

Term of Reference
Evaluation of the Cash-Transfer-programming:

**“Improving the economical relations between the local host communities
and refugees
in Dadaab, Kenya**

1) Introduction

Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe in cooperation with the Kenya/Djibouti programme of the Lutheran World Federation is implementing a Cash Transfer Project in the refugee camp complex in Dadaab, Kenya. The project is running from 01st October 2015 to 30th September 2018.

The commissioning organisations:

Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe is the humanitarian assistance agency of the Protestant Churches in Germany with headquarters in Berlin. Through its partner organisations, Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe provides humanitarian aid worldwide. It supports people who have fallen victim of natural disasters, war and displacement and who are not able to cope on their own in the emergency situation they find themselves in. For the past 5 years, Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe has progressively carried out Cash Transfer Programming, where local markets and operational contexts allow to do so. Already in 2015, the organisation has provided more than 14% of our total contributions through Cash Transfers. In line with the commitments made at the World Humanitarian Summit, Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe is committed to further strengthen the use of CTP in its humanitarian responses.

Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe has invested in people, systems, procedures and ongoing institutional learning to absorb the increased use of Cash Transfer Programming while upholding quality. To achieve this we work in close partnership with CaLP (the Cash Learning Partnership) and through the ACT Alliance network.

The Lutheran World Federation (LWF) is an International Non-Governmental Organization working in Dadaab Refugee operation providing humanitarian and assistance services to refugees in the areas of Community services, Education and sustainable livelihoods projects. LWF World service is working in all the 4 camps namely Hagadera, Ifo1, Ifo2 and Dagahaley. The BMZ/DKH is a three- year project and implemented by LWF world service. The project started in October 2015 and is expected to end in September 2018. LWF World Service as an implementing partner intends to carry out end of project evaluation for the project: *Improve the Economic Relation between the Local Host Communities and Refugee in Dadaab Kenya.*

Aim of the Evaluation

To conduct an in-depth appraisal of the project to enable Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe and other stakeholders to learn from evidence-based information about the project and ensure accountability. The key findings will also inform the senior management in decision making with regards to the design and improvement of future, similar projects.

The project

The Dadaab Refugee Complex is located in an area classified as arid and that does not generally permit large scale food production through agri-, or horticulture. The communities living around the camp are predominantly pastoralist and nomadic. Most of the vegetables and fruits consumed in Dadaab are transported from other parts of the country. Due to this the demand, and thus supply, for fresh food is limited.

Refugees are the majority of the persons residing in and around Dadaab, but most refugees have no sustainable sources of regular income and most households lose out on the health benefits associated with the consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables. The lack of income among the majority of the residents and the associated lack of choice contribute to limiting the demand for fresh food. Most refugees rely to a large extent (or fully) on the food provided by World Food Program (WFP) through twice weekly distributions of dry food rations.

Whereas there seems to be vast land available, the perennial water problems, harsh climatic conditions and the pastoralist nature of the host community combine to make any agricultural activities difficult. This is a major obstacle in attaining food diversity and fresh food for both refugees and host community.

The food rations offered during general food distribution does not include fresh foods (such as fruits and vegetables). This has a negative impact on all but especially on refugees who *entirely* depend on the WFP food basket and on persons with specific needs (including persons with disabilities (PWDs), children and the elderly).

According to an assessment carried out by LWF in Dadaab in March 2015, 18% of the WFP rations are re-sold or barter traded among refugees and to the host community in the Hagadera market. This is done to acquire other preferred food items such as vegetables and fruits. Selling or trading food for other desired goods, such as sugar, tea, clothes, and other items also occur. This type of trade only benefits the traders from the host community since refugees have very limited or no bargaining power in such exchanges. This is especially true for refugees with specific needs, who have no other source of income than selling or trading part of the food rations.

The general lack of livelihood opportunities and scarcity of resources in Dadaab often result in conflict between refugees and members of the host community. A common perception among members of the host community is that refugees are getting “*full humanitarian aid*” whereas some host community members who are living near the camps can’t access adequate food or water supply. Some host community members have therefore also registered themselves as refugees in an attempt to benefit from aid, particularly food distribution.

In the aim to improve the economic and social relations between the refugee and host community, the project has opted to promote the market linkages for social and economic integration between refugees and host communities people by address the demand side, assuming that the local community are known to be entrepreneurial and skilled business people.

The project targets a total 17,590 individuals (direct beneficiaries) out of which 17,530 are refugees in Hagadera refugee camp and initially Kambioos Refugee camp

before it was closed. 60 are host community members who will benefit as vendors and 17 are refugees recruited as project facilitators.

The project is financed by the special initiative of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ): “Tackling the *root causes* of displacement, reintegrating refugees”. The funds are channelled through “Brot für die Welt - Bread for the World”, the sister organisation of “Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe”. Both organisations are part of the “Protestant Agency for Diakonie and Development”, located in Berlin, Germany.

A general food distribution project *Bamba Chakula* by WFP in partnership with World Vision is also under implementation. *Bamba Chakula* allows refugees to buy food that is not given at distribution centres such as meat, milk, fruits and vegetables. With *Bamba Chakula*, refugees have more choices and control over what they want.

2) Cause and objective of the evaluation

The evaluation will be an end-of-project evaluation and is mandatory. A mid-term evaluation has been carried out in July 2017. The report is available. It will likely inform future project designs for the area as well as identify some best practices and lessons learnt for DKH in general.

The purpose of the evaluation is:

- Have recommendations of mid-term evaluations been translated into action
- Has the response has been relevant to the humanitarian needs of the refugees in Kambioos and Hagadera camps within the Dadaab camp complex
- To assess and report on the performance and results achieved (intended or unintended, positive and negative) of the project against the OECD DAC criteria
- Identify best practice and lessons learnt, with particular focus on the modality, transfer mechanism, accountability to beneficiaries as well as the social cohesion between host community (traders) and the refugee population (direct beneficiaries)

Though it is not planned for now to extend the project or set up a follow-up project, the results will be valuable for Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe and LWF in the first place to understand if the cash transfer programming has been successful and how and where the approach can be transferred to other contexts.

3) Key questions

RELEVANCE (Are we doing the right thing?)

- Areas for analysis will include the extent to which the objectives, targeting, choice of activities, transfer modalities (as well as conditionality and restrictions) and mechanisms:
 - were appropriate to the needs of the target population (What are the top needs of the Somali refugees and host community/ vendors and were the cash expenditure aligning with those needs)
 - were coherent with relevant stated national policies, including sector policies and strategies
 - Were aligned with the priorities of Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe and LWF?
 - were aligned with the priorities of the donor’s (BMZ) funding programme: “Tackling the root causes of displacement, reintegrating refugees” - action

- field 2 aiming to mitigate conflicts between host and refugee communities and tapping into the economical potential of refugees
- Beneficiaries' feedback and how the feedback received through current monitoring and mid-term evaluation has been processed and resulted in adjustments to the project
 - level of ownership among beneficiaries (refugees and traders)
 - Were there any deliberate actions taken to reduce risks of illegal diversion, insecurity, inflation, of the restricted voucher modality accessed?

EFFECTIVENESS (Are the objectives of the project being achieved?)

- Has the project been effective in achieving the intended outputs, objectives and outcomes which are:
 - Development goal: To improve the food supply for refugees with special needs and to improve economic relations between host and refugee community in Dadaab
 - Project objectives:
 - Fresh food will be available in the camps in Hagadera and Kambioos
 - The food situation of refugees with special needs has improved
- What were the major factors (Both internal and external) influencing the achievement or non - achievement of the outputs, outcomes/objectives of the intervention?
- Have the beneficiaries' sufficient awareness of fresh food (there might be vegetables and fruits available in the market now that were not sold before the CTP intervention) and sufficient knowledge about a balanced diet and vitamin-preserving and hygienic way of preparation to improve their nutrition status?

EFFICIENCY (Have the objectives been achieved in an economically viable manner?)

- Has the project been efficient in achieving the intended objectives and outputs?
- Were the activities implemented in the most efficient way (cash, mobile transfers) compared to alternative modalities or transfer mechanism?
- Was the budget and available financial resources realistic for the achievement of the intended objectives and outputs?
- Has there been enough time allowed for the achievement of the intended objectives and outputs?
- Is there enough staff, of appropriate competency, for the achievement of the intended objective and outputs?
- Are there appropriate financial systems in place?
- Are there appropriate logistics system, monitoring and HR system in place?
- Was the selected service provider good value for money?
- How effective were the communication plans with the vendors, beneficiaries and other stakeholders?
- Is there an appropriate system of management and communication in place to support staff?
- Is new learning being captured and acted upon during implementation? If yes, how and what? If no, why not?

IMPACT (Did the project contribute to a positive change / avert negative change)

- What evidence is there of the impact that the project has had to date on refugees with special needs, women, the relations between the refugee and the host communities and the local economy? Which changes are evident and attributable to the project?
- What psychological effects has the response had (e.g. do beneficiaries feel dignified, empowered, trusted and respected due to cash)
- Does the review team observe any unintended changes or side-effects, positive or negative that have stemmed from the project? (e.g. explore household or community tensions due to receiving/ not receiving cash as well as decision making authority in the household), please also explore whether there were unintended results around security to do with cash for beneficiaries
- Particularly, are there positive or negative changes in the host community and refugee relations which are attributable to the project?
- Have any changes occurred or lessons learnt on the collaboration with the service provider?
- Was the voucher value sufficient to boost the demand side an extent that it has had an impact on the economical relations between refugees and host communities?
- Was the voucher value sufficient from the beneficiaries' perspective to cover their specific food needs, also in relation to market price fluctuations?

COVERAGE AND STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES (incl protection concerns)

- Who was supported by the humanitarian interventions? Which groups were taken into account and which not?
- Was the project response well coordinated and aligned to technical guidance of the cash working group?
- Was the project well coordinated with other NGOs implementing cash in Dadaab and where lessons learnt from previous, similar responses been taken into consideration?
- Is the project reaching the key groups who are at greatest risk? Have all of those in need of protection received protection during the interventions?
- What do the beneficiaries think of the project? Its relevance, appropriateness and outcomes? What would they like to see differently?
- Do beneficiaries find the vulnerability criteria fair and transparent (do they know why they were selected)? Are any groups missed out in their opinion?
- What is the perspective of other primary and secondary stakeholders (e.g. camp management, staff, Cash working group, Service Provider, community leadership, local government officials, UN)? Are the most vulnerable being reached?
- Are there appropriate systems of downwards accountability (participation, information sharing and feedback) that beneficiaries are using? How was the beneficiaries' feedback taken into consideration?

CONNECTIVENESS/ Sustainability (Are project activities carried out in a context that takes longer-term and interconnected problems into account?)

- Which positive changes will have a lasting effect?
- To what extent have relationships between host community and refugees changed?
- To what extent has there been a multiplier effect of beneficiaries spending funds with selected local vendors and shops? How has the additional business contributed to the sustainability of local business?
- What success factors and challenges have emerged from the collaboration of NGO and the financial service provider? Did sustainable aspects emerge from this collaboration, or the use of the transfer mechanism?
- Has the use of technology resulted in particularly sustainable aspects attributable to the project?
- Has the project had a sustainable impact on the market?
- Were there any deliberate actions taken to reduce risks of inflation?

Focus on Key Lessons Learnt and recommendations

- Could the approach be replicated in other camps, in other contexts (f.i. returnees in Somalia)?
- What must be in place to ensure that the project results can last over the project running time?
- How could the approach be used in other interventions to serve nutrition, health and protection needs?
- Would CTP be appropriate not only for complementary food, but for the whole food basket? If so, what must be in place?

4) Principles for Evaluation

When evaluating programmes and projects it is useful to consider the OECD. The following further explains the criteria and provides some sample questions to illustrate how they may be used in practice:

- What do the partners consider to be the critical issues for future support and moving from immediate response to recovery?
- How are other actors responding and relating to [NGO NAME] and its partner's response?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?

5) Evaluation design/methods

- Desk review of secondary data (proposals, progress reports and mid-term evaluation and previous studies)
- Review of finance documents and budget
- Compare the project documents with relevant and guiding documents of the Cash Working Group
- Key Informant Interviews with regional teams, advisers and project officers and partner staff
- Focus Group Discussions with beneficiaries (incl disaggregation by gender)
- Visits to selected project sites

- Key Informant Interviews with other stakeholders (e.g. local authorities and camp management, donors, other NGOs, UN, Cash Working group, OCHA, non-beneficiaries)
- Sharing of initial findings and learning with regional team and partners in country

6) **Time Frame**

The broad and general timelines for the exercise are provided below. The exact dates of each activity shall be discussed during kick off and clarification meeting:

- 1-15 June 2018: Obtaining offers
- 16-23 June 2018: Selecting evaluators
- 24-30 June 2018: Concluding the contract
- 1-7 July 2018: Kick off and clarification meeting
- 8-14 July 2018: Inception report (to discuss the draft report) within seven days after commencement of the exercise
- 15-20 July 2018: Debriefing/Presentation of results
- 20-30 July 2018: Assessment of the final report

7) **Expected products**

- Inception report
- Presentation of the main results and key lessons learned for future CTP interventions at a workshop in Nairobi
- Final report incl separate Executive summary not exceeding 12 pages
- Brochure presenting key lessons learnt and recommendations on mobile cash transfer in a camp context
- 4 case studies (incl photos in Jpeg) to be produced to demonstrate project impact for a) beneficiaries (2) and b) traders (2) to follow the DKH Case study guidelines template.
- Another case study to be produced to highlight successful collaboration between DKH, LWF and Service Provider with specific success factors, as well as recommendations.

8) **Content of evaluator's offer**

- CV of all evaluators involved
 - a) University degree, preferably Master's Degree (for individual consultant) and has qualified staffs with similar educational level to be engaged in the review/evaluation (for consulting firm). The consultancy firm must have substantive experience of 7 years and more in project evaluation and reporting preferably on Food Security and Livelihoods
 - b) A maximum of one and half pages Expression of Interest outlining the understanding of the TORs
 - c) A detailed activities schedule/work plans with time frames.
 - d) A profile of the consultant ,copies of CVs for the lead consultant(s) and the supporting team outlining who will undertake the different roles within the assignment if applicable
 - e) Description of at least 3 relevant examples of recent work

- f) At least one referee for whom the consultant has carried out similar work(stating the organization, assignment undertaken, date and duration, contact person's name, email address and contact number)
 - Short explanation and justification of the methods to be deployed
 - Financial proposal
 - a) The consultant should indicate the consultancy fees for the evaluation
 - b) Provide breakdown of additional chargeable expenses including field work related costs and other administrative cost
 - c) Note that transport to and accommodations within the camp and field will be provided and arranged by LWF World Service Dadaab.
 - Submission deadline is 08 June 2018
 - Applications should be sent by email to lwf.nbi.kenya@gmail.com with the words EVALUATION "IMPROVING THE ECONOMICAL RELATIONS BETWEEN THE LOCAL HOST COMMUNITIES AND REFUGEES IN DADAAB, KENYA" as the email title.
- Any additional clarification on the consultancy should be addressed to Program Manager- LWF World Service, Kenya-Djibouti Program Email: pro.ken@lwfdws.org