

**Draft**  
**Terms of reference**  
**Development and Recovery Portfolio Evaluation for Uganda CO**

**Background**

Uganda has achieved steady improvements during the last decade in the economic, Political and social spheres. Notwithstanding, Uganda ranks as number 146 out of 177 countries in the 2004 United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Human Development Report (2002 figures). Although annual growth rates have exceeded 5 percent over the past decade, contributing to a reduction in poverty levels from 56 to 41 percent between 1992/1993 to 1998/1999, there are significant disparities in income distribution, with 41 percent of the population still living on less than US\$1 a day. Life expectancy is only 42.6 years. Annual real per capita gross domestic product (GDP) is 283 United States dollars. The FAO Aggregate Household Food Security Index for Uganda is 76.4, but this national rate hides great regional disparities.

Furthermore, Uganda suffers from recurrent drought, flooding and civil unrest in the north and west of the country, which causes varying numbers of internally displaced people, and it is home to 150,000 Sudanese refugees. Since 1964 WFP has assisted the Government of Uganda in responding to the different needs launching a mix of emergency, protracted relief and recovery and development operations latest the Country programme (1999-2005), PRRO 10121 (2002-2005) and Development Project 10139 (2002-2004).

According to OEDE policy all first generation CPs have to be evaluated to provide accountability to the EB and to ensure that WFP learns from experience and can improve the quality of its development activities. In consultancy with the Country Office (CO) it was decided to also evaluate the development project 10139 and the recovery activities of PRRO 10121 as they together contribute to WFP's strategic priorities 2, 3, and 4 related to development and recovery as expressed in WFP's management plan approved by the EB in e October 2003. As the CO is currently preparing a new CP and a PRRO the findings from the evaluation will inform the design of the new documents.

**Objectives of the evaluation**

- To assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and connectedness of the portfolio of development and recovery activities in the CO in Uganda, and provide accountability to the Executive Board.
- To learn from the current portfolio in order to improve the design of the new PRRO and Country Programme under preparation

## **Scope**

This evaluation will assess to what extent the development and recovery activities have achieved their objectives and contributed to national development and recovery efforts and to WFP's strategic priorities. As these were only approved by the EB in October 2003, the current activities were not designed to specifically contribute to these, and will therefore not be evaluated against them. But as the new CP and PRRO in the future will be assessed based on their contribution to the SPs, the mission team will look at the potential of the current activities to do so, and recommend adjustments that would enhance this link in the future programmes. The activities to be evaluated are:

HIV/AIDS (PRRO 10121.0, CP)

Food for Assets (PRRO 10121.0)

Local Procurement (PRRO 10121.0 and CP)

School Feeding (PRRO 10121.0, CP activity I, II, III and Development Project 10139)

Food Security (PRRO and CP)

The evaluation will focus on assessing the results and the effectiveness with which they have been achieved by the operation, and will only look at process or management related issues if they are identified as obstacles to achieving the desired results.

## **Key questions and sub-questions:**

The evaluation mission will examine though not necessarily limiting themselves to following key issues:

1. Is WFP's development and recovery portfolio relevant to the reduction of poverty and food insecurity in Uganda?
  - Is the portfolio relevant to national priorities as expressed in the national Poverty Eradication Action Plan? And how does it complement other international and national efforts directed at this through initiatives such as the UNDAF, PRSP, etc.?
  - Is the portfolio contributing to development and recovery in Uganda across WFP's programme categories without overlapping, and is there evidence that the recovery objectives contribute to building the bridge between relief and development?
  - To what extent does the portfolio contribute to WFP's strategic priorities 2, 3, 4, and 5, and WFP's policies on development and recovery?
  - What is the comparative advantage of food aid in the areas where WFP operate?
2. What are the main recovery and development results (output and outcome level) achieved by the operation?
  - Has the operation achieved its intended outcomes and outputs? (a result matrix will be developed to clarify activity specific outcomes and outputs) If not, what are the main obstacles, and what can be done to reduce them?
  - How effectively has the portfolio been implemented in terms of quality, quantity and timeliness? (e.g. are the right beneficiaries being reached at the right time? Are the food rations adequate? Are the targeted groups benefiting from the assets created?)
3. Do the assessments on which the activities are based seem valid and in sync with what is considered to be the situation by other stakeholders? How have food insecurity,

vulnerability and beneficiary figures been assessed at country level, community level and household level? How effectively is vulnerability assessment linked to programming?

4. Does the targeting seem reasonable? How successfully has the project targeted poor, vulnerable and food insecure households in food insecure areas? How effectively is the project ensuring female participation in sub-project selection and in programming?
5. Have there been other unintended results or spin off effects, negative or positive, such as effects on agricultural production, prices and markets or labour market dynamics?
6. What monitoring systems are in place for assuring programme quality? (M&E plan, capacity building of IPs, involvement of stakeholders, etc.) and how are they linked to programming?
7. How effective are partnerships with other national and international actors on the ground?
8. Does the operation seem to be achieving an optimum relationship between cost and results?
9. What are the prospects for self reliance and continued utilization of community assets and services after WFP assisted operations have been completed?
  - What is the likelihood that an improvement in any of the indicators (increased enrolment rates, reduced gender disparity in primary schools, etc) will be sustained if food rations are phased out?
  - Is a viable exit strategy in place for all activities?

### **Evaluation approach and method**

A team of independent consultants will be identified to carry out the field mission. They will be guided by the present TORs and the Evaluation Manager assigned by OEDE. The evaluation has four phases:

- I CO preparation, design of TORs, identification of mission team
- II Documentation review
- III Field visit and report writing
- IV Stakeholder consultation

The documents to be reviewed are national policy documents, WFP policy and operational documents (e.g. UNDAF, project documents, earlier evaluations, self assessments carried out by the CO, monitoring data, etc.). The TOR have been drawn up by OEDE in consultation with the CO and the mission team leader. The initial hypothesis formed after the document review will be triangulated and expanded through interviews with WFP staff at HQ, CO and Sub-office levels, key informants (Government, other UN agencies, donors, NGOs, etc.) at capital, district and local levels, and focus groups and household interviews with beneficiaries. As resources do not permit to carry out interviews with a representative sample of the beneficiaries, a convenience sample of a limited number will be drawn based on types of activities and areas that can be reached by the mission team in the relatively short time available.

Before the mission leaves Uganda, it will produce a written Aid Memoire containing the initial findings and recommendations. This will be presented to the CO and Regional Bureau before

departure. This should ensure that the findings can feed into the ongoing formulation of a new PRRO and CP. The initial findings will also be presented in HQ. The team leader will write a report based on inputs from other team members. The report will be circulated for comments and a final draft will be ready approximately 1.12. A recommendation matrix will be drafted to ensure management response to the findings.

### **Timing and outputs**

Documentation review 1.9 –5.9

Travel 6.9

Field mission 7.9- 27.9. Aide Memoire.

Report writing 28.9-12.10. Report max. 60 pages + summary of max. 5000 words

Circulation 18.10-1.12

Submission to PEBC 15.12

### **Team composition**

#### **Team leader:**

- Evaluation skills incl. proven skills in construction of logic models and indicators
- Theoretical and proven practical skills with evaluation methods such PRA, RRA, focus group interviews, etc.
- Proven skills in facilitation and team leading
- Theoretical and Practical experience with food security issues and food aid in relief and recovery operations (such as food for work and food for assets)
- Prior experience with the UN in the field and ideally with WFP
- Practical experience with relief and recovery in both post-conflict and drought related emergencies
- Uganda experience

#### **Team members:** (2-3 international/national) should have following skills combined:

- Prior work experience in Uganda and understanding of national priorities, specially with regards to food security
- Theoretical and programmatic background and work experience with, school feeding and vocational training, income generating projects, IDPs and refugees, HIV/AIDS, nutritional interventions and local procurement
- Theoretical background and work experience with livelihood approaches
- Understanding of food security and food aid issues in relief and recovery situations
- Proven practical experience with Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) and/or other participatory assessment methods
- Prior experience with WFP