

COMMON PROGRAMME OF PROMOTION OF SUSTAINABLE
FAMILY FARMING AND SOCIAL ECONOMY FOR A FAIRER
WORLD (2017-2021)

Terms of Reference for the final evaluation

TANZANIA

ONG ILES DE PAIX

April 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Context of the evaluation	3
1.1.	Presentation of the NGOs SIA	3
1.2.	General presentation of the SIA programme	5
1.3.	Commissioning NGO(s), countries and areas concerned by this final evaluation	5
1.4.	Presentation of the local context	5
1.5.	Logical framework of the programme	7
2.	Evaluation stakes	8
2.1.	Rationale and objectives of the evaluation	8
2.2.	Fields of evaluation	8
3.	Evaluation questions	9
4.	Stakeholders and responsibilities	9
5.	Methodology and content of the evaluation work	10
6.	Indicative evaluation planning	11
7.	Indicative calendar	11
8.	Expected outputs	11
9.	Evaluator profile	12
10.	Contractual and financial conditions	12
11.	Practicalities of application	13
11.1.	Reply modalities and documents to be provided	13
11.2.	Selection process	13
12.	Annexes	13
12.1.	List of available documents	13
12.2.	List of partners in the field	14

1. Context of the evaluation

This evaluation is part of the five-year programme (2017-2021), financed by the Directorate-General for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid (DGD) and implemented by a consortium of 3 Belgian NGOs, SOS Faim, Iles de Paix and Autre Terre, which work on the same general mission: the promotion of family farming and the social economy model with a view to the emergence of a fairer and more united world oriented towards sustainable development.

1.1. Presentation of the NGOs SIA

SOS Faim

SOS Faim is a Belgian development NGO, active since 1964 in the fight against hunger and poverty in rural areas in Africa and Latin America. SOS Faim supports family farming as the most sustainable model of food production that respects people and the land.

Two main lines of action structure the activity:

- Capacity building for farmers in Africa and Latin America by providing technical, organisational and financial support to improve their own food, economic and social situation in a sustainable way and ultimately to become self-reliant.
- Raising awareness and mobilising Belgian and European citizens in order to influence, together with partners in the South, policies that have an impact on hunger and poverty in developing countries.

In the South, SOS Faim has an approach that favours partnership. This approach has always been a major element in SOS FAIM's intervention strategy. SOS Faim works in close collaboration with local partners such as farmers' organisations, producers' associations, rural financial institutions and support organisations whose actions it directly supports in order to enable people in the South to be actors of their own development.

SOS Faim accompanies its partners by providing technical, organisational and financial support, by establishing contacts, by supporting representativeness and recognition to ensure food security, a better nutritional balance and a decent income for small family rice producers.

Support and participation in the creation of financial institutions with a social purpose to allow equitable and sustainable access to financial resources in rural areas are also part of this effort.

SOS Faim collaborates with three types of partner organisations:

- Grassroots organisations representative of rural stakeholders: cooperatives or producers' organisations, federations of farmers' organisations, consultation platforms, local groups, rural youth movements, etc.
- Rural finance institutions: microfinance institutions, guarantee funds, agricultural banks, etc. with a strong social purpose and working with populations excluded from the traditional financial system. Priority is given to member-based organisations.
- Support or advocacy NGOs that support participatory rural development dynamics, in conjunction with farmers' and producers' organisations.

SOS Faim operates in 3 South American countries (Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru) and 6 African countries (Burkina Faso, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Ethiopia and the Democratic Republic of Congo).

Iles de Paix

Iles de Paix (IdP) is a Belgian development NGO founded in 1962 with a general mission to contribute to the research and experimentation of alternative models of development based on values:

- centred on the human person;
- harmonious balance and respect of the individual with others (his family, his community, the human race) and with nature;
- quality of life for all.

To be realistic and concrete, Iles de Paix focuses on a particular mission that is both broad and relatively circumscribed: the promotion of sustainable food systems. This choice is justified given the important issues it encompasses at the local level (particularly for rural families in the South that Iles de Paix supports) and at the global level (food security and resilience to climate change). For Iles de Paix, the promotion of sustainable food systems implies special support for the development of sustainable family farming and responsible food.

In the South, the NGO focuses its interventions in developing countries on strengthening production activities and the sustainable management of productive natural resources. In addition, it places a strong emphasis on the storage, processing and marketing of products at the level of families and groups of producers in order to improve their income and food security. Finally, it supports in these countries the emergence of a socio-political framework favourable to sustainable family farming and responsible food.

Iles de Paix is currently working in Burkina Faso, Benin, Tanzania, Uganda and Peru. Within each of these regions of intervention, Iles de Paix supports vulnerable populations in rural and peri-urban areas through development programmes carried out at a local level in an autonomous or inter-institutional manner. Through these programmes, Iles de Paix stimulates, encourages and supports the local development dynamics, latent or expressed, which the beneficiary populations themselves are the bearers of. This implies an active, close and permanent attitude of listening, support and accompaniment, notably through appropriate animation and training actions. These actions are carried out by professionals who play a facilitating role so that the beneficiary populations are given maximum responsibility in their development processes, from the selection of objectives and activities to their implementation and the evaluation of their effects.

In Belgium, Iles de Paix contributes to the formation of a more enlightened, supportive and active public opinion towards the populations of the South. More specifically, Iles de Paix carries out information, awareness-raising and education activities in relation to the realities of developing countries and in particular concerning family farming in these countries. To this end, it produces educational dossiers, exhibitions and documentaries. It also offers activities for schools, youth movements and adult groups. Finally, it carries out advocacy work in Belgium to promote sustainable food systems.

Autre Terre

Autre Terre asbl is a development NGO that works in the North and the South. It is part of the Terre Group, which is a group of companies and associations with social aims.

In Belgium, Autre Terre carries out educational activities related to North/South relations and the social economy. Multiple events are also set up to generate the necessary funding to support the programmes.

In the South, Autre Terre accompanies rural communities and various types of local associations in social and economic development programmes.

Its countries of intervention are Burkina Faso, Mali, Senegal and Peru. It also supports more specific programmes in the Philippines.

Beyond its central theme of social economy, its two main areas of work are: agroecology (ecological cultivation and sale of processed local products) and urban environment management (sanitation, recovery and sale of recyclable materials).

The will of Autre Terre is to support its partners and above all the organisations of beneficiaries in the South in the realisation of profitable economic activities that will allow them to generate their own income.

For the NGO, the objective is also that these activities be carried out in an autonomous way, according to a mode of operation that generates systems of solidarity and participation of the people concerned in the decision-making process.

The mission of Autre Terre is to promote and support economic, social and solidarity-based activities in the North and the South.

1.2. General presentation of the SIA programme

For the period 2017-2021, the 3 SIA NGOs are implementing a common programme, the SIA programme, to promote sustainable family farming and social economy for a fairer world. This programme has a North and a South component.

In the North, the SIA consortium wishes to contribute to the establishment of an alternative global paradigm acting - in a complementary way to other actors in the sector - more specifically on the theme of the social and solidarity economy, particularly applied to the emergence of sustainable food systems based on family farming.

In the South, SIA NGOs wish to contribute to strengthening the resilience and capacity to sustainably meet the basic needs of family farmers and micro-entrepreneurs and their families in 11 countries in 3 homogeneous geographical areas of Africa and South America.

The specific objective of the South component of the programme is therefore to contribute to strengthening the economic, environmental and social performance of sustainable family farming and social economy actors, in particular by acting on 5 priority areas (intermediate changes): (1) production techniques and capacities, (2) processing, marketing and storage capacities, (3) access to sustainable and adapted financial services, (4) advocacy and citizen mobilization capacities for sustainable family farming and the social economy, (5) capacity building for the structures supported.

1.3. Commissioning NGO(s), countries and areas concerned by this final evaluation

This evaluation is commissioned by **Iles de Paix**.

It relates to the Specific Objective of the SIA programme in **Tanzania**.

In this country, the programme is implemented by partners in the following areas: **Karatu District Council – Arusha Region**.

1.4. Presentation of the local context

The program is implemented in Karatu District Council located in the Arusha Region.

Location and accessibility - Karatu is one of the seven districts in Arusha Region, located in the northern part of Tanzania, at 140km from Arusha. It became an administrative district in 1997. Karatu District borders Mbulu District to the west, Ngorongoro District to the north, Babati District to the south-east and Monduli District to the east. Karatu has 4 administrative divisions, 13 wards and 45 registered villages. It is an important stopover for most tourists heading for Ngorongoro and Serengeti National Parks.

Human population and demography - The official population of the district is 178,434 people: 92,895 men and 85,539 women, growing at an annual rate of 3.2% and aggregated into 33,000 households. The average population density is 52 person/km² with low densities in the western zone along Lake Eyasi (7–10 person/km²) and higher densities (100 person/km²) in Karatu and Mbulumbulu division. Most people live in the higher rainfall areas where the average population density tends to be high.

Climate - Rainfall in the district is bimodal: the short rains fall between October and December and the long rains between March and June. Rainfall may range from less than 400 mm in the Eyasi Basin to over 1000 mm in the highlands with rain zones classified as semi-arid (300–700 mm/year) and sub-humid (700–1200 mm/year) respectively. Rainfall varies considerably between years, especially in the semi-arid region. Rainfall intensity can be very high, causing erosion, particularly at the onset of the rainy season when soils are bare.

Soils - Soils vary depending on their origin and location. Shallow soils with low fertility are found on summits and slopes. Clay soils of moderate fertility are found in the valleys in gently rounded summits and on slopes overlying soft gneiss rocks. Rocks of volcanic origin are the predominantly clay soils, some very shallow but very fertile.

Economic activities - Crop and livestock production are by far the most important economic sectors, employing over 90% of the labour force in the district. Farming is largely rainfed. Apart from agriculture, tourism and associated businesses such as shops, hotels and restaurants are another significant source of income for the people of Karatu. Other local economic activities include producing beer and selling forest products such as charcoal. Farms provide a significant source of income, especially during planting and harvesting, when many people are employed as casual labourers.

The household economy is built around crop and livestock production. Maize, beans and pigeon peas are the main food crops. A few households grow sunflower as a cash crop. All production is rain-fed.

The main constraints and hazards within these farming systems are:

- **Soil degradation** through soil erosion, decrease in soil fertility, hardpan and surface sealing: Soil erosion and loss of fertility were identified as major environmental constraints in both high and low altitudes of Karatu. On some occasions a lack of well-defined land ownership caused farmers to hesitate to make long-term investments in measures to conserve the environment.
- **Unreliable rainfall**, which leads to serious volatilities in crop production, degradation of pastures, drying up of local water sources and spikes in food prices. This is clearly a consequence of **Climate Change** that affects Tanzania;
- **Insecure land tenure rights** which do not motivate farmers to invest in soil fertility. Women are the first victim of this difficult access to ownership of land;
- **Lack of access to inputs** (seeds, fertilizers, equipment): Farmers continue to use basic traditional farm equipment and inputs. On one hand farmers' not having access to finance are not able to buy these inputs. On the other hand, there is a lack of agro dealers in the area able to supply inputs to farmers. In the case where agro dealers are present, they don't see the opportunity and potential benefit to invest in remote areas;
- **Poor extension services**: For now, farmers don't benefit from good, reliable and innovative extension services. The extension officers are not awarded of new and innovative technologies and techniques and don't have the required means to support farmers.

- **Poor marketing:** Many reasons are behind the problem of poor marketing. We can briefly mention poor transport infrastructure, poor negotiation capacities of farmers, lack of knowledge on market opportunities, inadequate storage ability to wait for higher prices during the time of scarcity, lack of processing industries, lack of entrepreneurship mindset, lack of knowledge and capacities about standard scales and quality control, ...;
- **Livestock diseases** can cause significant herd losses, translating into large declines in income. Veterinary services and medicine are not available in most of the places;
- **Crop pests and diseases** cause losses throughout the zone almost every year. Pests and diseases are exacerbated by inappropriate techniques of cultivation and inappropriate practices of harvest, post-harvest and storage;
- **Gender inequalities:** The position of women is marginalized with access to essential resources but limited control over it. They have very little opportunity to contribute to the decision making process even though they are the major income earner.

1.5. Logical framework of the programme

The logical framework of the programme and the expected results have been defined on the basis of a theory of change which is included in the technical and financial file. This file will obviously be available to the team in charge of the evaluation. However, we are summarising the programme's logical framework here in order to present the expected results that will be the subject of the evaluation.

The Kilimo Endelevu Programme aims to contribute **to strengthen the economic, environmental and social performances of the actors of sustainable family farming** in the communities of Karatu District located in Arusha Region, Tanzania.

As **desired situation**, the communities of Karatu District envision a future where Family Farmers are able to sustainably satisfy their basic needs and are more resilient. This future is linked with improvement of human dignity, life quality and wellbeing through more prosperous rural communities, reduction of poverty, food insecurity and malnutrition.

In order to reach this optimal situation, the Kilimo Endelevu Programme aims at contributing to **improve sustainable family farming and responsible food systems** for communities in Karatu District, with sustainability including its three dimensions: economic, environmental and social. Five results have been identified to lead to this desired situation:

Result 1: Family Farmers adopt improved and environment friendly techniques of production and strengthen the management of their activity

Result 2: Family farmers and micro-entrepreneurs increase their income through better post-harvest handling (PHH) which includes storage, processing and commercialization

Result 3: Family Farmers and producers' organizations have sustainable micro-financial services adapted to their needs

Result 4: Public authorities, Organizations of the civil society and citizens are sensitized, take into account and mobilize in favour of sustainable family farming

Result 5: Capacities of the organized actors of sustainable family farming are strengthened

2. Evaluation stakes

2.1. Rationale and objectives of the evaluation

This evaluation must meet the requirements of learning and accountability to the financial donor that is the DGD. It must make it possible to assess the achievement of results and to draw lessons for future interventions.

In particular, the objective of this evaluation is to assess all the programme's results, whether or not they have been achieved, on the basis of DAC criteria. The new DAC criteria do not need to be taken into account for this current programme and the evaluation will therefore focus on the criteria of relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability as well as the cross-cutting dimensions of gender and environment.

It will therefore:

- For each of the results of the programme (including SOs):
 - Assess the achievement of the result in terms of quality and quantity
 - Qualify the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the changes observed in the field
- For the programme as a whole:
 - Appreciate the consideration of the transversal gender dimension
 - Appreciate the consideration of the cross-cutting environmental dimension
- For specific aspects of the programme:
 - Responding to the specific evaluation questions proposed

2.2. Fields of evaluation

The evaluation will report on the results of the SIA programme carried out by Iles de Paix in Tanzania.

For this evaluation, the consultant may refer to the programme's Theory of Change, through which the desired results are made explicit. However, the consultant should focus on assessing the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the results achieved in accordance with DAC requirements.

Relevance: The degree to which an aid activity is relevant to the needs of the target group and the priorities of the beneficiary.

Effectiveness: The degree to which the objectives of an activity are achieved.

Efficiency: Measures the relationship between the results - qualitative and quantitative - and the resources used to achieve them within a given time frame. As an economic concept, efficiency means using the least expensive resources possible to ensure that the desired results are achieved. Therefore, to determine whether the most efficient process has been adopted, it is usually necessary to compare it with other possible ways of achieving the same results.

Sustainability: Measures the chance that the benefits of a development intervention will survive after the intervention ends. The potential for survival of the intervention after the end of the grant is assessed according to three aspects: financial sustainability, social sustainability and knowledge transfer/capacity building.

Impact: positive and negative effects, direct or indirect, intended or unintended, induced by an intervention in support of development.

3. Evaluation questions

The evaluation questions are as following:

1. Are the results of the programme, analysed under the filter of the DAC criteria, in line with expectations?
2 aspects will require a specific focus:
 - Was the agricultural extension methodology using farmers' group and farmer field school approach relevant and successful? This question should be analysed in particular from the point of view of efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.
 - Was the spreading approach implemented by the programme successful in terms of number of indirect beneficiaries reached and in terms of adoption of the new techniques and technologies disseminated? This question should be analysed in particular from the point of view of relevance, effectiveness and sustainability.
2. Has the programme satisfactorily integrated the cross-cutting dimensions of gender and environment?
 - How inclusivity (women and youth) has been addressed in the programme? Was the approach implemented successful? This question should be analysed in particular from the point of view of relevance, effectiveness and sustainability.
3. What are the main strengths and weaknesses of the programme?
4. What are the main lessons learnt by the evaluator from observing the results of the programme?
5. Iles de Paix was the only partner of the SIA consortium in Tanzania. However, the programme initiated several collaborations with a large variety of partners (national and international NGOs, universities, local and regional authorities, etc.). Do these collaborations have had a specific added value, and how could they be improved for the next programme? The added value of the collaboration should be analysed from the point of view of efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.
6. What are the evaluator's conclusions and recommendations in view of the 2022-2026 programme, which will focus on the promotion of sustainable food systems?

4. Stakeholders and responsibilities

The evaluation is entrusted to a lead evaluator who will be responsible for the overall coherence of the evaluation and the delivery of the final evaluation report. The lead consultant will work in collaboration with one or more associate consultants, who will support him/her during the field missions.

The evaluator will submit a detailed methodology (see below) for the proper execution of the evaluation exercise. He/she will ensure that the conclusions and recommendations are properly presented in the field and in Belgium.

The evaluation steering committee is composed as follows:

- Ludovic Joly – Country Director – Iles de Paix - Tanzania;
- Ayesiga Buberwa – Program Manager Kilimo Endelevu – Iles de Paix - Tanzania;
- Amelie Bodson – Technical Advisor Tanzania & Burkina Faso – Iles de Paix (HQ);
- Josephine Ng'ang'a – Programs Leader – RECODA;

- Damian Sulumo – Programs Manager – MVIWATA-Arusha;

The **Steering Committee** is responsible for the overall support of the evaluation process: finalization of the ToR, selection of the office and associated consultants, pre-departure briefing of the evaluator to agree on the timetable and clarify expectations, validation of the draft report, use of the final report, recommendations and management response.

It is also responsible for steering the evaluations in the field: logistical organization of the evaluation, briefing of the evaluators in the field, support and information sharing with the partners involved, debriefing at the end of the mission and validation of the evaluators' initial conclusions before the reports are drawn up.

The **lead** of the evaluation is provided by Ludovic Joly, who is a member of the Steering Committee.

After receiving the final evaluation report, the Steering Committee will organize, together with the evaluator, a feedback to the Southern Technical Committee and COPIL SIA in order to ensure that the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluators are properly exploited.

5. Methodology and content of the evaluation work

The methodology of the evaluation will be proposed by the consultant in his/her offer. Particular attention will be paid to the following elements:

- Methodology envisaged for each of the questions taken individually;
- Methodology envisaged for data collection to ensure the quality of the sources of information, the triangulation of information and the neutrality of the evaluation;

On the basis of the study of the programme documents, the selected evaluator will propose a work schedule with the field visits to be carried out and the partners to be met. This proposal will be discussed with the evaluation steering committee in order to ensure a good representation and diversity of the beneficiaries and partners met.

At the start of the evaluation, a briefing will take place in Belgium. It will focus on the following points:

- Presentation of the stakeholders
- Review of the evaluation questions (and, if necessary, revision of evaluation questions)
- Presentation and explanation of the evaluation methodology
- Clarification of objectives and approach

A start-up briefing will also take place in the field. This briefing will cover the following points:

- Presentation of the stakeholders
- Review of the evaluation questions (and, if necessary, revision of evaluation questions)
- Presentation and explanation of the evaluation methodology
- Discussion and validation of the list of partners to be solicited
- Planning and organisation of field trips and interviews with identified partners

The consultant will work closely with the field teams to ensure the best possible ownership of his/her work. In addition, the consultant will ensure that the objectives of the evaluation are explained to his or her contacts in the field.

At the end of his or her stay in the country of evaluation, the consultant will organise a workshop for restitution and reflection to deliver the preliminary conclusions and exchange on them.

6. Indicative evaluation planning

Approx. 39 M/D from June 2021:

- Senior Consultant: 20 M/D
- Associate Consultants: 19 M/D

Work at headquarters (1 day): a half-day briefing to launch the evaluation + half a day to hand in the evaluation report.

Fieldwork: the consultant proposes a planning that takes into account the sample of partners he/she wishes to meet, max. 12 days in the field.

Max. budget: € 20 000 including all taxes.

7. Indicative calendar

Period (indicative)	Action
May 2021	Publication of the ToRs and launch of the recruitment procedure
July - August 2021	Review of tenders and selection of evaluators
September - October 2021	Organisation of the evaluation
November 2021	Presentation and discussion of the provisional report
End of November the latest	Submission of the Final Report

8. Expected outputs

NB. The outputs will be written in English.

- Support (PPT or other) for the restitution of preliminary observations to the field teams at the end of the visits and partner meetings;
- A **provisional report**;
- A **final report** which should contain the following elements:
 1. Executive summary,
 2. Background and objectives of the programme
 3. Reminder of the objectives and questions of the evaluation,
 4. Description of the evaluation methodology (highlighting how the methodology was used to answer the evaluation questions, the arrangements made to ensure the quality of the sources of information, the arrangements made to ensure the triangulation of data, and the arrangements made to ensure the neutrality of the evaluation report),
 5. Evaluation:
 - Analysis of programme results according to DAC criteria (evaluation question 1)
 - Analysis of the consideration of cross-cutting dimensions (evaluation question 2)
 - Analysis of strengths, weaknesses and lessons identified from the analysis of programme results (evaluation questions 3 and 4)

- Response to specific evaluation questions (evaluation question 5)
6. Conclusions and recommendations (evaluation question 6)
- Overall conclusions
 - Overall recommendations and areas for improvement (making sure they are realistic and workable),
- A **PowerPoint presentation** of the results of the evaluation
 - A "**key message**" note summarising in a maximum of one page the main messages to be retained from the evaluation

9. Evaluator profile

For this evaluation, a team consisting of a principal expert and one or two associate experts is sought. The lead expert, responsible for the overall coherence of the evaluation work, will meet the following requirements:

1. Solid methodological experience (at least 8 years) in the external evaluation of socio-economic and environmental development programmes.
2. Mastery of evaluation methodologies for rural development programmes based on DAC criteria.
3. Evidence-based experience in the country where the evaluation takes place.
4. Perfect command of written and spoken English and mastery of the official language of the country where the evaluation takes place.
5. Excellent writing skills.

The evaluator is expected to have duly registered his or her professional activity in his or her country of residence.

The international expert will be accompanied by one or two associate experts, who will meet the following requirements:

- Points 1, 2 above
- Proven experience in international evaluation teams
- Good knowledge of civil society organisations in their country
- Good knowledge of sustainable family farming and the social economy.
- Availability to travel to the programme's areas of intervention

10. Contractual and financial conditions

The proposed contract will be a service provision contract. The evaluator is fully responsible for all costs related to the consultancy (visa, travel, insurance, field trips, etc.). Mission expenses (accommodation, visa fees and international transport) will be paid on presentation of expense statements. Payment for the service will be made by cheque or bank transfer and on the basis of invoices issued by the service provider according to the following breakdown:

- 1st instalment on signature of the contract: 20% of the total amount of the service.
- 2nd instalment on submission of the provisional report: 30% of the total amount of the service.
- 3rd instalment upon acceptance of the final report: 50% of the total amount of the service.

11. Practicalities of application

11.1. Reply modalities and documents to be provided

The proposal will include two files written in English:

- A technical and financial offer (15 pages maximum);
- The composition of the evaluation team: An updated CV of the lead evaluator (including a possible referenced list of relevant publications with the service in question: 5 pages maximum);

The technical offer will clearly include a description of the evaluation process, the proposed methodology and the possible survey mechanism, a proposed timetable, a list of the equipment required to carry out the mission and a list of the documents required for consultation before the mission (the documents will only be sent to the selected candidate).

The financial offer will clearly detail the fees (including all taxes) of the evaluators as well as all other expenses (visa, travel, accommodation, etc.).

Tenders will be sent by e-mail to Ludovic Joly (ludovic.joly@tz.ilesdepaix.org) by 13th June 2021 – 5pm (East Africa Time) at the latest. Please note that only complete offers corresponding to the profile will be processed by the selection committee.

11.2. Selection process

Technical proposals will be evaluated on the basis of their compliance with the terms of reference, using the following evaluation criteria:

- Expertise, experience and skills of the consultants: 30 points
- Understanding the TOR and matching supply and demand: 25 points
- Proposed methodology: 25 points
- Financial offer: 20 points

12. Annexes

12.1. List of available documents

In order to carry out this evaluation, the following information and documents will be made available to the evaluator:

- Kilimo Endelevu program document (Proposal);
- Theory of Change of the program;
- Detailed Action plan 2017 / 2021;
- Annual reports 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020;
- Report of the Mid-Term review – 2019;
- Monitoring and Evaluation System: Matrix and narrative reports;

12.2. List of partners in the field

Name	Organisation	Function	Phone	E mail
ILES DE PAIX				
Ludovic Joly	Iles de Paix	Country Director	06.85.81.12.60	ludovic.joly@tz.ilesdepaix.org
Amélie Bodson	Iles de Paix	Technical Advisor – Tanzania & Burkina Faso (HQ)	+32.486.98.28.08	amelie.bodson@ilesdepaix.org
Ayesiga Buberwa	Iles de Paix	Program Manager – Kilimo Endelevu	07.62.54.22.53	ayesiga.buberwa@tz.ilesdepaix.org
Abiud Gamba	Iles de Paix	Technical Advisor- Agriculture – Kilimo Endelevu	07.67.59.11.50	abiud.gamba@tz.ilesdepaix.org
IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS				
Dominick Ringo	RECODA	Director	07.68.22.40.52	ed@recoda.or.tz
Josephine Ng'ng'a	RECODA	Programs' Manager	07.54.66.49.59	jnganga@recoda.or.tz
Silvester Masanja	RECODA	Project Officer – Kilimo Endelevu	06.85.45.44.10	smasanja@recoda.or.tz
Caleb Massam	RECODA	Field Officer	07.54.60.16.53	cmassam@recoda.or.tz
Richard Masandika	MVIWATA – Arusha	Coordinator	07.54.81.83.55	ricmasandika@mviwataarusha.org
Damian Sulumo	MVIWATA – Arusha	Programs Manager	07.67.90.71.55	sulumod@mviwataarusha.org
Juma Mchinja	MVIWATA – Arusha	Project Officer	07.56.07.02.28	mchinja@mviwataarusha.org
Akyoo Eliud	MVIWATA – Arusha	Project Officer	07.54.43.81.36	elly4@mviwataarusha.org
Wayda Peter	Karatu District Council	Crop Officer (Focal Person / Kilimo Endelevu)	07.84.39.55.34	waydapeter12@gmail.com
Fraterine Malamsha	Karatu District Council	District Agriculture, Irrigation and Cooperative Officer	07.55.15.33.85	Fraterini11@gmail.com
Denice Buberwa	Karatu District Council	District Livestock Officer	07.64.88.66.84	/
TECHNICAL PARTNERS				
Bart Casier	Trias	Regional Director	07.56.85.98.55	bart.casier@trias.ngo
Lilian Makoy	Trias	Program Manager – DGD Strong	/	lilian.makoy@trias.ngo
Mateete Bekunda	IITA-Africa RISING	Chief Scientist	06.82.05.98.02	M.Bekunda@cgiar.org
Sognigbé N'Danikou	World Vegetable Center	Scientist, Traditional Vegetables Conservation & Utilization	07.56.90.38.25	sognigbe.ndanikou@worldveg.org

Christopher Mutungi	IITA-Africa RISING	Post-Harvest expert	07.66.71.07.28	C.Mutungi@cgiar.org
William Hamisi	National Plant Genetic Resource Center	Director	/	h_mwanahamisi@yahoo.com