

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Final Evaluation of PARtNER project

From January 2022 to December 2026, Cambodia

A.1 EVALUATION CONTEXT:

Since 2016, four Belgian university NGOs including ECLOSIO (currently Ucoopia, the NGO of the University of Liège), Louvain Coopération (Louvain-la-Neuve), FUCID (Namur) and ULB-Coopération (Brussels), have decided to implement a common program financed by the Directorate-General for Development Cooperation Belgium (DGD) for a period of 10 years, from 2017 to 2026, under the name of Uni4Coop. Uni4Coop's specificity is to contribute to development by mobilizing the human and scientific resources of the university community.

For the program 2022-2026, Uni4Coop proposed a fully integrated program between Louvain Coopération and Ucoopia in Cambodia. This joint program will enable the two organizations to join forces, strengthen each other, promote exchanges and better capitalize on practices, and generate new expertise at the crossroads of research and development.

The Uni4Coop office in Cambodia is located in Phnom Penh. It coordinates a local multidisciplinary team. The thematic areas of intervention are sustainable food systems, food and economic sovereignty (support to family farming, agroecology transition, income-generating activities, rural entrepreneurship, farmer organization) and health (with a focus on non-communicable diseases and a special emphasis on mental health).

Within the outcome of Sustainable Food Systems (SFS), Uni4Coop was granted a PARtNER project (2022 – 2026) which aims at “generating economic and social changes in rural farmers families and improving the food market through agroecology transition and gender equity in agriculture”. This outcome was jointly developed by LC and Ucoopia and their Cambodian partners. It intends to contribute to SDG 2 “End hunger, achieve food security, improve nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture” (main), to SDG 1 “End poverty in all its forms everywhere” (secondary), to SDG 5 “Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls” (secondary) and to SDG 8 “Promote inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all” (secondary). It is consistent with the national policy of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) and with the objectives of the Joint Strategic Framework (JSF) 2022 – 2026 developed by all Belgian Non-Governmental Cooperation Actors (NGCAs) active in Cambodia.

Field-activities are carried out by key partners including (i) the Tramkak Union of Agricultural Cooperatives (TrUAC) in Takeo province, (ii) the 4 Agricultural Cooperatives in Battambang province, (iii) and 3 Agricultural Cooperatives (ACs) in Kampong Thom province, (iv) the Ecosystem Services and Land Use Research Centre (ECOLAND) of the Royal University of Agriculture (RUA), and Development and Partnership in Action (DPA) organization. In addition, several other higher education institutions, NGOs, networks and consultants are collaborating to implement different interventions.

The Specific Objectives as formulated in the five-year program are:

Organization	Specific Objectives	Partner ¹ ; Synergy/collaboration
Uni4Coop	Generate economic and social changes of the Cambodian rural farmer families by improving Cambodian food market through agroecological transition and gender equity in agriculture <u>Target areas</u> : Takeo, Kampong Thom, Battambang provinces	<u>Partners</u> : TrUAC, 4 ACs in Battambang, 3 ACs in Kampong Thom, DPA <u>Collaborations</u> : ECOLAND, Banteay Srei, CIRD NUBB, FoAS, St Paul Institute, PDAFF Battambang

The SFS outcome supports family farming systems by strengthening their resilience functions as food providers for the Cambodian society. The intended approach combines the increase of agricultural productivity through agroecological practices, the increase of revenues, and the improvement of the socio-economic environment. This is to be achieved through:

- The promotion of Farmer-to-Farmer-led (F2F) extension systems, technical and managerial innovations, and co-investments in agroecological production assets;
- The creation of value-addition and the reach to remunerative markets by upgrading sustainable and inclusive value-chains of agroecological products;
- Supporting farmers representatives' initiatives to address constraints and opportunities during dialogues with the private sector and the government, to promote gender-inclusive governance models, and to foster policies in favour of small-scale farmers;
- Raising consumer awareness of healthy food intake and promote quality standards and control systems to improve sustainable consumption patterns, with an emphasis on the role of women as agents of change; and
- Improving knowledge management to foster and disseminate innovations and results and to influence policies in favour of agroecological transition.

The target groups of the project include:

Organization	Direct Target groups	Indirect Target groups	Total number of participating populations
Uni4Coop	• Small scale farmers and their family members, cooperating within the 14 ACs in Takeo, Kampong Thom, and Battambang provinces • ALiSEA Network and its members in Cambodia	• The family farming population neighboring the 14 ACs and benefiting from their services. • Stakeholders of ALiSEA members	• 26,225 small-scale farmers and their families (Direct) • 322,000 households (Indirect) • 78 ALiSEA members in Cambodia

¹ Annex 3: Brief description of partners

The PARTNER project is implemented starting from 1st January 2022 and ending 31st December 2026. However, it was developed and built upon an action strategy dating back to the early 2000s. The strategy of actions ends at the end of 2026, and therefore Uni4Coop will have to conduct a final evaluation of this PARTNER project. This is all the more important as Uni4Coop is transitioning towards exiting Cambodia and will therefore analyze not only the impacts of its actions but also the conditions for the long-term sustainability of its partners.

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

A.2.1 OBJECTIVE:

Accountability:

The DGD requires that the Outcomes they are co-funding are evaluated at the end of action, specifically regarding Impact and Sustainability on the level of the Specific Objective (SO). As with any action coming to a conclusion, another important criterion to prioritize is effectiveness. Other OECD DAC criteria may be addressed on parts of the program, in specific questions, not forgetting the contribution to the Joint Strategic Framework (JSF), to mainstreaming gender and environmental aspects.

Learning:

Beyond its accountability function, the final evaluation offers an opportunity to draw valuable lessons for Uni4Coop. A secondary objective of this call for expressions of interest is to assess issues specific to our Outcome, such as the main drivers and obstacles encountered, or lessons transferable to other projects or contexts.

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 Ucoopia and the DGD website.

A.2.3 PERIOD COVERED BY THE EVALUATION:

The final evaluation will cover the entire duration of the PARTNER project from 2022 to 2026.

A.3 TYPE OF EVALUATION:

This is an external conventional 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 Ucoopia in Cambodia and at Uni4Coop level.

The Scope of Work (SOW) stated below will be reviewed by the evaluation team and the evaluation steering committee 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.

Main question: Has the project contributed to generate economic and social changes through the promotion of agroecological practices, improvement of agricultural value chains, and strengthening of gender inclusion in target areas?

DAC criteria and evaluation questions	Comments
<u>Efficiency</u> To what extent were inputs managed in a cost-efficient way and within the set timeframe? To what extent were the intended processes and all types of activities implemented within the planned timeframe? Accountability and Learning	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. 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? <u>Proposed approach:</u> Semi-structured interviews with partners and collaborators involved in the program.
<u>Effectiveness</u> 1. To what extent have the three 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? 3. Has the transition to a more sustainable agriculture led to empowerment of women farmers? 4. Is achieving high TAPE’s CAET scores lead to more sustainable agricultural production? Accountability	Effectiveness is about achieving the specific objectives (SOs) 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 by the participating populations. <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.
<u>Impact:</u> 1. To what extent the capacity building supported by the project reduce small-scale farmers’	Impact addresses the ultimate significance and potentially transformative effects of the intervention. It seeks to identify the effects of

reliance on external agricultural inputs? - Has there been a change in the behaviour (mindset) of small-scale farmers towards the use of agroecological (AE) inputs during or after the project intervention in link with intensified productivity (yields, labour, knowledge...) of AE production? (social sustainability) - What were the crucial factors that significantly 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 risks to change/adapt their production systems, and which factors mostly inhibit their transition? (technical sustainability) - Are the business models of the UAC and ACs financially viable? Revenues exceed costs? What has been done to increase the volume of products sold or to increase the sale price obtained? - Does selling AE products lead to receiving more value additional for small-scale farmers? - How did the UAC/ACs take action to improve their services and value-chains? - To what extent do women in the project succeed to design, manage and lead collective AE-related businesses? Did the PARtNER project activities to support farmer organizations (market orientation, technical and business performance, organizational development) made them viable and sustainable? - What has been done by the partners and collaborators of the project to raise awareness of consumers on AE products, and healthy diets? Accountability and Learning	the intervention that are longer term or broader in scope than those already captured under the effectiveness criteria. The project was intended to lead to an improvement of the economic security of family farmers and contribute to reach better food sovereignty. Besides, it was planned that the farmer organizations improve their solidarity and social cohesion and promote the inclusion of women and youth in decision-making processes. Behaviour changes of the target groups (investment level, participation...) Services provided and funding of services <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.
<u>Sustainability</u> - What is the level of the participation of small-scale farmers to the capacity building sessions followed the farmer-to-farmer extension approach (F2F) deployed by the UAC/ACs? (Environmental sustainability) - What are the challenges to keep the UAC/AC functionally operating? What is the efficiency of these farmer organizations? and what are the motivations and benefits that small-scale	Potential Sustainability: the degree of probability of sustaining the benefits of the intervention in the long term (after completion of the program) This criterion assesses the potential of continuation of the intervention beyond the current funding period. To this end, four aspects of sustainability are assessed, i.e. environmental, social, technical and institutional

farmers have to join them? What are the levels of ownership and autonomy of UAC/ACs? (institutional sustainability) - How many ACs developed and applied social protection schemes (SPSs) as part of their structures during the course of the project? How many ACs will continue to apply such SPSs? What are the challenges faced by ACs to develop SPSs? - Will the enhanced services (purchase of basic seeds, purchase of irrigation equipment, purchase and sale of agricultural products, etc.) of the ACs or UACs be maintained and functional after the end of the project? - How has the ALiSEA network governance mechanisms been progressing? What will it look like when the project phases out? - Is the exit strategy well carried out, both at the partner level and at the local HR level of LC? Is the departure of LC well perceived, understood, and accepted by the partners and the LC staff on site? Were there any consultations, preparation meetings, discussions with partners and local LC staff for a smooth exit? - Was the additional budget of 28.828 euros (budgetary adjustment) able to strengthen the autonomy of the ALiSEA network and support the commercial consolidation of agricultural cooperatives? If yes, how and at which levels concretely? Can we conclude that this contributes to the sustainability of the programs? Accountability and Learning	sustainability. The capacities of partners to carry-on actions or services beyond the end of the project. <u>Proposed approach:</u> Semi-structured interviews with the participating farmers (involved in the development of AE practices and organization systems); UAC/ACs representatives; LC's staff and partners; and ALiSEA stakeholders.
<u>Contribution to Results</u> - What spaces have the partners and collaborators of the project created to ensure knowledge products were widely shared and multiple actors in agroecology network were reached? - Has the project produced adequate knowledge products (with participation of women) and shared with its stakeholders, particularly farmers? - How are the knowledge products shared with its stakeholders? Was it effective? Accountability	<u>Result 4:</u> Innovations derived from the experimentation by small-scale farmers in the agroecology transitions, the upgrading of value chain and the better governance are consolidated in research-actions, studies or systematizations that are co-constructed with farmers and disseminated for their internal and external valorisation, in particular to influence policies and decision-making in favour of the transition to AE.

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. Uni4Coop (Ucoopia and Louvain Cooperation) encourages the use of innovative methods of data collection and stakeholder consultation.

A.6 SKILLS REQUIRED

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

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

- Strong 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 agricultural 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, agroecological practices, agribusiness 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 for this evaluation is 14.000 Euros including tax.

All costs related to data collection (e.g. enumerators, field assistants, survey implementation, or other data collection expenses) must be included in this package.

Other costs related to the evaluation, particularly physical events or meetings organization (if there are any) for additional data collection or data verification purposes that require a large number of participants which could not be covered by the consultant, will financially be covered directly by Uni4Coop following our internal policies. Uni4Coop will approve such cases only when we deem necessary.

A.8. TERMS OF THE EXPERTISE:

A.8.1 STEPS FOR SUBMISSIONS OF APPLICATIONS

The consultant selection process will follow the 2 steps below:

Step 1: Open Call

- The applicant (Individual consultant or legal entity) is required to submit only:
 1. A motivation letter for this assignment;
 2. CV(s) of the consultant(s). For legal entity, CVs of the proposed key person who will undertake the assignment, highlighting relevant experience with similar evaluations and contacts of referees from the previous evaluations; and
 3. A short understanding note responding to this ToR, as well as how the context and the evaluation questions were understood.

The project team will evaluate the applications and notify qualified applicants if they will proceed to the next step. ***Only shortlisted applicants will be notified and proceeded to step 2.***

Step 2: Shortlisting

- Each selected applicant will be invited to have an individual meeting with the project team to understand better about the PARtNER project and the supports from the project team when conducting the evaluation before being asked to submit the:
 1. Technical proposal: describing methodological approaches to answer the questions and objectives set out in the ToR, and detailing the tools for collecting information, the profile of involved persons, indicative timetable of the evaluation;
 2. Financial proposal: detailing proposed budget for the evaluation in euros including tax of the service.

The selected applicant will be notified and contracted for the assignment after the evaluation.

A.8.2. DOCUMENTS TO REVIEW

After being passed into Step 2, the project will make the following documents available to the consultant(s):

- Annex 1: PARtNER CAMBODGE ANX19 - Complete Document
- Annex 2: JSF Cambodia
- Annex 3: Mid-term review and managerial response

After being selected for the evaluation, the consultant will get further access to:

- Project's Annual Reports;
- Reports of Baseline, Midline, and Endline Assessments;
- Partnership management and evaluation tools developed as part of the project and previous projects; and

The consultant may ask to consult any document she/he deems useful (partnerships agreements, reports, list of groups and participating stakeholders, etc)

A.8.3. MODALITIES FOR CARRYING OUT THE FIELD MISSION

The consultant will be in contact with the steering committee and with the coordination team in Phnom Penh.

The consultant 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 project's partners/collaborators.
- A debriefing meeting (including online facilities) at the end of the field mission, organized with the main actors, including LC/Ucoopia team members.
- A post-submission meeting of the interim report, organized with the steering committee. This will allow for adjustments before the final report is submitted.
- A managerial response meeting following the submission of the final report.
- 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 coordination team based in Cambodia 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

Interested consultants are required to submit the Step 1 Applications to: veata.mey@uni4coop.org and christophe.goossens@ucoopia.org. Applicants who pass to step 2 will be notified afterwards.

The evaluation committee will be composed of the pilots (Christophe Goossens and Veata Mey) and another member of Uni4Coop (Vincent Henin).

The evaluation of **Step 1** will follow below grid:

Criteria	Relative Weight
Profile of the Consultant(s)	100
Qualifications, experience and skills	40
Experience in the subject to be evaluated	30
Knowledge of the assignment	30

The evaluation of **Step 2** will be carried out according to the following grid:

Criteria	Relative Weight
Technical and methodological offer	60
Presentation of the questions to evaluate and understanding of the subject	30
Proposed methodological approach	30
Financial offer	40
Price of the service	20
Cost realism compared to the proposed methodology	20
Total	100

A.9.2. CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS

The payment of fees will be made in three instalments: 40 % upon signature of the contract, 30 % upon submission of the interim report and 30 % upon approval of the final report. Instalments will be paid on the basis of the submission of the appropriate supporting documents (Invoices, Reports...).

A.9.3. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES:

- **A summary accountability document** of +/- three pages for the general public, members of Uni4Coop, and 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 submitted in electronic format for the final version of the report.

A.7.1 PROVISIONAL TIMETABLE:

Process	Timeline
Publication of the call for proposals	By 03 August 2026
Supplementary questions (only by emails)	By 10 August 2026
Submission of Step 1 Application by candidates	By 25 August 2026
Shortlisting of candidates (maximum 3 candidates)	By 28 August 2026
Scoping meeting with shortlisted candidates	From 31 August to 04 September 2026
Submission of Step 2 Application by shortlisted candidates	By 11 September 2026
Announcement of the final selection and signing of contract	By 18 September 2026
Scoping note and discussion before the field mission	From 21 to 25 September 2026
Achievement of the field mission in Cambodia	From 26 September to 07 November 2026
Online debriefing meeting	By 06 November 2026
Submission of the interim report	By 13 November 2026
Post-submission meeting	By 20 November 2026
Submission of the final report	By 27 November 2026
Managerial Response Meeting	By 04 December 2026
Post-evaluation meeting	By 11 December 2026

ANNEX 3: TABLE OF LEAD QUESTIONS BY RESULTS

Specific objective	Generate economic and social changes of the Cambodian rural farmers families by improving Cambodian food market through agroecological transition and gender equity in agriculture.
S.O.1	Average income of small-scale food producers participating to the program, PPP.
S.O.2	Abbreviated Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index in 2 domains: (i) Leadership in the community, (ii) Workload (Index, A-WEAI).
S.O.3	Level of agroecological transition achieved by small scale farmers. (Step 1 (CAET) of TAPE (FAO, 2019)).
Lead Questions: 1. To what extent have the three 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? 3. Has the transition to a more sustainable agriculture led to empowerment of women farmers? 4. Is achieving high TAPE's CAET scores lead to more sustainable agricultural production?	
Result 1	Small-scale farmers and their family members improve their knowledge and capacity to ensure sustainable, healthy, diversified and culturally appropriate food production.
R.1.1	Rural families get greater autonomy through the decrease of external inputs (farm gross margin calculation and analysis).
R.1.2	Number of participatory F2F knowledge exchange and trainings (by gender and age of the participants).
R.1.3	Percentage increase in quality-verified (PGS or other participatory standards) AE products.
Lead Questions 1. To what extent the capacity building supported by the project reduce small-scale farmers' reliance on external agricultural inputs? 2. Has there been a change in the behaviour (mindset) of small-scale farmers towards the use of AE inputs during or after the project intervention in link with intensified productivity (yields, labour, knowledge...) of AE production? (social sustainability) 3. What were the crucial factors that significantly 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 risks to change/adapt their production systems, and which factors mostly inhibit their transition? (technical sustainability) 4. What is the level of the participation of small-scale farmers to the capacity building sessions followed the farmer-to-farmer extension approach (F2F) deployed by the UAC/ACs? 5. After a series of training provided by the project and its partners/collaborators, are Farmer Specialist Trainers more confident and capable to play their roles as the agents to promote local AE innovation? Are they able to provide their services (training, coaching, initiating new pilots) to their members (including women/youth) independently? 6. Does receiving training sessions on agroecological topics lead to more adoption of quality standards?	
Result 2	Value-chains and market access of products from agroecological practices are upgraded.
R.2.1	Number of (innovative/new) direct marketing strategies of AE products developed.
R.2.2	Rural families get a greater share of the value addition on productions supported by the project.
Lead Questions 1. Are the business models of the UAC and ACs financially viable? Revenues exceed costs? What has been done to increase the volume of products sold or to increase the sale price obtained? 2. Does selling AE products lead to receiving more value additional for small-scale farmers? 3. How did the UAC/ACs take action to improve their services and value-chains? 4. How has the project helped overcome UAC/ACs' challenges to access credits from micro-finance institute and banks? What is the capacity of farmer organizations to manage their capital and repay their debt? Has it changed during the program? What other resources for financial access have been developed?	

Result 3	R.3. Improved governance to favour peasant rights, gender equity and democratization of decision -making space (changes at national, meso, and local levels).
R.3.1	Number of women designing and managing AE value chain business functions and its benefits (by collective business).
R.3.2	Number of ACs developing social protection schemes for their members.
R.3.3	ALiSEA governance mechanisms through national board of members are established.
Lead Questions:	
1. To what extent do women in the project succeed to design, manage and lead collective AE-related businesses? Did the PARtNER project activities to support farmer organizations (market orientation, technical and business performance, organizational development) made them viable and sustainable? 2. What has been done to improve participation of women and youth in UAC/ACs' businesses? 3. How many ACs developed and applied social protection schemes (SPSs) as part of their structures during the course of the project? How many ACs will continue to apply such SPSs? What are the challenges faced by ACs to develop SPSs? 4. What are the challenges to keep the UAC/AC functionally operating? What is the efficiency of these farmer organizations? and what are the motivations and benefits that small-scale farmers have to join them? What are the levels of ownership and autonomy of UAC/ACs? (institutional sustainability) 5. How has the ALiSEA network governance mechanisms been progressing? What will it look like when the project phases out? 6. Was the additional budget of 28,828 euros (budgetary adjustment) able to strengthen the autonomy of the Agroecology Learning alliance in Southeast Asia (ALiSEA) network and support the commercial consolidation of agricultural cooperatives? If yes, how and at which levels concretely? Can we conclude that this contributes to the sustainability of the programs?	
Result 4	Improved sustainable and healthier consumption patterns.
R.4.1	Increase in the average number of different food groups consumed by households. (Household dietary diversity Score HDDS)
R.4.2	Number of consumers (in local and city markets) reached by campaigns to increase consumers' knowledge on AE products, healthy diets, and NCDs prevention.
Lead Questions:	
1. Does applying agroecological practices lead to more adverse food group consumption by households of small-scale farmers who are the beneficiaries of the project? 2. What has been done by the partners and collaborators of the project to raise awareness of consumers on AE products, healthy diets, and NCDs prevention?	
Result 5	Innovations derived from the experimentation by small-scale farmers in the agroecology transitions, the upgrading of value chain and the better governance are consolidated in research-actions, studies or systematizations that are co-constructed with farmers and disseminated for their internal and external valorisation, in particular to influence policies and decision-making in favour of the transition to AE.
R.5.1	Cumulative number of spaces for exchanges/meetings - in which knowledge management outputs and processes are mobilized - where (a cumulative number of) multi-actors (especially young Cambodians) are discussing and co-building.
R.5.2	Cumulative Number of products-(capitalization/systematization, reports, studies, publications, tools, guidelines, visual material) created and used to share and foster information and innovations among farmers (specific attention on the gender of the contributor of KM product)
R.5.3	Cumulative number of KM outputs shared through the ALiSEA platform.
Leading Questions:	
1. What spaces have the partners and collaborators of the project created to ensure knowledge products were widely shared and multiple actors in agroecology network were reached? 2. Has the project produced adequate knowledge products (with participation of women) and shared with its stakeholders, particularly farmers? 3. How are the knowledge products shared with its stakeholders? Was it effective?	

Additional Management Questions:

1. Is the exit strategy well carried out, both at the partner level and at the local HR level of LC? Is the departure of LC well perceived, understood, and accepted by the partners and the LC staff on site? Were there any consultations, preparation meetings, discussions with partners and local LC staff for a smooth exit?