) promoting civic participation of community members - and women and girls in particular - are fundamental components and remain the focus of the project strategy.

Project goal and expected outcomes

The Project's ultimate goal is ***to reduce rural poverty and enhance inclusion for communities, particularly for women, toward post-conflict stability in central Sofala*.**
The three intermediate outcomes are:

- **Intermediate outcome 1100:** Improved access to and performance of education and health services in the GNP Buffer Zone, with particular emphasis on girls and women;
- **Intermediate outcome 1200**: Improved sustainable economic opportunities for men and women living in the GNP's Buffer Zone through rural productive value chain development, including addressing barriers for women to benefit from these opportunities; and
- **Intermediate outcome 1300**: Improved men's and women's civic participation and benefit from local development processes (planning, decision-making and oversight).

Geographical Scope

The PEACE project is being implemented in the Cheringoma district. Benefiting over 33,000 people living in Cheringoma including Inhaminga town and its rural surroundings. The project also includes specific interventions in the Gorongosa district to support the livelihood and value chain

approaches, in particular the honey value chain. Beekeeping is a well-known and millenary activity practiced all over the Park's districts but its main region of production is in the Cheringoma district, where yields are higher and locals seem to have extended experience passed to them from previous generations. Even though this area is a hotspot of production, the GRP Apicultural Program has its logistical center operating in Vila Gorongosa (Gorongosa district). The Honey Processing is constructed to facilitate, integrate and centralize operations all around the Buffer Zone (BZ), including Cheringoma district and Catemo regulado. The Processing Unit is crucial to guarantee organic certification and food safety as well as adding value to the final product to promote fair trade, and results in an inclusive business model, self-reliance, and sustainability throughout the production cycle.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW

The purpose of this mid-term review is to assess the project progress, achievements, and challenges over the three-year period from March 2021 to the date of the assessment (1st quarter of 2024), to inform the GRP, GAC and other project partners of the progress, key lessons learned, and propose recommendations for any improvement or adjustment needed for the remaining project implementation period. It will review activities and analyse the extent to which their outcomes are fulfilling planned targets.

More specifically, the evaluation will:

a) Assess the project activities, implementation strategy and approaches, challenges and how these challenges are addressed; and to what extent that these contribute to the achievement of project objectives.
b) Ascertain the soundness of the methodologies/approaches developed for improved access to and performance of education and health services in the GNP Buffer Zone, with particular emphasis on girls and women by applying the Project Innovation outlined in the PIP.
c) Assess the application of the developed methodologies and best practices for the improvement of sustainable economic opportunities for men and women living in the GNP's Buffer Zone through rural productive value chain development, including addressing barriers for women to benefit from these opportunities.
d) Determine the contribution of activities towards improving men's and women's civic participation and benefits from local development processes (planning, decision-making and oversight).
e) Draw key findings and lessons learned and proposing improvement and adjustment needed to ensure that the project remains relevant to the needs of the target groups and contributes to poverty reduction.

III. SCOPE OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW

The review will cover the work carried out over the first three years (March 2021 to the date of the review). The Mid-Term Review will cover the following **aspects of project design and implementation**:

a) Relevance and strategic fit of the project

- ✓ To what extent the project objectives/outcomes are relevant to the needs of the beneficiaries?
- ✓ To what extent have the project's interventions so far contributed to reduce rural poverty and enhance inclusion for communities, particularly for women,

- ✓ Do the three (3) project outcomes, still represent the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives?
- ✓ Considering the time left until the end of the project, is the timeframe set still realistic? If applicable, outline recommendations for revising this timeframe with proposed benchmarks for the reminder implementation time of the project.

b) Project progress and effectiveness

To what extent has the project been making progress towards its planned objectives?

- ✓ What have been achieved so far?
- ✓ What are the major constraints so far?

With focus on the expected results, the evaluators are to assess how well the project is performing in terms of:

- ✓ Achieving the set of outputs that is expected;
- ✓ Professional capacity and the quality of inputs and activities
- ✓ Managerial aspects of the project, including how the co-ordination is organized, the set of skills required vis-à-vis the challenges, the management style and the management of human and financial resources
- ✓ Adequacy, effectiveness of implementation arrangements of the project.

For all of the above points, the evaluators are to make recommendations as to how project performance can be improved.

To what extent has the project promoted non-discrimination and gender equality? What approaches have been adopted to ensure the interests of the poor people including most vulnerable and other socially and economically disadvantaged groups are fully considered during the implementation of project activities?

Sustainability:

The focus will be on the extent to which the benefits of the project are likely to continue, within and outside the zones of project intervention, after the project has come to an end. The Review should also pay special attention to the potential contribution of the project to creating the basic conditions to ensure sustainability.

How likely the project will achieve its objectives in the second half of the project and what elements need to be considered to ensure sustainability of outcomes?

Gender perspective:

Extent to which the project accounts for gender differences when developing and applying project interventions. How are gender considerations mainstreamed into project interventions? Suggest measures to strengthen the project's gender approach.

Coherence: The extent to which the project has work in collaboration with other GRP projects.

The extent that the project has added value and collaborate with others who are doing similar work in Cheringoma and Gorongosa and not duplicating the efforts with others.

IV. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE MID-TERM REVIEW

Main products:

- **Mid-term Review report** should include an executive summary, main findings conclusions, lessons learned and emerging good practices as well as key recommendations. The final report is to be cleared and accepted by GRP. The final report (including executive summary but excluding annexes) should not exceed 25 pages.

- **A Power-Point presentation** of the findings of the evaluation: The Reviewer will be requested to make presentation to the partners and stakeholders.

Indicative outline of the review report:

1. Executive summary (2 pages)

2. Introduction (3 pages)
- Status of project (problem being addressed, expected results, measures of success, project strategy, key partners/stakeholders, project progress)
- Methodology of the review

3. Findings and Review Outcomes (10-15 pages)
- Progress Towards Expected Results
- Project's Adaptive Management Framework
- Underlying Factors
- Partnership Strategy

4. Recommendations (2 pages)

5. Evaluation report Annexes
- ToRs
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)
- Summary Rating Table (using 11 categories cited in Evaluation Methodology section below)
- Any other annex considered important by the reviewer

V. METHODOLOGY

The reviewer must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project staff and stakeholders and applicable to the remaining period of project duration. The review should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible. The review will be carried out by the team through:

Documentation review (desk study); the list of documentation to be reviewed is included in of these ToRs. These documents will be availed by GRP Office.

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and entities:

- The GRP Program Director.
- The Park Warden
- PMU – Project Management Unit
- The Provincial Directorate for Environmental Services
- The Provincial Directorate for Education, Youth and Technology Services
- Project Steering Committee
- Project Implementing Managers and Supervisors (Health, Education, Agriculture, Savings, Handcrafts and Apiculture)

Field visits should be made to at least three focal communities/sites in the project area.

A ***Project Rating Matrix*** will be annexed to the report and will rate the project according to the following criteria:

1. Attainment of objectives and planned results
2. Achievement of outputs and activities
3. Impact
4. Sustainability
5. Stakeholder participation / public awareness
6. Implementation approach
7. Replicability
8. Monitoring and Evaluation

The ratings will be presented in the form of a table. Each of the eight categories shall be rated separately with brief justifications based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The following rating system is to be applied:

HS = Highly Satisfactory
S = Satisfactory
MS = Moderately Satisfactory
MU = Moderately Unsatisfactory
U = Unsatisfactory
HU = Highly Unsatisfactory

VI. IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT

The principal responsibility for managing this review lies with the GRP Program Office, being thereby the main operational point for the review, responsible for liaising with the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits and co-ordinate with the GRP team and Government counterparts.

The Mid-term review timetable

The timetable presented in this section is indicative and, to a certain extent, negotiable. Candidates are welcome to propose alternative timetable, which will be considered when assessing their candidatures.
The proposed time of the review will be from **01st – 17th December**, with the draft report being available for comment 3 weeks after the completion of the review.