



TOR FOR EVALUATION OF KENYA 2017 DROUGHT EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROJECT

1. INTRODUCTION

Caritas Kenya is the Development and Humanitarian arm of Kenya Conference of Catholic Bishops working primarily on Social Development and Humanitarian prerogative on behalf of the Conference of Catholic Bishops in Kenya. It holds the mandate to coordinate and facilitate effective implementation of the Church's Development programmes. Caritas Kenya works through the Diocesan Caritas in the 25 Catholic Dioceses countrywide. Caritas Kenya, plays coordination, facilitative and representation role, while the Diocesan Caritas do the actual implementation.

Caritas Kenya, intends to carry out an external evaluation of the **Kenya 2017 Drought Emergency Response Project** which was implemented in 6 Dioceses namely **Lodwar, Kitale, Maralal, Marsabit, Garissa and Malindi**, and hereby invites applications for the same.

1.1 Background

The Kenya 2017 Drought Emergency Response Project came to be as a result of the severe drought experienced in the country from late 2016 when the Short rains and long rains (October to December 2016 and March to May 2017 respectively began) prompting the Government to announce drought as a national Disaster. Caritas Kenya also embarked on calling for an international appeal through Caritas Internationalis Organisation, which has a platform that allows various Caritas Partners internationally to raise funds for other Caritas member that are in need. Hence from June 2017 Caritas Kenya launch the Kenya 2017 Drought Emergency Response Project now dubbed EA 14/2017.

The overall objective of this project is to contribute towards improving the living conditions of the drought affected victims in Marsabit, Maralal, Garissa, Malindi, Lodwar and Kitale Dioceses in Kenya.

The specific objectives of the project are as follows;

- 5,622 vulnerable households and 481 school children in drought-affected dioceses have access to sufficient food for 3 months.
- 79,958 people have access to potable water for themselves and for their animals (fuel subsidy, repair and rehabilitation of boreholes, support with fast moving spare parts, distribution of water filters, distribution of water jerry cans and installation of 10,000 capacity water tanks)
- 6,850 vulnerable households in marginal agricultural-livelihood zones have a continued improvement in living conditions by planting drought tolerant seeds.
- 42,475 people from vulnerable households in the pastoral livelihood and agricultural marginal zones have an environment of peaceful co-existence through peace campaigns, inter and intra community peace meetings.

1.2 The rationale for the evaluation

The evaluation should help capture the lessons learned and good practice from the implementation of the **EA 14/2017 Project** in order to help Caritas Kenya

- Improve response to emergencies;
- Improve the follow-up rehabilitation phase.

1.3 The main stakeholders of the evaluation

Caritas Internationalis Members Organizations: Caritas Belgium, Caritas Spain, Caritas Italiana, Caritas Australia, Caritas Japan, Caritas Austria, CAFOD, Trocaire, OBOS (One Body One Soul) and Caritas Canada

2. OBJECTIVES

The evaluation should:

- Assess whether appropriate targeting criteria have been identified to select the most appropriate beneficiaries to the project
- Assess the extent to which these criteria have been correctly applied to beneficiary selection in the current project;
- Assess the extent to which this targeting impacted women and men's access to and control over resources and/or impacted their role and decision-making power within the household;
- Analyze and document, with partners, the impact of their work to date (Impact analysis).
- Determine to what extent the project achieved the objectives (effectiveness)
- Determine whether the project achieved value for money (efficiency).
- Determine to what extent the partners have mainstreamed Gender and Environmental matters in the project
- Assess to what extent and levels various stakeholders were involved in the project e.g. project planning and design, implementation, monitoring etc.? (participation)
- Identify and attempt to quantify any actual or potential multiplier effects on the local economy that can be attributed to the project;
- Assess the level of effectiveness of sustainability initiatives in the project
- Determine the relevance and appropriateness of the project design to meet the development needs in the target area;
- Document lessons learnt, best practices and recommendations to inform future project design

3. KEY QUESTIONS & ISSUES

3.1 Relevance:

The extent to which the objectives and the design of the project are consistent with current challenges and concerns in the sector and with the needs and priorities of beneficiaries.

1. Was this project the most appropriate way to achieve intended outcomes? Were there other, more appropriate ways in which similar outcomes could have been achieved?
2. What do the beneficiaries think of the project? Its relevance, appropriateness and outcomes? Are the outcomes sustainable?
3. What do other primary and secondary stakeholders (e.g. staff, parish officials, local government officials, others) think of the project? Were the most vulnerable reached? Was

- the targeting appropriate? (NB beneficiary views should be given more prominence than those of other stakeholders)
4. Were appropriate systems of downwards accountability (participation, information sharing and feedback), put in place and used by project participants? Did the feedback received shape project design and implementation?
 5. Were the initial assessments of a good quality and based on strong beneficiary participation? How was gender taken into account throughout the project?
 6. To what extent has the project followed international humanitarian quality standards, such as SPHERE Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response?

3.2 Effectiveness:

The extent to which the project has achieved, or is expected to achieve its objectives, taking into account their relative importance.

1. Were activities implemented as planned? What were the main factors that contributed to whether activities resulted in intended outputs and outcomes?
2. Were quality standards defined, and did activities achieve high levels of quality in implementation?

3.3 Efficiency / cost-effectiveness:

The extent to which the project has achieved, or is expected to achieve its results efficiently or at a cost lower than alternatives.

1. How did the project compare to similar projects/programs run by organizations working with the same (or similar) target population, in terms of cost per beneficiary served?
2. Were there any noticeable, verifiable instances of waste or inefficiency?

3.4 Coverage:

The extent to which different target beneficiary groups were included or excluded in the project, and how inclusion/exclusion affected results for the different groups.

1. How did actual coverage compare to expectations and to need?
2. Were there any glaring inequities between project beneficiaries and other members of the surrounding community who were not included in the project? Would a different definition of intended beneficiaries have had different results?
3. Did beneficiaries—in general or for specific groups (such as the elderly or disabled)—encounter any difficulties accessing the project?
4. Were there any established criteria for camp selection and to what extent were they followed if any?

3.5 Coherence / connectedness:

The extent to which the design and objectives of the project took into consideration the humanitarian context in which it was implemented. This includes the identified needs, sector strategy and proposed or implemented projects/programs of other organizations working in the same sector and with the same target population.

1. How well did the project adapt its design and objectives to the prevailing humanitarian context for the target population and in the target sector?
2. To what extent did the project build on or fit into past or existing programs/projects?
3. To what extent did the project work effectively with partners (other NGOs, organizations, etc) in the target areas?

3.6 Outcomes:

The changes that resulted from the project, whether positive or negative, intended or unintended.

1. Did the project achieve its intended outcomes? Were there any important unintended outcomes, either positive or negative?
2. What were the main reasons that determined whether intended outcomes were or were not achieved, and whether there were positive or negative unintended outcomes

3.7 Impact:

1. To what extent is the project contributing to a long-term positive effect on people and nature?
2. How is Caritas making a difference to the targeted group and the community at large?

3.8 Sustainability:

The extents to which the outcome/benefits arising from the project are likely to continue after activities have been completed, or the extent to which the project is likely to continue over time.

1. Is there evidence of organisations/partners/communities that have copied, up-scaled or replicated project activities beyond the immediate project area. Is such replication or magnification likely?
2. How sustainable were the outcomes of the project? What are the main factors that affect, either positively or negatively, the sustainability of the project outcomes?
3. What exit strategies were incorporated into project design? Were such strategies implemented and to what extent did they contribute to sustainability?

3.9 Organizational Capacity Perspectives

1. Was there an appropriate system of management and communication in place to support project staff?
2. Was there an appropriate logistics system in place? (e.g. did the procurement process work in a timely, transparent manner?)

3.9 Conclusions

1. What were the key lessons learned? What should be repeated in similar projects in the future?
2. What should not be repeated in similar projects in the future?

4. METHODOLOGY

This evaluation will rely on the following methodologies to try to cover all aspects of the project and all stakeholders.

- Quantitative method by use of surveys or questionnaires, observation, or review of existing documents and databases.
- Qualitative methods through Focus Group Discussions with beneficiaries and other participatory techniques and key informant interviews with Caritas and local Church staff

5. EXPECTED OUTPUTS

This evaluation should produce the following:

A final report with the following report framework

- ✓ Executive Summary
- ✓ Background
- ✓ Introduction
- ✓ Context

- ✓ Description of Methodology
- ✓ Main findings
- ✓ Conclusions
- ✓ Recommendations.

If needed, add any other output useful for Caritas' learning.

6. USE OF THE EVALUATION RESULTS

The Evaluation Report will be shared with Caritas Internationallis and all Caritas Internationallis Member Organizations.

7. REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

The competencies required for External Evaluator consultant are:

- Relevant qualifications and past experience.
- Experience in project monitoring and evaluation;
- Ability to use participatory approaches to evaluation;
- Experience of operational management of humanitarian/development programmes;
- Awareness of cultural sensitivities and local context;
- Ability to work with a team and under pressure to meet deadlines and produce agreed deliverables.
- Excellent analytical, research, writing and communication skills.
- Excellent writing skills in the English language.

8. CONSULTANT'S PROPOSAL

Interested Evaluators for this assignment must submit a detailed technical and financial proposal by **2nd June 2018**.

The technical part should include the following components:

- Description of the assignment
- Approach and methodology to be used in undertaking the assignment
- Detailed implementation plan
- Organizational and personnel capacity including profile of key personnel
- Experience of similar assignments.
- CVs of intended team members
- Any other relevant information to the assignment

The **financial part** of the proposal should include summary of the prices and detail breakdown of each cost item. He/ She should also indicate his availability for the entire period of the consultancy work.

9. TIME FRAME

The Evaluation is scheduled to take place in the month of **June 2018** and this should commence once the ToR is signed between Caritas Kenya and the Evaluator.

Draft report to be submitted to Caritas Kenya by **25th June 2018** for circulation to partners and relevant staff for comments.

Report to be revised based on comments and Final Report to be submitted to Caritas Kenya by **7th July 2018.**

Applications to be send to caritaskenya@catholicchurch.or.ke by **2nd June 2018.**