

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Final Evaluation of UpScale and FES projects
From January 2017 to December 2021, Cambodia

A.1 EVALUATION CONTEXT:

In 2016, four Belgian University NGOs (ECLOSIO - formally named ADG-Aide au Développement Gembloux), FUCID, Louvain Coopération, and ULB Coopération) have decided to join forces and strengthen their synergies through the creation of the entity “Uni4Coop” and the mutual engagement in the implementation of one common program funded by the Belgian Development Cooperation (named as DGD in this file). Within the framework of this five-year Uni4Coop program (2017-2021)¹, two evaluations are planned: a Mid-Term Review (MTR) conducted in 2019 and a Final Evaluation to be conducted in 2021.

In Cambodia, the Uni4Coop Program is implemented by two of the four Belgian University NGOs, ECLOSIO and Louvain Coopération (LC). The first step undertaken to set up the program was a context analysis that gathered inputs from all the different Belgian ANGCO (Actors of Non-Governmental Cooperation) engaged in Cambodia that was ensued by a Joint Strategic Framework² that foreseen common strategies and objectives for each of the sectoral interventions supported by the DGD. The Context Analysis presents an analysis of the situation of the Cambodian civil society, the decentralized authorities and the government institutions, and elements for promoting circumstances of their strengthening. It led to the description of the different actors identified for intervening in the development of the sectors, including partnerships, synergies, and complementarities.

The Uni4Coop program is divided into Specific Objectives (SO) by country, by sector and by NGO. The Uni4Coop program in Cambodia has 3 SOs tackling two sectors, Agriculture/Rural Economy and Health. ECLOSIO and LC are both involved in the agriculture and economic sector (SO1 and SO2), LC alone is involved in the health sector (SO3).

This ToR aims to specify the scope of the Final Evaluation to be performed in Cambodia for the **Agriculture and Economic sector**. The Specific Objectives as formulated in the five-year program are:

	Specific Objectives	Partner ³ ; Synergy/collaboration
Eclosio	Small-scale family farmers and their family members strengthen their capacities to achieve food sovereignty, to defend their interests and to generate pro-poor growth. <u>Target areas</u> : Takeo, Kampong Speu, Prey Veng, Svay Rieng, Battambang and Kampong Thom provinces	Partners: CIRDA, FAEC, ISC, BUAC, TrUAC Collaborations: WWF, FCFD, DACP, NF3, ALiSEA, ITC, Liège University, St Paul Institute
LC	The food and economic security and the level of organization of vulnerable rural populations have	Partners: FAEC, RUA-ECOLAND Research Center, MB

¹ Annex 1: Uni4Coop Program Commun Cambodge

² Annex 2: JSF Cambodia

³ Annex 3: Brief description of partners

	improved in a sustainable way. <u>Target areas:</u> Kampong Thom and Kampong Cham provinces	Collaborations: GRET, ITM, ALiSEA, UCLouvain, DEMETER
--	--	---

The aim of Eclosio's SO was, together with structural (FAEC) and technical partners specialized in relevant fields, to promote food sovereignty, to create favorable conditions to enable small-scale farmers to defend their rights and interests, get proper incomes from sustainable agricultural activities to durably maintain their living conditions above poverty line, empower women in their communities, and enable youth to live with dignity in their rural areas. On the other hand, LC's SO aimed at creating structures (Self-Help Groups (SHGs) including the participating populations from LC's health programme) that can help farmers to develop their activities and find both technical and financial support to develop small businesses. The key approach involved the building of capacity, technical knowledge, and awareness.

The common Theory of Change visioned that family farmers improve their economic security and contribute to reach better food sovereignty. In this sense, family farmers would have improved their agriculture productivity through sustainable and climate resilient agriculture, and improved their income through informal and formal, individual, and collective income generating activities. For this purpose, farmers organizations (SHGs, FAs, ACs, UACs, FO-Federations) would have delivered quality and inclusive services to support farmers' technical knowledge and business skills.

The strengthening of ECLOSIO and LC's partners institutional and operational capabilities would have allowed them to fully accomplish their function of intermediaries with an emphasis on improving the productivity and competitiveness of small-scale farmers and micro-enterprises, the added-value and the quality of the products and services delivered.

The target groups distributed by organization are:

	Direct Target groups	Indirect Target groups	Total number of participating populations
Eclosio	Small scale farmers and their family members, cooperating within the 70 ACs represented by FAEC and FCFD	The family farming population neighboring the 70 Acs and benefiting from their services. Private sector firms operating in the value-chains promoted by the ACs	20.500 persons (Direct) 45.500 persons (Indirect)
LC	Vulnerable households (poor people, disabled persons, women-headed households, people affected by health problems)	Local partners staff, FAEC provincial representatives, FAEC services providers, members of ACs, FAs and SHGs, Patients and their families referred by LD's health partners	9.448 participating populations with at least 65% of the total participating populations being women.

Changes in the Cambodian Agriculture/Rural Economy context have led to some adaptations in the objectives and activities identified in the inception of the programmes.

The effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on agriculture have impacted in particular family farmers who are facing severe income shocks. Activities planned by both programs like provision of agriculture inputs and assets for production, access to financial service and technical capacity to enhance production and access to local markets have also been disrupted in the last 2 years of the programmes.

In 2020, Eclosio and LC's common partner FAEC was suspected of funds misuse and fraud. While a financial audit to investigate the use of FAEC financial expenditures was conducted, operational activities planned with this partner were put on hold. In terms of conducting surveys and research, FAEC has had compliance issues, for instance the baseline study and other research topics planned in coordination with LC were accomplished only in year 5.

It is important to note that the conceptualization of the 2022-2026 program has combined LC and ECLOSIO's intervention actions under **one single Specific Objective** (renamed as "Outcome") in the agricultural and economic sector. Conclusions retrieved from this Final Evaluation will be used for the improvement of the planned strategies of the new program.

One capitalisation of the knowledge process was launched at the end of year 4 (2020) of the LC and Eclosio programme. Case studies and research are to be published; it is expected that some of these documents will be drafted by the mobilisation of the evaluator, thus completing the project' documentations, such as roadmaps, work plans, reports, etc.

A.2 OBJECTIVE, FIELD AND USER(S) OF THE EVALUATION

A.2.1 OBJECTIVE:

Accountability:

The DGD requires all DAC criteria to be evaluated, specifically regarding Effectiveness and Sustainability on the level of the SO. The other criteria may be addressed on parts of the program, in specific questions, not forgetting the contribution to JSF, mainstreaming of gender and environmental aspects.

Learning:

Analyze the impact of the planned partnership relationships and participatory implementation of this program.

Identify Critical Areas for Improvement in relation to the design, implementation, or the M&E of the program.

A.2.2 PRIMARY USERS:

The final evaluation is a duty of accountability to the DGD, the main donor.

The underlying objective is to reflect on partnership relations, the partners of this program will be the privileged users.

UNI4COOP and JSF: conclusions and lessons learned will be shared among other ACNGs.

The results of the final evaluation will also be shared with other cooperation actors and the general public through the websites of LC and Eclosio and the DGD website.

A.2.3 PERIOD COVERED BY THE EVALUATION:

The final evaluation will cover the entire duration of the project from 2017 to 2021 with particular attention to the 2 last years in which the major adaptations have taken place.

A.3 TYPE OF EVALUATION:

This is an external end-of-program evaluation to be carried out in all areas covered by the project.

A.4 GLOBAL APPROACH

This is an external evaluation. The theme on which this Final Evaluation focuses was retrieved from common interest elements between LC and Eclosio in Cambodia.

The Scope of Work (SOW) stated below will be reviewed by the evaluation team and the evaluation steering committee together with the selected evaluator in order to achieve the desired results and objectives at a feasible and measurable level.

FORMULATION OF KEY QUESTIONS OF THE EVALUATION

In view of the above purpose and objectives, the evaluation will address the following criteria and related key questions. For more details refer to Annex 4: Table of Lead Questions by common Results (UpScale and FES).

Main question: Has the design and M&E system led to a strengthening of capacity enabling the selected partners to reach the small-scale family members?

DAC criteria and evaluation questions	Comments
<p><u>Efficiency</u> To what extent are inputs managed in a cost-efficient way and within the set timeframe given the changes in the Cambodian Agriculture and Economic sector and the effects of the Covid-19 situation? To what extent are the intended processes and all types of activities implemented within the planned timeframe?</p> <p>Accountability and Learning</p>	<p>The input/output ratio: the means used provide the best “cost/benefit” ratio to achieve the predefined outputs. For the costs, reference is made to the budget as approved by the DGD.</p> <p>No need to carry out a detailed analysis of each expenditure, but to analyse the reallocation of resources with questions like "what if we had to do it again"? Would we use the same allocation strategy?</p> <p><u>Proposed approach:</u> Semi-structured interviews with partners involved in the program.</p>
<p><u>Effectiveness</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent have both SOs been achieved as planned by the end of the program? 2. Has the transition to a more sustainable agriculture brought economic growth to small-scale farmers? How is the increment of income being invested? 3. What have been the COVID-19 implications/effects in the income generated from farming by small scale farmers? What coping mechanisms have been implemented by 	<p>Effectiveness is about achieving the specific objective (SO) and must be seen at the level of the participating populations. It assesses the achievement of the outputs (results) because it is considered a condition for achieving the outcome. It is about the completeness and quality of the outputs delivered. The quality refers to meeting the needs of the participating populations. This means for example that the participating populations have access to the outputs and that the outputs will likely be used</p>

<p>small-scale farmers, the community, AC's and Farmers Associations? What has been set by farmers, AC, and UAC to solve specific social problems to the benefit of the poor or disadvantages?</p> <p>Accountability</p>	<p>by the participating populations.</p> <p><u>Proposed approach:</u> The evaluator is asked to corroborate the level or not of achievement of these results on the basis of the documents provided and on a survey among a sample of participating populations, target groups, and service providers.</p>
<p><u>Impact:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are the business models (initiated by the participating populations of the programme) of IGA (income generating activities), family farming, AC, and UAC financially viable? Revenues exceed costs? What was done with the surplus (does the surplus cover profits for the formation of capital to expand business and stay competitive)? What has been done to increase the volume of products sold or to increase the sale price obtained? 2. Evaluated with a gender perspective, what were the benefits gained and constraints faced by farmers in the different forms of collaboration that were promoted by UpScale and FES projects? How cooperation among farmers generated an economy of scale? Did the UpScale and FES projects activities supporting producers' cooperation (market orientation, technical and business performance, organizational development) made them viable and sustainable? 3. What is the level of use of the outputs produced by the projects? How the target groups took action to improve their services and value-chains. 4. Utilisation of results: Are the promotion of services and products (value-chains) being used by the direct target groups? <p>Accountability and Learning</p>	<p>Impact addresses the ultimate significance and potentially transformative effects of the intervention. It seeks to identify the effects of the intervention that are longer term or broader in scope than those already captured under the effectiveness criteria.</p> <p>Both programmes were intended to lead to an improvement of the economic security of family farmers and contribute to reach better food sovereignty.</p> <p>Besides, it was planned that family farmers' organizations improve their solidarity and social cohesion and promote the inclusion of women and youth in decision-making processes.</p> <p>Behavior changes of the target groups (investment level, participation...) Services provided and funding of services</p> <p><u>Proposed approach:</u> Semi-structured interviews with all categories of parties and stakeholders, including the participating populations, involved in the development of business models and cooperation systems.</p>
<p><u>Sustainability</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has there been a change in the behavior (mindset) of small-scale farmers towards the use of organic (not chemical) inputs before/during the program intervention? In link with intensified productivity (yields, labor, knowledge...) of AE production. (social sustainability) 2. What were the crucial factors that significantly 	<p>Potential Sustainability: the degree of probability of sustaining the benefits of the intervention in the long term (after completion of the programme)</p> <p>This criteria assesses the potential of continuation of the intervention beyond the current funding period. To this end, four aspects of sustainability are assessed, i.e.</p>

<p>contributed to the AE transition (e.g. the changes of practices, the farmers' conviction regarding an AE approach, etc.) that enable small-scale farmers to take the risk to change/adapt their production systems, and which factors mostly inhibit their transition? What is the level of efficiency and small-scale farmers' ownership of the small irrigation system developed by ISC (Disaggregated by types of farming: family consumption, commercial, and semi-commercial). How can the model be scaled up? (technical sustainability)</p> <p>3. What are the challenges in establishing SHGs and FOs, ACs; what is the efficiency of these organizations and what are the motivations and benefits that small-scale farmers have to join them? (institutional sustainability)</p> <p>4. What are the levels of utilization, ownership and autonomy of SHGs? What about the analysis of the main operating ratios (savings, credit, reimbursement, capitalization, etc.)?</p> <p>Accountability and Learning</p>	<p>environmental, social, technical and institutional sustainability.</p> <p><u>Proposed approach:</u> Semi-structured interviews with the participating populations, involved in the development of AE practices and organization systems.</p>
<p><u>Relevance</u></p> <p>1. After the training received from FAEC, are Service Providers strong enough now? What about the local Service Providers (master farmers)? Are they able to provide their services (Decision-making & management for ACs, SHGs; market access; and AE technical practices for producing chicken feed, vegetables and rice seeds) to their members (including women/youth) independently? Or are they still relying on FAEC?</p> <p>2. Integration of women and youth in decision making spaces of AC and UAC is to improve their business performance; is this hypothesis verified? What has been done to improve participation of women and youth in AC and UAC businesses?</p> <p>3. How the interventions (UpScale and FES) have helped overcome small scale farmers' challenges linked with micro-finance and banking organizations to access credits? What is the capacity of farmers to manage their capital and repay their debt? Has it changed during the program? What other resources for financial access have been developed?</p>	<p>Relevance: the extent to which the intervention is in line with the priorities of the target group, partner organisation or donor.</p> <p>The programmes planned to promote farmers' product value chains (JSF goal 1D) by: (1) analysing relevant value-chain to be supported; (2) improving cooperatives business plan; (3) creating business linkage; (4) improving necessary services of FAEC for the value chain actors; (5) assisting in finding financial support for the value chain actors such as farmers and cooperatives; (6) improving quality and standard.</p> <p>And, JSF 1, by helping small-scale farmers increase their productivity and capacity through the development of sustainable agriculture, to assist in organizing them into groups and eventually through additional support from FAEC into more formalised forms of associations</p> <p><u>Proposed approach:</u> Semi-structured interviews with the participating populations and service providers</p>

<p>4. Which factors influence trust-building in the provision of technical assistance in AE and capacity building in business development for small-scale farmers? Accountability and Learning</p>	<p>(from FAEC and locals). Reference for the analysis of the challenges on accessing to microfinance: Master thesis on the links between the household economy and microcredit in Kampong Thom</p>
<p><u>Contribution to Results</u> 1. In what level has the program contributed to achieve the following results ? 2. What tools/strategies for sharing knowledge among farmers are the most effective for the Cambodian context? Accountability</p>	<p><u>UpScale Result 5</u>: Actors supporting small-scale family farmers and their family' members are sharing and improving their practices and approaches. <u>FES Result 5</u>: Evidence-based information, studies and operational research on farmers issues are conducted and results are disseminated among farmers and key stakeholders in the sector.</p>

Remark:

As a cross-cutting criteria, the evaluation is also expected to identify Key Areas of Success and Critical Areas for Improvement. Therefore, in addition to the key questions mentioned above, the following questions should also guide the assessment of each of the above criteria:

- Which factors were crucial for the achievements?
- Which factors were inhibiting to reach the expected results?

A.5 DESIRED METHOD AND TOOLS:

The choice of the methodology is left to the evaluator, including in terms of the time to be given to each question. The proposed approaches stated in the previous table are merely suggestions.

The evaluator will propose information gathering tools and a methodology based on his/her particular professional knowledge. An outline scoping report, drawn up after the preparatory meeting for field work, will determine, by mutual agreement, the evaluation methods and tools that will be used during the field phase and their justification. The evaluation should involve a representation of key partners and participating populations at different levels. Eclosio and LC encourage the use of innovative methods of data collection and stakeholder consultation, which may include remote data collection methods.

A.6 SKILLS REQUIRED

It is envisaged that the assignment is carried out by an evaluation expert or team with profound knowledge of the Agriculture and Economic sector and extensive proven experience in Cambodia.

It is to be expected that international travel remains restricted in 2021. Therefore, any proposal by an evaluation expert who is not based in Cambodia, must include one in-country expert (as co-evaluator) to conduct (as a minimum) the field-phase. In case the in-country evaluator is not a native Khmer speaker, the project team must also include an experienced translator. Evaluation experts based in Cambodia can also decide to include one or more co-evaluators/assistants in their proposal. In any case, the evaluation expert or team should be able to work independently in the sense that neither Eclosio or LC cannot assist with interpretations during interviews or with translations of relevant documents.

The proposed consultant or team of consultants should meet the following requirements:

- Solid experience with the evaluation of international development/donor-funded projects, both midterm and final evaluations;

- Team leader has developed a minimum of 3 evaluations or other relevant studies in the past 5 years, preferably in Cambodia;
- Experience with the evaluation of capacity development interventions in the Agriculture and Economic sector. Common practice of participatory evaluation methods;
- Knowledge of the area of intervention and experience in working with local Cambodian context in the field of environment, sustainable agriculture practices, micro-business development, farmers organizations and relevant policies and strategies;
- Sensitivity to the themes of gender and environment;
- Excellent written and spoken command of English, the notion of Khmer language is an asset.

A.7 BUDGET

The maximum budget available is 12,000.00 EUR including tax.

These amounts will cover all the costs related to the evaluation (fees, international and local transportation, accommodation and per diem, visa, organization of workshops ...), with the following exception:

- The program will make one vehicle available for major trips during the field visits but not for the travel within Phnom Penh.

A.8. TERMS OF THE EXPERTISE:

A.8.1 DESIRED CONTENT FOR THE TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL OFFER

Proposals must provide the following:

- An understanding note of the ToRs, as well as how the context and the evaluation questions were understood in relation to the Theory of Change;
- A description of the methodological approach envisaged to answer the questions and objectives set out in these ToRs, detailing the tools for collecting information, the profile of involved persons, etc.
- An indicative timetable of the mission as well as an estimate of the costs in terms of person/day.
- A presentation of the expert(s) highlighting the aspects particularly relevant to the intended evaluation;
- The profile of the expert (s) (max 3 pages per CV), references, and
- A financial offer including the detailed budget in euros including tax of the service

Ethical principles: autonomy and confidentiality, neutrality of the evaluation team, validity and reliability of information.

A.8.2. DOCUMENTS TO REVIEW

For drafting the offer:

These annexes are made available upon request.

Annex 1: Uni4Coop Programme Commun Cambodge

Annex 2: JSF Cambodia

Annex 3: Brief description of partners

Annex 4: Table of Lead Questions by common Results (UpScale and FES)

Annex 5: Master thesis on the links between the household economy and microcredit in Kampong Thom

After selection:

After selection, the project will make the following documents available to the retained consultant (s):

- The project document;
- Technical reports;
- Mid-term evaluation;
- Partnership management and evaluation tools developed as part of the project and previous projects;
- The expert may ask to consult any document she/he deems useful (partnerships agreements, reports, list of groups and participating populations, etc); and
- The new program 2022-2026 in Cambodia, named “PARTNER project”.

A.8.3. MODALITIES FOR CARRYING OUT THE FIELD MISSION

Support by the expert will be done remotely (head office) and face-to-face (Cambodia). The expert will be in contact with the steering committee and with the coordination team in Phnom Penh.

The evaluator will provide:

- A framework meeting in Cambodia, following which, she/he will draft a scoping note in case the mission outline needs to be reviewed on the basis of the knowledge of the documentation that will be given to her/him and the first exchanges conducted both in Belgium and in the field.
- Restitution meetings with the local team and partners.
- A debriefing workshop (including online facilities) at the end of the field mission, organized with the main actors, including LC/Eclosio team members.
- A post-submission meeting of the interim report, organised with the steering committee. It will allow for adjustments before the final report is submitted.
- A management response meeting following the submission of the final report. This provides a better understanding of the nature of the recommendations.
- A post-evaluation meeting when the managerial response has been formulated on the basis of the final evaluation report, the location of which will be agreed on time.

The Uni4Coop operational team based in the intervention country will be available to facilitate the smooth running of the evaluation (contacts, general information, logistical assistance, etc.).

A.9. SELECTION AND CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS

A.9.1. SELECTION METHOD

Technical and financial offers should be sent electronically to: christophe.goossens@eclosio.org and tkhem@louvaincooperation.org

The evaluation steering committee will be composed of the pilots (Christophe Goossens and Giuliana Zegarra), the copilots (Khem Thann and Say Treukphaline) and members of the Uni4Coop M&E committee (Anne Depret, Clémence Vanommeslaeghe and Florence Schinckus).

The evaluation of proposals will be carried out according to the following grid:

Criteria	Relative Weight
Profile of the expert(s)	50
Qualifications, experience and skills	20
Experience in the subject to be evaluated	15
Knowledge of the local context	15

Technical and methodological offer	30
Presentation of the question to evaluate and understanding of the subject	15
Proposed methodological approach	15
Financial offer	20
Price of the service	10
Cost realism compared to the proposed methodology	10
Total:	100

The selection of candidates will be in two steps. The first step upon the reception of the technical and financial offer following the above grid; the second step following scoping meetings and negotiations with the candidate to clarify and review the technical scope of work.

A.9.2. CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS

The payment of fees will be made in three installments: 40 % upon signature of the contract, 30 % upon submission of the interim report and 30 % upon approval of the final report.

These arrangements may be reviewed.

The per diem will be covered by the 40% instalment provided at the signature of the contract. Installments will be paid on the basis of the submission of the appropriate supporting documents (Invoices, Reports...).

Other possible specific arrangements.

A.9.3. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES:

- **A summary accountability document** of +/- three pages for the general public, members of Uni4Coop, Eclusio and LC, participating populations, this document shows the main conclusions and recommendations related to the evaluation questions, with illustrations (diagrams, photos, graphics, drawings, etc.) and at least one beneficiary's testimonial.
- **A presentation of restitution** (Power Point, Prezi ...).
- **A complete report** containing:
 1. Summary of key findings and recommendations;
 2. Objective, scope of the evaluation and context;
 3. Definition of the main concepts used;
 4. Methodological approach and its justification, and the challenges encountered;
 5. Findings (with reference to sources)
 6. Conclusions, judgment providing an answer to the evaluation questions. Any underlying analysis will be explicitly formulated.
 7. The recommendations, reasoned, concrete and realistic to be implemented in the continuation of the program or in future interventions and in relation to the evaluation questions.
 8. Appreciation of the understanding of the logic of intervention/theory of change.
- **Appendices:** Anonymous raw data.

Documents will be written in English and sent in electronic and paper format for the final version of the report.

A.7.1 PROVISIONAL TIMETABLE:

Process	Deadline
Publication of the call for proposals (second)	November the 1st, 2021
Deadline for supplementary questions (only by email)	November 10, 2021
Submission of offers	November 22, 2021
Pre-selection (3 candidates)	November 30, 2021
Scoping Meeting and negotiation with candidates	December 1 to 3, 2021
Announce of the final selection, Signature and beginning of the contract	December 5, 2021
Scoping note and discussion prior field mission	December 10, 2021
Achievement of the mission	Mid-December 2021 to February 2022
Online debriefing workshop	February 28, 2022
Submission of the interim report	March 7, 2022
Post-submission meeting	March 11, 2022
Submission of the final report	March 31, 2022
Management Response Meeting	April 15, 2022
Post-evaluation meeting	April 20, 2022

ANNEX 4: TABLE OF LEAD QUESTIONS BY COMMON RESULTS (UpScale AND FES)

	UpScale		FES
Specific objective	Small-scale family farmers and their family members strengthen their capacities to achieve food sovereignty, to defend their interests and to generate pro-poor growth.	Specific objective	The food and economic security and the level of organisation of vulnerable rural populations have improved in a sustainable way.
S.O.1	Income of the targeted farmers' family increases more than the average income of similar population in the framework of the program	S.O.1	Households having enough food to eat all year around
S.O.2	Cumulative amount of new or revised legal frameworks in favor of small-scale farmers and in consideration of gender, youth and environmental issues; in consideration of proposals submitted by FOs	S.O.2	Increase of women beneficiaries' income above the average level
S.O.3	Percentage increase of women and youth among FAEC operational actors (%) (women; youth)	S.O.3	Number of new registered Agricultural Cooperatives (ACs) in the target areas
Lead Questions:			
1. Has the transition to a more sustainable agriculture brought economic growth to small-scale farmers? How is the increment of income being invested? In AE production?			
2. What have been the COVID-19 implications/effects in the income generated from farming by small scale farmers? What coping mechanisms have been implemented by small-scale farmers, the community, AC's and Farmers Associations? What has been set by farmers, AC, and UAC to solve specific social problems to the benefit of the poor or disadvantages?			
Result 1	Farmers (men, women, young) and their family improved sustainably their production through better natural resources access and management	Result 2	SHG's members that applied a sustainable agricultural approach, improved their level of organisation and increased their food production
R.1.1	Amount of family farmers having access to on-farm small irrigation system	R.2.1	Targeted households practiced at least 3 sustainable agricultural practices
R.1.2	The amount of AE techniques adopted by targeted family farmers increases	R.2.2	Number of beneficiaries who manage to increase their yield of rice, vegetables and chicken (60%, 75%, 70% respectively)
R.1.3	Percentage of production' quantity increases (compared to baseline) for rice, rice seed, chicken, vegetables	R.2.3	Number of SHGs that decided to become Farmers Associations
		Result 4	Improve environmental protection and climate changes awareness and resilience
		R.4.1	Number of SHG members who have developed a climate change mitigation plan
		R.4.2	The project stakeholders have put in place measures to mitigate environmental impacts
		R.4.3	Number of families who have a disposal pit

			system and properly discard wastes at community level
Lead Questions			
<p>1. How does a sustainable agricultural practice contribute to protecting the environment in Cambodia's context? What business processes have been established and applied to improve ecological sustainability?</p> <p>2. Has there been a change in the behavior (mindset) of small-scale farmers towards the use of organic (not chemical) inputs before/during the program intervention? => link to the production (increase the yield of AE production.)</p> <p>3. What is the level of efficiency and small-scale farmers' management of the small irrigation system developed by ISC (Disaggregated by types of farming: family consumption, commercial, and semi-commercial). How can the model be scaled up? Adapted?</p> <p>4. What are the challenges in establishing SHGs and FAs, ACs; what is the efficiency of these organizations and what are the motivations and benefits that small-scale farmers have to join them?</p>			
Result 2	Organized small-scale farmers increase the total value of their production through better access to market and allows the creation of job and business opportunities	Result 3	The revenue of the targeted vulnerable beneficiaries is improved
R.2.1	% of increase of quantities of products sold collectively by agriculture cooperatives (compared to the baseline)	R.3.1	Number of beneficiaries who manage correctly their IGA and reached over 50 \$ profit per month
R.2.2	Number of cooperative scoring over 80/100 on SCM grid	R.3.2	Number of SHGs actively working
Lead Questions			
<p>1. Are the business models (initiated by the participating populations of the programme) of family farming, AC, and UAC financially viable? (Revenues exceed costs? What was done with the surplus (does the surplus cover profits for the formation of capital to expand business and stay competitive)? What has been done to increase the volume of products sold or to increase the sale price obtained?</p> <p>2. Evaluate with a gender perspective, what were the benefits gained and constraints faced by farmers in the different forms of collaboration that were promoted by UpScale and FES projects? How cooperation among farmers generated an economy of scale? Did the UpScale and FES projects activities supporting producers' cooperation (market orientation, technical and business performance, organizational development) made them viable and sustainable?</p>			
Result 4	FO improve skills and capacities to manage their structures and advocate for SSFF interest including those for women and youths	Result 1	The institutional strengthening of local partners and SHGs allows improving their technical capacity in relation to supporting small-scale farmers and their management capacity ensuring their sustainability.
R.4.1	Amount of qualified Service Providers of FAEC /FCFD trained and are operational (men/women/youth)	R.1.1	Increased percentage of partner capacity rate (assessed by using organisational capacity building assessment tool)
R.4.2	Amount of FAEC /FCFD annual services delivered to FOs and individual members	R.1.2	Number of short studies or assessments conducted by FAEC
R.4.3	Increased percentage of FAEC / FCFD A-C members	R.1.3	Number of SHGs leaders trained in finance, management and members needs assessment
Result 3	FOs and their members improve their access to finance to develop production and collective commercialization		

R.3.1	Cumulative amount of A-Cs getting access to finance for A-C collective commercial activities		
R.3.2	% of A-C capital increases during the program (compared to the baseline)		
Lead Questions:			
<p>1. After the training received from FAEC, are Service Providers strong enough now? What about the local Service Providers (master farmers)? Are they able to provide their services (Decision-making & management for ACs, SHGs; market access; and AE technical practices for producing chicken feed, vegetables and rice seeds) to their members (including women/youth) independently? Or are they still relying on FAEC?</p> <p>2. Integration of women and youth in decision making spaces of AC and UAC is to improve their business performance; is this hypothesis verified? What has been done to improve participation of women and youth in AC and UAC businesses?</p> <p>3. How the interventions (UpScale and FES) have helped overcome small scale farmers' challenges imposed by the micro-finance and banking organizations to access credits? What is the capacity of farmers to manage their capital and repay their debt? Has it changed during the program? What other resources for financial access have been developed?</p> <p>4. Which factors influence trust-building in the provision of technical assistance in AE and capacity building in business development for small-scale farmers?</p>			
Result 5	Actors supporting small-scale family farmers and their family' members are sharing and improving their practices and approaches	Result 5	Evidence-based information, studies and operational research on farmers issues are conducted and results are disseminated among farmers and key stakeholders in the sector
R.5.1	Cumulative number of studies published during the program	R.5.1	Number of capitalisation topics carried out
R.5.2	Cumulative number of collaboration with other actors on exchanges of experiences and capitalization of knowledge processes developed during the program	R.5.2	Number of thematic working groups organised
		R.5.3	Number of National Seminar organised (in collaboration with ADG)
Leading Questions:			
<p>1. What tools/strategies for sharing knowledge among farmers are the most effective for the Cambodian context? Khmer versions of the studies, videos, manuals ?.</p>			