

Terms of Reference

Evaluation of Tear/Tearfund Protracted Crisis Programme Focused on Food Security

Implemented from April 2014 – March 2017 in Ethiopia, Somaliland and North Kenya

Table of Contents

1. Introduction and background
2. Purpose and objectives of the evaluation
3. Methodology
4. Evaluation Output and Reporting
5. Key Stakeholders and utilisation of findings
6. Budget
7. Planning, management and evaluation team
8. Resources
9. Assessment Criteria

This ToR built upon the ToR submitted to BuZa with the baseline in October 2014.

1. Introduction and background

Tear and Tearfund have jointly implemented a programme in Ethiopia, Somaliland and North Kenya supported with funding from the Dutch government under the Protracted Crisis Call, working through the Tearfund country offices and Partners in Ethiopia, Kenya and Somaliland.

Under this call the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Dutch Government (BuZa) has selected 7 NGOs as partner to work together for long term results related to the crisis situations. This was a new approach for the Dutch government and an evaluation is set up with the dual purpose:

- i. to evaluate the results of the Tear/Tearfund implemented programme and
- ii. to evaluate the results of the new way of working in a strategic partnership between BuZa and NGO/Tear.

The evaluation of the results of the Tear/Tearfund implemented programme is the subject of this ToR for an external evaluation. The evaluation of the partnership model will be done with the embassies and Ministry in The Hague separately. The second evaluation will contribute to a wider evaluation by BuZa of the results of all partnerships set up under the Protracted Crisis Call.

The period of implementation is April 2014 – March 2017, the last 3 months is a no-cost extension. This evaluation will be undertaken in January/February 2017 to allow sufficient reflection within the partnerships and contribute to the final programme conference.

2. Purpose and objectives of the programme evaluation

The **Goal** of the evaluation is to answer the following question: To what extent has the Self Help Group - Food Security programme in the three countries increased the food security of marginalised groups and their resilience to crisis in a sustainable way?

The **Specific Objectives** of the evaluation are to:

1. Determine the level to which the programme has achieved the stated outcomes in the three countries and contributed to the BuZa policy framework for the Strategic Partnership.
2. Assess the programme against the 7 OECD-DAC criteria and associated detailed questions (see below)
3. Identify key learning from the different stakeholders, including BuZa (the Dutch Embassies), Tear, Tearfund and Partners. The evaluation will draw attention to lessons learned, the learning strategy in the programme, activities that went different than planned, challenges to the Theory of Change, success factors, challenges etc.
4. Model participatory evaluation approaches to Partners for their learning.

OECD-DAC Criteria:

All Tear / Tearfund evaluations assess programmes against the OECD-DAC criteria: Relevant, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability. For interventions that take place in an emergency, complex emergency or conflict situation, such as the HoA, it is also helpful to consider Coordination and Coherence. Part 9 of the TOR provides a tool for doing this. The following is the list of OECD-DAC criteria for reviewing the programme, and a list of specific questions to be considered within each criteria by the evaluation team:

Relevance: *[The extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor]*

1. Determine the validity of the Theory of Change for the implementation of the programme.
2. Determine the contribution of cross country programming in reaching the outcomes.
3. Determine the result of the cooperation with other relevant stakeholders outside the programme
4. Which context situations provide a good basis for improved Food Security through the SHG approach, and in which (crisis) situations is the SHG approach less or non-effective? Are there political, economic, funding, structural or organizational factors that present potential risks for the non-achievement of results with the SHG approach? (not a priority question)

Effectiveness: *[A measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.]*

1. Determine the effectiveness of the programme in achieving the stated outcomes in the three countries and its contribution to the chosen objective Food Security in the policy framework for this Strategic Partnership. Where the outcomes have changed in priority, determine the validity of this.
2. Determine the progress in the programme themes of Conservation Agriculture, Disaster Risk Reduction, Self Organised Learning and Income Generating Activities in the programme period and the contribution to improved food security of the target groups.
3. Determine the contribution of the results of the cross cutting themes (gender, environment and governance) to achieving the outcomes.
4. Determine to what extent the approach has been gender sensitive and/or gender transformative.
5. Determine the quality of the data collected through the web-based data collection system (SWIS), used in the reporting. What was the take-up of SWIS by Partners, also outside Ethiopia? What is the potential of SWIS for uniform data collection on SHGs in different contexts?

Efficiency: *[Efficiency measures the outputs -- qualitative and quantitative -- in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which signifies that the aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted.]*

1. What have been the benefits and challenges of using local CBOs like churches to nurture the start-up of SHGs, which has been a key strategy in Ethiopia?
2. How efficient and effective has the Capacity Building of Partners been in strengthening quality of SHGs and other themes of the programme? To what extent has the capacity building gone beyond the Tearfund Partners?
3. To what extent has the pre-existing capacity of Tear and Tearfund before the start of the programme, as given in the Tear track record submitted to BuZa, contributed to an efficient achievement of outcomes?

Impact: *[The positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This involves the main impacts and effects resulting from the activity on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators. The examination should be concerned with both intended and unintended results and must also include the positive and negative impact of external factors, such as changes in terms of trade and financial conditions.]*

1. What elements of food security (access, availability, utilisation, stability) have been improved by the SHG approach, and how can these linkages be shown?
2. What level of increase in food diversification has been achieved among Self Help Group members, taking into account the quality of food consumed; what have been the driving factors?
3. What learning has taken place within the existing partnership on SHG programmes and with other partners? How has the learning led to adaptations of the programme?

Sustainability: *[Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.]*

1. In what ways have local SHG structures become sustainable, what ownership is locally taken and what aspects still need external support (financial, institutional, ecological, technological, social aspects)?
2. What has been the level of accountability in the programme, from Tear through Tearfund, to Partners, field officers, community facilitators and SHG structures? Has the target group participated meaningfully in the PME of the programme, leading to increased sustainability?

Coordination: *[The extent to which different actors' interventions are harmonised, promote synergy, and avoid gaps, duplication, and resource conflicts. Coordination can also be included in the effectiveness criterion rather than treated as a separate criterion. It is particularly relevant to humanitarian situations where there are multiple actors responding.]*

1. What type of partnership and collaboration has developed during the programme with other stakeholders in the local context, what were the (de-)motivating factors and what have been the results?
2. Identify key lessons on the structure of the programme and the interaction between stakeholders, based on successes achieved and obstacles encountered during the implementation period.

Coherence: *[The extent to which there is consistency across security, developmental, trade, military, and humanitarian policies, and to which all policies take into account humanitarian*

and human-rights considerations. Coherence is a policy-level issue that may not be relevant in single-agency, single-project evaluations.]

1. To what extent has an adequate response been given to the upcoming crisis situation (El Nino) in the project context, as facilitated by the funding flexibility in the partnership? How was that response linked to the general programme approach?
-

3. Methodology and selection of evaluation team

The evaluation team leader will develop a detailed plan for the evaluation in discussion with the Programme Coordinator. It should include:

- Desk review of key documents prior to departure.
- Interviews with Netherlands based Tear staff, BuZa staff and UK-based Tearfund staff prior to departure.
- In-country key informant interviews.
- Beneficiary interviews and focus group discussions using open dialogue approaches to assess changes or verify indicated progress
- Partner interviews.
- Direct observation/project visits in-country.

Discussion of initial findings with in-country teams to give an opportunity for feedback.

Tear will consult with Tearfund and BuZa on the selection of an external evaluation team.

Tear will ask prospective evaluation team leaders to provide a detailed methodology for the evaluation based on the Terms of Reference. The evaluation team should be working in a participatory manner, in close relationship with the country offices, Partners and the Embassy, while retaining an independent and critical view.

It is expected that the evaluator(s) will have good understanding of food security, the regional situation in the Horn of Africa and adult learning processes such as used in Self Help Groups and by partners.

4. Evaluation output / Reporting

The evaluation team is to report on their work in English and use the following format (the numbers give the maximum number of pages):

1. Executive summary (4 pages)
The executive summary contains the main findings, conclusions and recommendations.
2. Introduction
Background for the evaluation.
3. Methodology (4 pages)
Description of criteria for sampling, planning of consultation processes and limitations of the methodology. A distinction will be made between the partner level achievements and the total programme achievements over the three countries and with other stakeholders.
4. Context analysis (6 pages)
Brief description and analysis of the broader policy and institutional context, including the position of the programme and relevant stakeholders. Where needed make this region and country specific. Give a comparison with the context analysis in the track record where relevant.

5. Findings (15 pages)
Present the findings of the evaluation, breaking it down per country and using the framework. In this section provide the information that is needed to answer the question asked in the ToR.
6. Answers to question asked, lessons learned and conclusions (8 pages)
In this section the specific main question and where possible sub questions will be addressed, followed by lessons learned and conclusions for the programme
7. Recommendations
The evaluation team will formulate specific actionable and prioritised recommendations for the future development of the SHG-approach at the level of different stakeholders
8. Annexes
The evaluation team will provide information on tools used, answers obtained (without revealing the sources in case of sensitive information), indicator values of results achieved by project partners, persons participating in the evaluation, copies of questionnaires used and datasets, field data used, ToR, profile of evaluators, documents consulted etc.

5. Key stakeholders and utilisation of findings

The key audience for the evaluation is the management team, composed of the Tear coordinator of the programme and the three country reps, with representatives from the HQs of Tear Netherlands and Tearfund. The results will also be used by the country teams in the three countries, as well as inform other SHG programmes in other countries. Local partners in the three countries implementing programmes, are also an important group to use findings. Finally the evaluation report will be used with external stakeholders as appropriate.

- a. Dissemination of the report will be to the Dutch government, DSH, and the relevant embassies; to Tear Netherlands, Tearfund UK and involved local partners
- b. The parties mentioned above under section 5.a will be involved in developing an action plan based on the recommendations of the evaluation report.

6. Planning, management and evaluation team

The evaluation will use the following time table:

Date	Activity
October 2016	Advertisement of ToR, to recruit evaluators
November	Review of submitted evaluation plans by recruitment team; selection of independent evaluators and full briefing of the evaluation process
January/February 2017	Fieldwork in 3 countries. Validation workshops will be held in each country after finishing the work in that country
End February	Presentation of initial findings during regional conference in Addis (Feb. 21st)
March	Submission of draft report to programme coordinator
March	Presentation of updated report to BuZa and European stakeholders
May 1	Final version of evaluation document approved by Tear and Tearfund
May 15 th	Submission of evaluation document to BuZa

Management of the evaluation is the responsibility of the Tear SHG/Food Security Programme Coordinator. A recruitment team will be formed by the coordinator with involvement of Tearfund. This team will also be involved in the final debriefing workshop with the evaluation team.

Logistics will be overseen by the Programme Coordinator, while practical arrangements for field visits, including transport and accommodation, will be done by the Tearfund Country Offices with Partners.

It is expected that an international consultant will be recruited to lead the evaluation, plus a regional consultant. It may be possible to use several national consultants for the different countries, or to work with one regional consultant.

7. Budget

The following is a rough estimate of the expenses:

Items	Cost (€)
Visit costs Somaliland 7 days	
Visit costs North Kenya 7 days	
Visit costs Ethiopia 14 days	
International travel	
Local travel (it is expected that programme vehicles will be available for most local travel, but costs in Somaliland are high due to armed escort regulations)	
Fees lead consultant (35 days at /day)	
Fees regional consultant (35 days at /day)	
Other costs, unforeseen	
Total	

8. Resources

The consultants will make use of at least the following documents:

- policy documents of the Dutch government, including the Protracted Crisis Call documents
- Project documents of local partners
- Consolidated reports for the programme over 2014, 2015, as well as quarterly reports of partners and country offices for 2016
- Baseline data, SWIS web based information on Self Help Groups, Monitoring data; ToC developed
- Case studies being developed by partner organisations on specific themes (expected ready November 2016)
- Report strategic partnership cooperation Tear and partners, Learning loop consultancy, October 2015
- Specific research implemented during the course of the programme:
 - Increasing resilience of local farmers through financial self-help groups in the Wolayta Zone in Ethiopia, Anika Quist, Van Hall Larenstein (June 2015)
 - Review of M&E in the SHG/FS programme, Robert Scofield, external consultant (November 2015)

- o The contribution of Self-Help Groups in the Horn of Africa to a range of outcomes, Wouter Rijnveld, Resultante (January 2016)
- o Tools for measuring impact of self-help groups on food and nutrition security: the case of Tearfund Horn of Africa and EKHC, Lianne Vreugdenhil, Van Hall Larenstein (April 2016)
- o Drought, Resilience and Self Help Groups in Ethiopia, Fiona Meehan, Tufts University (June 2016)
- o Savings and Self Help Groups in Ethiopia: A review of programming by five NGOs, Julie Lawson etc., ODI, (September 2016)
- o The influence of Self Help Groups on Food Security in Yirgachefe, Ethiopia, Iris Mooiweer, Wageningen University (August 2016)
- o Resilience pathways for SHGs, ODI study to be confirmed (December 2016)
- o Psychosocial effects of SHG membership, Trinity College Ireland, to be confirmed (December 2016)
- o Quick scan on the delivery of Cash through SHGs during emergencies, to be confirmed (January 2016)

9. Assessment Criteria

A common scoring system is used to assess the contribution to programme performance against the OECD-DAC criteria for all Tear / Tearfund evaluations:

0	1	2	3	4
Low or no visible contribution to this criteria	Some evidence of contribution to this criteria but significant improvement required	Evidence of satisfactory contribution to this criteria but requirement for continued improvement	Evidence of good contribution to this criteria but with some areas for improvement remaining	Evidence that the contribution is strong and/or exceeding that which was expected of the intervention