

## EAST AFRICA FUND EVALUATION

### RESTORING LIVELIHOODS AMIDST CLIMATE CHANGE AND CONFLICT

#### Terms of reference

##### Background

A severe drought hit parts of Ethiopia, Somalia and Kenya in 2021 and 2022, with more than 20 million people suffering from acute food insecurity. Below average harvests, death of livestock, rising prices of food and fuel on international markets and macro-economic disturbances contributed to a spike in food prices. Millions of people could not access enough water for drinking, cooking and cleaning. The drought increased the incidence of disease and had devastating consequences for the health of affected communities. There were alarming levels of malnutrition among women and children.

Close to ten million livestock, which pastoralist families rely upon for sustenance and livelihoods, died across the region. As more than one million families left their homes in search for food, pasture and alternative livelihoods, inter-communal conflict increased and the pressure on already limited basic services grew more severe.

In late 2023 and early 2024, several zones in the three countries that were still reeling from the drought suffered devastating floods, further weakening the resilience of the affected communities. The Horn of Africa is one of the most climate-vulnerable regions in the world and the population often lacks the resources to adapt to an increasingly inhospitable environment. As climate change progresses, many will find it more and more difficult to achieve recovery after climatic shocks and to adapt to chronic crises.

The shortage of food and water, loss of assets, displacements and health crisis resulting from the catastrophic climate events and conflict in the region between 2021 and 2023 constituted a multidimensional shock. Actions were needed to support individuals and households to recover from it, to build longer-term resilience and to enhance the capacity to adapt to climate change.

##### Swiss Solidarity response to the drought and conflict-related crisis in East Africa

To respond to the drought and food deficits, Swiss Solidarity launched an appeal for donations in April 2022 and collected more than CHF 15 million. The fund has been supporting projects in the zones most affected by food insecurity in Somalia, Ethiopia and Kenya. A total of 32 projects received funding, of which 9 are still active as of August 2024. All funds have now been allocated. Swiss Solidarity partner NGOs have implemented projects either directly, in collaboration with local partners or with mixed modalities.

Multipurpose cash assistance was a major component in many projects, accounting for approximately 40% of total programming in terms of funding volume, followed by food security and health services with about 20% each and livelihoods recovery and WASH (water, sanitation and hygiene) with about 10% each. However, many projects had an integrated multisectoral approach.

##### Purpose of the evaluation

The evaluation will review the livelihood and food security recovery activities (projects or project components) funded in the framework of this response. Learnings from the evaluation should inform future livelihood and food security programming in this and other contexts. The ultimate goal is for future interventions to become more effective and context-specific and better anchored in the needs and preferences of the affected people.

## Scope

This evaluation focuses on the following projects funded by Swiss Solidarity which were or are seeking to restore the livelihoods and re-establish the food security of the affected people:

Organisation	Country	Title	From	To	Budget	Contribution
Helvetas	Ethiopia	Emergency and recovery for Women Pastoralists in Borana (ERWoP – Borana)	01.11.22	28.02.23	303,447	262,559
Caritas	Ethiopia	Immediate Recovery of Drought Affected Communities	01.11.22	31.05.23	780,487	300,000
ADRA	Somalia	Drought Emergency and Early Recovery (DEER)	01.12.22	31.05.23	356,943	285,395
Vétérinaires sans Frontières	Kenya	Emergency food security and livelihoods support for vulnerable drought affected pastoralists	01.02.23	31.08.23	562,520	495,000
Vétérinaires sans Frontières	Somalia	Emergency Lifesaving and Livelihoods Protection Project	01.05.23	31.03.24	909,399	800,000
Vétérinaires sans Frontières	Ethiopia	Borana Drought Response	01.05.23	31.12.23	892,076	761,284
Save the Children	Kenya	Improving nutrition security and resilience of drought affected communities through disaster risk reduction and economic recovery	01.11.23	31.10.24	340,909	300,000
Vétérinaires sans Frontières	Somalia	Emergency Lifesaving and Livelihood Support to Vulnerable IDPs and Host Communities Affected by Floods	01.01.24	30.06.24	466,261	408,387
Vétérinaires sans frontières	Ethiopia	Emergency Response for Flood-Affected Communities	01.03.24	31.08.24	345,054	300,000
Swissaid	Kenya	Strengthening vulnerable Community Seed Banks for emergency preparedness, response and recovery	01.06.24	31.05.26	329,991	290,390
CBM	Kenya	Turkana Inclusive Livelihood and Resilience Program	01.03.24	30.06.25	610,235	299,972

For access and security reasons, the evaluators may choose to exclude field visits to some projects.

## Evaluation questions

### *Effectiveness*

1. Did the projects effectively support individuals and households to improve their access to food in the short to medium-term? In particular:
  - Was the specific support to agropastoral activities leading to improvements of food security outcomes?
  - Had the unconditional cash transfers that were carried out alongside livelihood interventions a bridging function until income from the recovery of agropastoral activities or from business activities was available?
2. Did the projects effectively support individuals, households and communities to recover from the shocks and improve their livelihood outcomes?



- Did the projects sufficiently assist new entrepreneurs and community initiatives to overcome the barriers they faced, such as the lack of information, limited access to resources (capital and/or agricultural inputs) and disrupted social networks?
- Has business skills training translated into income?
- 3. What were the factors of success for financial inclusion programmes (such as saving and lending associations) to result in household resilience and food security?
- 4. What were the factors of success for agricultural support programmes (such as agricultural inputs distributions, training on sustainable agricultural practices and land restoration) to result in household resilience and food security?
- 5. What were the factors of success for pastoral support programmes (such animal feed distribution, veterinary services provision and restocking) to result in household resilience and food security?

#### *Relevance*

- 6. How did the new businesses/community initiatives consider, integrate or affect local value chains, food systems and markets?
- 7. Did the projects consider that they operated in contexts where extreme poverty is systemic and climate shocks recurrent and prolonged? Depending on the projects:
  - What were the limits to financial inclusion activities?
  - What were the limits to agropastoral support activities?
- 8. Did livelihood-focused projects consider the differentiated capacities of the targeted persons to create viable businesses? Were the specific barriers that specific target groups, such as women or persons with disabilities, face in developing livelihood strategies taken into account? How could this be improved in future programming?

#### *Economic sustainability*

- 9. Are the diversified livelihoods still pursued beyond the support from the projects? What proportion is discontinued? Depending on the projects:
  - Are VSLA/self-help groups still functional? Has any of them managed to sell foodstuffs commercially?
  - Are the seed banks functioning? Has local seed production increased?
  - Are the restored irrigation schemes still functional?
  - Has the health of cattle improved? Has milk production increased?
- 10. When participants received inputs, have they been able to maintain their resources?
- 11. Does the degree to which outcomes are sustained differ for women and men?

#### **Methodology**

The evaluator(s) are expected to use mixed methods, including:

- A review of the project documentation (funding application, reports)
- Desk research that includes a review of existing literature and reports resulting from beneficiary accountability initiatives and available evaluations
- Project visits and interviews with affected people, project staff, local authorities, aid coordination bodies, local thematic experts and other relevant stakeholders
- Quantitative surveys, to complement the qualitative fieldwork

Bids are required to propose and to justify a methodology and a sequence of activities. The selected evaluator(s) are then expected to present a detailed methodology as part of an inception report.



## Outputs

The evaluators are expected to produce the following outputs in line with agreed deadlines:

- An inception report
- A draft evaluation report
- A final evaluation report
- A presentation to Swiss Solidarity and its partners (possibly as part of a wider learning event to be confirmed).

## Steps and deliverables

### 1. Desk study of project documentation

The evaluators will have access to the project files. SwS staff will be available for further guidance, information and discussions.

### 2. Inception report

The inception report will include the following elements:

- The final list of projects to be considered
- The evaluation workplan (timeline)
- An evaluation matrix setting out: the subsidiary evaluation questions; the criteria used for assessing the questions; the planned sources for the necessary data and the methods used to collect the data
- The detailed methodology that the evaluators plan to use
- An analysis of the risks inherent in the proposed methodology, as well as the broader risks that the evaluation may face
- The planned structure of the evaluation report

### 3. Field visits and data gathering

The SwS partners and their local partners (if any) that implement the projects will assist with information, data and interactions with project staff. Within a reasonable scope, they also are expected to assist with local transport including site visits. The evaluators are expected to be autonomous regarding their accommodation arrangements and their security management.

### 4. Draft evaluation report

The draft evaluation report will be of no more than 20 pages plus annexes. The report's writing style should be accessible and suitable for humanitarian professionals.

The report should include a list of recommendations, categorized according to priority (high, mid, low). Such recommendations may go beyond the scope of the evaluation questions laid out above and hence relate to any of the OECD DAC evaluation criteria.

The draft will be reviewed by the Swiss Solidarity programme manager who will provide comments to the evaluators, particularly as regards accuracy and communication style.



## 5. Final evaluation report

After receiving initial feedback on the draft report, the evaluator(s) will prepare a final evaluation report incorporating those comments that they accept.

The final report should include a one-page summary drafted in accessible language suitable for a general public.

## 6. Presentation of results to Swiss Solidarity partners

The evaluators will present and discuss the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation at two sharing and learning events, one in Switzerland and one in Addis Abeba or Nairobi (format to be defined).

### The evaluation team

The evaluation team will consist of a team leader and one or several team members.

The evaluation leader is expected to

- have significant experience of humanitarian evaluation using a range of methods
- have excellent writing skills in English
- have an extensive experience of the context

The team as a whole should have

- strong experience in East Africa and detailed context knowledge
- strong expertise in qualitative methods and ability to analyse quantitative and qualitative data
- experience in and knowledge of livelihood and food security interventions
- experience and knowledge in economic and environmental sustainability issues
- experience and knowledge in gender and inclusion approaches
- good presentation and communication skills for the purposes of the sharing/learning event

### Evaluation management arrangements

This is an independent evaluation. The evaluation team will keep SwS informed of any threats to the independence of the evaluation.

#### a. Evaluation manager

The evaluation will be managed by a steering committee formed by staff from the programme department in SwS.

#### b. Technical backstopping

A technical expert from the SwS project commission will be called upon to advise the steering committee. The expert will provide recommendations on the evaluation process and outputs.

#### c. Reference group

A reference group will be drawn from operational and evaluation staff of SwS partner NGOs that are active in East Africa. The group will discuss and provide comments on the inception report and on the draft evaluation report and make recommendations to the steering committee. The final decisions on the outputs rest with the steering committee.

### Insurance and security

The evaluators are responsible for their own insurance coverage and security management.



## Communication

The results of this evaluation are meant to be accessible to the public. However, the mention of individual partners and projects or details that allow to identify individuals, partners or projects is being avoided if it is not relevant for the understanding of the evaluation's results.

SwS may be conducting communication activities highlighting examples of the results and the impact of the foundation's work. The evaluation leader or a member of the team is expected to provide input to such communication activities in terms of their time, up to a maximum of one working day, to be interviewed as needed. During such media interviews the evaluators are expected to retain their independence and to be frank and truthful in any interviews that they give. There is no expectation that they will present anything else than an accurate picture of what the evaluation found.

The final evaluation report will be published in English.

## Volume of work

We expect the work to be completed within 50 to 70 days, between October 2024 and April/May 2025.

## Timeline

The following broad timeline is proposed for the process:

Publication of call for expressions of interest	September 2024
Recruitment of the evaluators	October 2024
Initial document review and desk research	November 2024
Inception report	November 2024
Fieldwork/survey	November to February 2024
First draft of evaluation report	3 March 2025
Final version of evaluation report	14 April 2025
Sharing and learning events	April – May 2025

## Bid instructions

Bidders should submit the following:

1. A letter confirming that the bidder has contacted the proposed team member(s) and that they can carry out the evaluation in the timeframe given in the ToR. The letter should also indicate the bidding company or group's experience with evaluations of this type.
2. A short (no more than two page) proposal on the methodology
3. A budget (in Swiss Francs) for the evaluation, setting out the full cost of the evaluation. This should include:
  - a. The daily cost and number of days (by task) for each expert
  - b. The daily cost and number of days for other personnel (if required)
  - c. The costs of per diems by location and number of days
  - d. The costs related to the quantitative survey (if subcontracted to a survey firm)
  - e. All other costs for the evaluation (the team will be responsible for their own transport, accommodation and security management)



The costs of hosting the sharing and learning events will be covered directly by Swiss Solidarity and are not part of the evaluation budget.

4. CVs for the proposed team members (no longer than 4 pages per CV)
5. A table showing which of the team members meet the skill requirements (see chapter “evaluation team”: please use scores (0 - no experience, 1 - some experience, 2 - significant experience, 3 - very significant experience)
6. Two examples (or links to examples) of reports drafted by the team leader
7. Two examples of previous evaluations managed by the bidding company or group (if applicable)

In the event of the score of two or more of the highest tenderers being close, a second stage is foreseen. Short-listed tenderers may then be asked to submit a more detailed methodology proposal.

The final selection will be made after interviews.

### Assessment criteria

Aspect	Criteria	Points
Team leader	Significant experience of humanitarian evaluation using a range of methods	15
	Excellent writing skills in English	10
Whole team	Detailed knowledge and a thorough understanding of the context in East Africa	10
	Expertise and technical background in livelihood and food security programming	15
	Expertise and technical background in economic and environmental sustainability issues	10
	Experience and expertise in gender and inclusion approaches	5
	Ability to analyse quantitative and qualitative data	5
Methodology	Extent to which the proposed methodology is fit for the purpose of responding to the evaluation questions	15
Price	Score = $15 \times (1 - (\text{this bid} - \text{cheapest bid}) / (\text{most expensive bid} - \text{cheapest bid}))$	15
	Maximum possible score	100

### Submission of offers

Bids should be submitted by 17h00 (Geneva time) on 8 October 2024 to [jobs@swiss-solidarity.org](mailto:jobs@swiss-solidarity.org).

