TERMS OF REFERENCE

SEPTEMBER 2026

ADAPTED FINANCIAL SERVICES FOR SUSTAINABLE FORESTRY VALUE CHAIN DEVELOPMENT

DECEMBER 2023 – JUNE 2026

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PROJECT EVALUATION

Contents

List of acronyms

ADA	Appui au Développement Autonome
CIFOR - ICRAF	International Centre for Research in Agroforestry
KPI	Key performance indicator
MFI	Microfinance institution
SME	Small and medium enterprise
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
ToR	Terms of Reference

1. Background

1.1. Project summary

Rwanda, a landlocked country with over half of the land is dedicated to agriculture. Historically, Rwanda has witnessed significant deforestation due to population growth, agriculture expansion, and resource demands. Presently, roughly 30% forest cover is achieved, and increased attention of public policies and international and national development organisations is attributed to improving forest quality and increasing tree cover on agricultural land.

However, the forestry sector faces a substantial financing gap. Small-scale producers receive less than 1.7% of climate funding, impeding the development of sustainable, integrated value chains. Moreover, there is low awareness on the benefits of less known tree species to increase livelihood and restore and/or preserve ecosystems, and producers also lack capacity to plant and manage trees according to sound practices. Limited linkages in the wood value chains, between producers and small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and market off-takers adds up to these challenges.

In this context and building on the lessons learned of a previous test-project, ADA initiated a multi-year project in Decembre 2023 in Rwanda’s Western Province. It aims to support small-scale producers in the wood value chain to improve forestry and agroforestry management practices and to access adequate financial services to invest in their productive capacity.

The project is carried out in partnership with the microfinance institution (MFI) Inkunga Finance Plc. to advance the development of innovative financial products and partnerships. Furthermore, the International Centre for Research in Agroforestry (CIFOR-ICRAF) supports delivering technical expertise to Inkunga Finance Plc. and to producers.

The project ended in June 2026.

1.2. Initial objectives and approaches

The project seeks to reach two outcomes: 1. producers produce quality wood and tree derived products at competitive costs thereby boosting their incomes; 2. producers develop their skills to adopt and improve management practices which guarantee a balance between production and sustainable resource management, in order to ensure productivity over time and preserve the environment.

To achieve this, three outputs are expected. Firstly, sustainable financial services are provided to landowners for tree planting and management, and for companies and organisations in the wood value chain (output 1). Currently, Inkunga Finance Plc. is rolling out three financial products previously piloted, namely: "Kundigiti" to support producers investing in forestry, including costs for seedlings, planting, management, and harvesting; "Noz'Urubaho" to facilitate financing access for SMEs in acquiring quality timber products and expanding their inventory; "Ongerigiti" to finance tree planting initiatives and promote the transition of farmers towards agroforestry practices.

Alongside, capacity building services are provided by Landscape Alliance (formerly CIFOR-ICRAF) to landowners for tree planting and management, and for companies and organisations in the wood value chain (output 2).

Finally, Inkunga Finance Plc.’s capacity is strengthened through the implementation of environmental and social management systems, the delivery of tailored services to forestry value chains, and the support for fund acquisition from green finance sources (output 3).

The project logical framework with respective key performance indicators (KPIs) and targets is presented in annex 1 of this ToR.

1.3. Main results of the project

At the end of the first quarter of 2026, the following key results had been achieved:

Output 1 (financial services): 3 financial products dedicated to forestry or agriculture value chain actors were available. 212 producers accessed the Ongerigiti product, representing a total of RWF 89,130,000 mobilized; 72 producers accessed the Kundigiti product, representing a total of RWF 182,968,864 mobilized; and 78 forestry value chain actors accessed the Noza Urubaho product, representing a total of RWF 377,384,472 mobilized.

Output 2 (capacity building services for producers): 1,360 producers benefited from capacity building services.

Output 3 (Inkunga capacity strengthening): 43 staff members were trained.

2. Objectives of the evaluation

The objectives of the project evaluation are to: verify the appropriateness and the limitations of the chosen intervention methods, highlight the results achieved by the project, make recommendations for the sustainability of the developed financial products with the associated capacity building services following the withdrawal of the project and the subsidies as well for conducting similar projects.

For that, the OECD evaluation criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability will be used, as per the definitions below:

Relevance: the extent to which the expected results of the project respond to identified and shared problems, according to the right priorities and correspond to the expectations of the beneficiaries.

Coherence: the extent to which the structures present on the intervention territory (including the project partners) were complementary or in competition (external coherence), and the extent to which the project matched the purpose of the organizations that implements it (internal coherence).

Effectiveness: whether the objectives of the project have been achieved, considering their relative importance.

Efficiency: the extent to which resources (financial, human, time, etc.) were converted into results in an optimal and timely way.

Impact: the project's contribution to the development goal, the unintended and counterproductive or beneficial effects that emerge over the long term.

Sustainability: probability of the benefits from the project to continue after the end of the intervention.

In particular, the evaluation should answer the following questions:

Relevance:

- Was the target population of the project – small-scale forestry and agroforestry producers – appropriately reached?
    - What was the demographic, social and economic profile of the actual beneficiary producers?
    - Did the project reach the most vulnerable forestry and agroforestry producers, or did it exclude certain profiles?
- Have the needs of target population been appropriately analysed and considered?
    - Beyond forestry and agroforestry production, what were the most important livelihood constraints faced by beneficiary households?

    - What are the main unmet needs of beneficiary households (e.g. income generation, energy, food security, water access, housing, education, access to finance)? Which of these needs created the greatest pressure on natural resources?
    - To which extent have gender issues been considered?
- Did the beneficiary producers need financing to carry out their forestry and agroforestry activities?
- What other investments or services do beneficiary households consider necessary to improve their livelihoods and resilience?
- To which extent were the financial products developed in the project adequate to the needs of the beneficiary producers?
    - What types of financial products did the beneficiaries actually need?
- To which extent did the beneficiary producers need the capacity building provided by the project?
- Did the financial partner need capacity building? To which extent was the capacity developed by the project in line with the needs? What are the main gaps?
- To which extent was the value chain approach (support to the production and commercialization of timber and non-timber products) used in the project appropriate to meet the main needs of small-scale forestry and agroforestry producers? What are the advantages and the limitations of this approach to meet these needs?

Coherence:

External coherence:

- Was the intervention logic appropriate to the local context? Did it consider local particularities?
- Are there contextual factors or emerging trends that should have been considered in the design of interventions supporting forestry, agroforestry and sustainable livelihoods? How did the identification and definition of the project take place? In particular, to what extent did local stakeholders, project partners and direct beneficiaries participate in these steps?

Internal coherence:

- To which extent was the project consistent with the strategies of each partner (MFI, technical assistance partner)? Was it part of their strategic priorities?

Effectiveness:

- According to the project’s targets and pre-final results, what were the completion rates for each output and outcome?
- What were the main reasons for non-compliance in completion rates, if any?
- What were the key success factors and bottlenecks in the provision of each financial service, namely Kundigiti, Noz'Urubaho, and Ongerigiti (output 1)?
- What were the key success factors and bottlenecks in the provision of capacity building services for producers (output 2)?
- What were the key success factors and bottlenecks in the capacity development of the partner MFI (output 3)?

Efficiency:

- Were the resources mobilised (human and financial) to achieve the results appropriate to the project's outcomes?
- Were the activities carried out in the most efficient way?

- Were the results achieved according to the original timetable? Were necessary adjustments, if any, made in a timely manner?
- From the point of view of the partner MFI and the technical assistance partner, to what extent did ADA's management and coordination of the project contribute to the achievement of the results?
    - What were the strengths of ADA's management of the project and of the relationships between the partners at the different stages of the project? What are the areas to be improved?
    - The level of investment made by ADA was required for the full duration of the project? How can the current intervention model be further optimised to reduce the cost per farmer reached while maintaining the quality and effectiveness of services delivered?

Impact:

- What are the effects of the products and services of the project to beneficiary producers, particularly on their: a. productivity, b. product quality, c. income (outcome 1)?
- To which extent have beneficiary producers developed skills and knowledge in production, processing, and/or marketing (outcome 1)?
- What is the final land size (in ha) under sustainable/resilient practices (total and average per producer)?
- To which extent have beneficiary producers adopted climate-smart, agro-ecological, or sustainable production practices (outcome 2)?
- To which extent have the project products and services enabled beneficiary producers to improve or increase their market access (e.g. selling more products, selling better quality products at a better price, etc.)?
- To which extent did the project strengthen the value chains (support to the production and commercialization) addressed by its technical and financial services?
- To what extent did household needs related to energy, land access, water, income generation or climate resilience influence the adoption of forestry and agroforestry activities?
- What environmental challenges were perceived by beneficiaries as having the greatest impact on their livelihoods (e.g. soil erosion, declining soil fertility, water availability, droughts, forest degradation) and might have hindered the benefits of the project?
- Which sustainable land use and natural resource management practices have been most successfully adopted by beneficiaries? What factors enabled or constrained adoption? How do beneficiaries perceive the relationship between their livelihood activities and their impact on the management of natural resources?

  What are the potential longer-term effects of the capacity built for the partner MFI?

Sustainability:

- To which extent are the financial products developed under the project likely to be continued by the partner MFI?
- To which extent are capacity building models for beneficiary producers used in the project sustainable and economically viable for partners?
- How can the sustainability of capacity building to beneficiary producers be ensured?
- What actors or services do beneficiaries consider most important to support them beyond the life of the project (e.g. financial services, technical assistance, producer organisations, buyers, local authorities)?

3. Methodology

3.1. Scope of the study

The evaluation will be carried out in Rwanda's Western Province,in the districts covered by the project, with focus on Karongi and Rutsiro. It will involve key project stakeholders and beneficiaries, as per the activities listed below.

3.2. Activities to be carried out

This evaluation will be mainly based on qualitative methodologies, to be further detailed by the consultant. The activities below shall be carried out:

• Document review: review of key project documents (technical documents, reports from the partners, monitoring data).

• Individual interviews: preparation of interview guides and conducting 7 to 10 individual interviews with key project stakeholders, namely: ADA project team, partner staff members, third parties involved in the project.

• Survey with beneficiaries: prepare questionnaires and carry out a survey with a representative sample of beneficiaries from each financial service (total universe per financial service: Kundigiti: 72 beneficiaries, Noz'Urubaho: 78 beneficiaries, Ongerigiti: 212 beneficiaries).

• Focus groups: preparing the guide and conducting 3 focus groups with beneficiary producers in two different districts.

4. Expected results

The mission will result in:

1. A methodological note detailing the proposed methodology and presenting the interview guide and the focus group guide.

2. A final report which will include:

- An executive summary;
- A reminder of the objectives;
- A summary description of the methodology;
- A presentation of the evaluation findings according to the different criteria;
- A conclusion and general assessment of the project, including the main lessons learned, questions that remain unanswered or to be verified, and avenues to be explored;
- Recommendations for the sustainability of the developed services and for conducting similar projects.

The report will include in the annexes:

- The questionnaires used;
- List of individuals interviewed;
- The datasets developed;
- A summary page for each partner involved in the project, summarising the results achieved, success and failure factors and perspectives.

5. Implementation

5.1. Role and responsibilities of ADA

- Discussion and validation of the proposed methodology;
- Sending of programme documents (concept papers, monitoring reports);
- Facilitation of contact with the partners and stakeholders to be interviewed;
- Review of the draft report.

5.2. Budget

The indicative working time for this assignment is ***25 consultancy days.***

5.3. Calendar

The timetable to be followed:

Step	Deadline
Receipt of proposals	06/10/2026
Announcement of the selected offer	12/10/2026
Signing the contract & sending of programme documents by ADA	23/10/2026
Kick-off meeting	26/10/2026
Submission of the methodology and questionnaires/guides	03/11/2026
Submission of the draft report	30/11/2026
Sharing of comments by ADA and discussion of results	07/12/2026
Delivery of the final report	14/12/2026

5.4. Submission of the proposal

This call is open for **consultants residing in Rwanda only**.
The response to this call must be sent to ADA by email no later than ***06 October 2026****.*
The email must include the following attachments:

- A technical and financial proposal;
- CV(s) of the proposed consultant(s) and in the case of a team specify the division of roles and the incumbent;
- References to previous work done on the topic;
- Any other element deemed useful.

The email should be sent by email to the following persons: *d.souza@adaimpact.lu*

5.5. Selection of the consultant

Technical proposals will be evaluated against the following criteria:

- Understanding of the TOR and the proposed methodology;
- Qualification and experience of the consultant or team, particularly in:
  - Project evaluation;
  - Forestry and agroforestry sectors and practices;
  - Inclusive finance.
- References for similar assignments.

The financial proposal will contribute to the final selection of the consultant.

5.6. Annexes

Annex 1. Project Logical framework

Impact	***Smallholder farmers and small-scale land- and forest owners secure their income and livelihood by leveraging on the sustainable management of trees and the resources and services they provide***		
		KPIs	**Targets**
Outcomes	Outcome 1: Producers produce quality wood and tree derived products at competitive costs thereby boosting their incomes. Outcome 2: Producers develop their skills to adopt and improve management practices which guarantee a balance between production and sustainable resource management to ensure productivity over time and preserve or enhance the environment and which are aligned to the requirements of local authorities.	*Outcome 1* *- Number and % of beneficiaries recording an increase of their production volume* *- Number and % of beneficiaries recording an improvement in the quality of production* *- Number and % of beneficiaries recording an increased income* *- Number and % of beneficiaries whose skills and knowledge in production, processing, and/or marketing has improved* *Outcome 2* *- Number and % of beneficiaries who adopted climate-smart, agro-ecological, or sustainable production practice* *- Land size (in Ha) under sustainable/resilient practices (total and average per producer)* *- Number of tons of CO2 equivalent absorbed or avoided as a result of Kundigiti (total and average per producer)* *- Improvement in biodiversity management score (in %)*	
Outputs & Key activities	***Output 1. Sound sustainable financial services are provided to landowners for tree planting and management, and for companies and organisations in the wood value chain*** *- Organise a product refinement workshop* *- Develop an outreach strategy that includes a product strategy, a*	Output 1. Number of producers and other agro-forestry and forestry value chain actors (including women) accessing financial services Number of financial services dedicated to forestry or agriculture value chain actors available through support from ADA during the year.	300 (Kundigiti), 60 (Noza Urubaho), 300 (Ongerigiti). 3

	communication/marketing strategy, a delivery and customer relationship strategy (focus on forestry product) *- Development of new financial products to foster sustainability and resilience of producers and private businesses in agriculture and forestry value chains, based on needs and market opportunities assessment* ***Output 2. Capacity building services are provided to landowners for tree planting and management, and for companies and organisations in the wood value chain*** *- Develop a training module on environment protection, climate change adaptation and mitigation, and key principles of sustainable resources management* *- Awareness rising and capacity building as part of the outreach strategy* *- Engage a market dialogue to ascertain the preferences and requirements of the wood industry, informing tailored support for producers in production methods, species selection, and related aspects.* ***Output 3. Inkunga has strengthened its capabilities by enhancing the implementation of environmental and social management systems, delivering tailored services to forestry value chains, and securing support for fund acquisition from green finance sources.*** *- Developing an environment strategy based on the findings of the assessment* *- Define and adopt an appropriate Monitoring, reporting and impact measurement system* *- Training staff on strategy, policies, and procedures for environmental protection, climate change adaptation, mitigation, and sustainable resource management principles.*	Output 2. Number of producers and other agroforestry and forestry value chain actors benefiting from capacity building services (total, women) Output 3. Number of Inkunga staff trained Volume (in FRW) of funds mobilised	1,000 40 1,000,000,000

	- Identify national and international sources of finance and their requirements *- Due diligence to identify and implement the adequate measures to comply with the requirements*		

ADA - Support for Autonomous Development
39 Glesener Street
L-1631 Luxembourg
Tel: +352 45 68 68 1
Fax: +352 45 68 68 68
www.ada-microfinance.org