

## **Terms of Reference**

### **Evaluation of Phase I of the Mt Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project**

#### **1.0 Background**

What was meant to be a longe

*“Enhancement of biodiversity conservation on Mt Elgon by building up the competencies of some local communities and the partner agencies in collaborative natural resources management and seeking means of decreasing the dependency of these communities on the natural resources of Mt Elgon.”*

## **1.2 Output**

The project was designed to delive

project activities implementation? What impact has this arrangement had on project implementation?

The perspectives of the project actors on the effectiveness of the institutional arrangements of project implementation in-so far as technical and financial resources flows are concerned

## **2.1 Tasks to be performed by the Evaluation Team**

1. Gain an understanding of the project and its operating environment by reading relevant literature (especially project documents) and interviewing key project actors, at a central and de-centralized level.
2. Determine, for as wide a range of project actors as possible within the time available, their perspectives on the usefulness of the project.
3. Determine whether the project's performance, as assessed against performance targets outlined in the Plan of Operations, has been satisfactory and cost effective.
4. Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of supervisory and support arrangements for the project, addressing in particular the role of the three principal partners in the project – IUCN-EARO, KWS and FD.
5. Review the programs and activities being undertaken by the project and determine whether they effectively address the prescribed project outputs; recommend whatever changes may be considered desirable.
6. Make recommendations on whether the project in some guise should continue, and if positive, how a continuation should be managed, that is, the scope of the project, its aims, organisational arrangements, staffing and its *modus operandi*.
7. Taking into account No. 6, make recommendations on whether there is need for a bridging phase (budget neutral) to enable decent exit and handover to another donor by the Dutch government and how the bridging phase should be managed, that is – scope, staffing arrangements and activities during this bridging phase.

## **2.2 Outputs of the Evaluation Team**

- a) The principal output of the evaluation will be a report addressing the issues raised in these ToRs. The report should contain among others concrete recommendations on continuation identifying suitable partners and their role in the second phase (under another donor?) and staffing and activities in the bridging phase.
- b) The Team will lead a half day Debriefing / Review of their view of

and producing a first draft of the report. The Royal Netherlands Embassy will arrange adequate formal working conditions in Kitale.

By the end of the sixteenth working day, the team will have distributed an initial draft of their findings.

On the afternoon of the seventeenth working day the team will conduct a debriefing review with key stakeholders, nominated by RNE, in Nairobi.

By the end of the eighteenth day the team will submit a revised draft of their report.

Within two weeks feedback on the revised draft will have been received by the Team Leader who will submit the final version of the report within a further two weeks.

## **2.4 The Evaluation Team**

The team will consist of three persons - an international consultant who will be the team leader, and two national consultants. At least one of the team members will be a woman.

The following skills and experience will be collectively present in the evaluation team:

- a) Collaborative natural resources management - forestry, wildlife and biodiversity conservation.
- b) Organization management and development.
- c) Agricultural development.
- d) Rural development, including rural sociology and gender competencies.
- e) Human resources development.

All team members will have had at least eight years of professional experience in their respective fields.

In addition, the Team Leader will have had at least ten years of work experience in developing countries of which at least five years will have been in Africa.

Whilst team members' opinion will be respected, the Team Leader will bear overall responsibility to RNE for the evaluation.

## **2.5 Resources**

### *Personnel*

RNE, EARO, KWS, FD will each designate an officer knowledgeable about the project to be a contact person for the Evaluation Team, and these officers will assist the Team to the best of their abilities.

Project Staff will be at the disposal of the Evaluation Team during normal office hours for the duration of the Evaluation, and outside these hours, by agreement with the individuals concerned.

### *Reading Material*

Project Formulation Document, April 1997  
Plan of Operations April 1999  
Plan of Operations December 1999  
Annual Workplan 1999  
Annual Workplan 2000

*Work-plan 2001*

Monitoring and Evaluation Plan  
Quarterly and Half Yearly Progress Reports Dec 1998-Dec 2000  
Proposals for Project Activities (filed in PMU Office)  
Review of the Management of the Forests of the Mt Elgon Ecosystem  
Various project reports - on PRAs, Trainings.  
PMU meeting minutes  
Project files on the Five Progr