

Terms of Reference

An evaluation of the effects, and a cost benefit Analysis, of GFD Cash Modality scale up for the refugees and host community in Kakuma and Dadaab Camp

WFP Kenya office

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Reasons for the Evaluation	1
2.1 Rationale.....	1
2.2. Objectives	1
2.3. Stakeholders and Users	2
3. Context and Subject of the Evaluation	4
3.1. Context.....	4
3.2. Subject of the evaluation	5
4. Evaluation Approach	6
4.1. Scope	6
4.2. Evaluation Criteria and Questions.....	6
4.3. Data availability.....	8
4.4. Methodology	9
4.5. Quality Assurance.....	9
5. Phases and Deliverables.....	10
6. Organization of the Evaluation.....	11
6.1. Evaluation Conduct.....	11
6.2. Team composition and competencies	11
6.3. Security Considerations.....	12
7. Roles and Responsibilities of Stakeholders	12
8. Communication and budget	14
8.1. Communication	14
Annexes.....	15
Annex 1: Evaluation Schedule	15
Annex 2 : M&E plan	17

1. Introduction

1. These Terms of Reference (TOR) are for evaluation and a cost benefit analysis of the World Food Programme's (WFP's) Cash Based Transfers for PRRO 200737 in Kakuma and Dadaab refugee camps. This evaluation is commissioned by World Food Programme Kenya office, Innovations Unit and will cover period from August 2015 to September 2016. It will **assess the effects of the cash transfer modality as part of the "mixed" food assistance package consisting of both "in kind" and "cash transfers" for the general refugee population on local economies, food & nutrition security, income and social aspects for both refugees and host community**. It will also assess how scaling up of cash transfers affects the net distribution of costs & benefits and develop a model that will help WFP determine the most effective and efficient mix between food and cash, given available resources.
2. This TOR was prepared and finalised by a WFP Kenya Internal Evaluation Committee based on a document review and the report on a proposed design of the evaluation that was compiled by an independent team. The purpose of the TOR is two-fold. Firstly, to provide key information to the evaluation team to help guide them throughout the evaluation process; and secondly, to provide key information to stakeholders about what can be expected from the evaluation.

2. Reasons for the evaluation

3. The reasons for the evaluation being commissioned are presented below:

2.1. Rationale

4. This evaluation follows an independent assessment conducted in August 2015 to design the methodology and tools for this evaluation. It is being commissioned for the following reason:

It is the first time WFP Kenya is scaling up the use of cash transfer modality to reach the entire refugee population in both Dadaab and Kakuma through a substitution of a % of the cereal ration with cash. The effects of this scale up need to be assessed and documented. In addition, WFP requires a model that will help determine the most effective and efficient mix between food in-kind and Cash, given available resourcing. As at the design stage of the programme, WFP committed to evaluations during the implementation period and at the end of the programme for both learning and accountability purposes. For this reason, WFP is commissioning an evaluation to assess the effects of cash transfers 12 months after the first transfer was done.

2.2. Objectives

5. The main objectives of this evaluation is to assess and report on the effects (intended or unintended, positive and negative) of cash transfer modality of the GFD activity of PRRO 200737. The evaluation will assess and report on the results achieved so far based on the activity log frame. The evaluation shall focus on local economies, food & nutrition security, income and social aspects for both refugees and host community. It will also assess how scaling up of cash transfers affects the net distribution of costs and benefits of both host and refugee community and develop a model that will help WFP determine the most effective and efficient mix between "in kind" food assistance

and “cash”, given available resources. This evaluation serves the dual and mutually reinforcing objectives of accountability and learning.

Accountability – The evaluation will assess and report on the performance and results of the GFD activity after introduction of cash transfer modality.

Learning – The evaluation will determine the reasons why certain effects occurred or not in order to draw lessons and derive good practices. It will provide evidence-based findings to inform operational and strategic decision-making for the ongoing programme. This evaluation will therefore give more weight to learning. Findings will be actively disseminated and lessons will be incorporated into relevant lesson sharing systems.

The specific objectives are to:

- Determine the effect of the change in transfer modality (combination of in-kind and cash) on the local economies, livelihoods ,health, Education, food and nutrition security, employment opportunities and relations between camp and host communities, and communities within the camps and general relationship between men, women, boys and girls in these communities
- Determine the reasons for observed effects and draw lessons to produce evidence-based findings that will allow the CO and other programmes to make informed decisions about change in transfer modality and transfer value
- Determine the ability of local markets and specifically the select traders to supply the populations in and around the camps with quality food at reasonable prices with increase in transfer value
- Assess how scaling up of cash transfers affects the net distribution of costs and benefits in all groups including refugee, traders and host community with particular consideration to vulnerable groups
- Develop a model that will help WFP determine the most effective and efficient mix between food and cash, given available resources and recommend possible synergies with other actors in the use of cash based interventions.
- Assess the efficiency of the cash delivery mechanism

2.3. Stakeholders and Users

6. **Stakeholders:** A number of stakeholders both inside and outside of WFP have interests in the results of the evaluation. Most of these were involved during the first phase where an independent assessment was commissioned to develop a methodology for the evaluation. Some will be asked to play a role in the evaluation process. Table 1 below provides a preliminary stakeholder analysis, which should be deepened by the evaluation team as part of the evaluation during the inception phase.
7. **Accountability to affected populations:** WFP is committed to include beneficiaries as key stakeholders in its work. WFP is especially committed to ensuring gender equality, inclusiveness and women’s empowerment in the evaluation process, with participation and consultation in the evaluation by women, men, boys and girls from different groups i.e nationalities, age, refugee and host communities etc.

Table 1: Preliminary Stakeholders’ analysis

Stakeholders	Interest in the evaluation and likely uses
INTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS	
Country Office (CO) Kenya	Responsible for country level planning and operations implementation, It has a direct stake in the evaluation and an interest in learning from experience to inform decision-making, notably related to programme implementation and/or design, country strategy and partnerships. It is also called upon to account to its beneficiaries and partners for performance and results.
Regional Bureau (RB) Nairobi	Responsible for both oversight of COs and technical guidance and support, RB management has an interest in an independent account of operational performance as well as in learning from the evaluation findings to apply this learning to other country offices as well as provide strategic guidance.
WFP HQ	WFP has an interest in the lessons that emerge from evaluations, particularly as they relate to WFP strategies, policies, thematic areas, or delivery modality with wider relevance to WFP programming.
Office of Evaluation (OEV)	OEV has a stake in ensuring that decentralized evaluations deliver quality, useful and credible evaluations. OEV management has an interest in providing decision-makers and stakeholders with independent accountability for results and with learning to inform policy, and strategic and programmatic decision-making. It may use the evaluation/evaluation findings, as appropriate, to feed into evaluation/evaluation syntheses.
WFP Executive Board (EB)	The WFP governing body has an interest in being informed about the effectiveness of WFP operations. This evaluation will not be presented to the EB but its findings may feed into annual syntheses and into corporate learning processes.
EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS	
Beneficiaries	As the ultimate recipients of food assistance, beneficiaries have a stake in WFP determining whether its assistance is appropriate and effective. As such, the level of participation in the evaluation of women, men, boys and girls from different groups will be determined and their respective perspectives will be sought through mixed methods such as Focus Group discussions and household interviews.
Government, National and county levels	Both county and national Government have a direct interest in knowing whether WFP activities in the country are aligned with its priorities, harmonised with the action of other partners and meet the expected results. Issues related to the effects of cash transfer modality will be of particular interest to the County Government of Garissa and Turkana
UN and Development Partners	UNHCR is a direct partner of WFP in the refugee operations. Mandated to protect and assist refugees, UNHCR has a strong interest in ensuring food assistance provided to its persons of concern covers basic needs and is delivered in a fair, transparent and indiscriminate fashion. FAO is interested in the livelihood opportunities for the host community in Kakuma.

NGOs World Vision, NRC, CARE	NGOs are WFP’s partners for the implementation of some activities while at the same time having their own interventions. The results of the evaluation will likely affect future implementation modalities, strategic orientations and partnerships.
Donors; DFID, ECHO, USAID, Germany and others	WFP operations are voluntarily funded by a number of donors. Some of the donors are major proponents of cash while others are currently interested in funding cash related activities. Both of these need good evidence on the effects of cash and the ability of the markets to support the cash modality

3. Context and Subject of the Evaluation

3.1. Context

8. For more than 20 years, WFP has been providing in-kind food rations to refugees and asylum-seekers in Kakuma and Dadaab camps. Through market assessments and monitoring, WFP has gathered evidence that refugees spend on average 60-70 percent of their income to buy meat, milk, vegetables, sugar, and other food not provided by WFP. The known sources of income include remittances, incentive wages, monetization of in-kind food and business activities in the camps. The terms of trade for in-kind food aid are poor, undermining food consumption, particularly in Kakuma where refugees have limited sources of income¹.
9. In 2013, WFP launched a pilot in Dadaab providing vouchers for fresh food (meat, fruit, and vegetables) to pregnant and nursing mothers. The pilot was evaluated in 2014, and results showed that markets were responsive and able to increase supply to meet the new demand generated by the vouchers. Indeed, prices of fresh food dropped during the lifetime of the pilot, and beneficiary satisfaction with the quality and availability of food items was high.
10. The evaluation² also found evidence that the new demand yielded more livelihood opportunities for both the refugee and host community populations; the retail businesses participating in the voucher programme increased their volume of trade, and the number of people they employ.
11. The nutrition outcomes resulting from the FFV pilot were not so clear. Dietary diversity of the pilot group improved only marginally over the lifetime of the pilot. These results may have been affected by other events that reduced food availability and income overall in the camps³. The marginal improvement may also be related to the fact that dietary diversity was already quite good in Dadaab, and improving it further may require other approaches (such as behaviour change communication).
12. Finally, the evaluation found that protection risks identified at the outset of the FFV pilot did not materialize. Stakeholders were particularly concerned that vouchers may cause tension in households, and that women (who typically control utilization of food aid) would lose control over the vouchers, and that men would monetize the

¹ WFP Market Assessment reports

² Fresh Food Vouchers Evaluation report 2014

³ For example, GFD rations were cut by 20% for several months during the pilot, due to a constrained pipeline. Also, WFP introduced biometric ID checks during general food distribution during the pilot period, which decreased the amount of food aid distributed in the camps by another 20%.

vouchers to purchase other (non-food) items undermining household food consumption. There was no evidence of this from the monitoring data, and focus group discussions with women confirmed that they remained in control of the vouchers, used them to buy food, and strongly preferred a cash-based modality to in-kind food aid.

3.2. Subject of the evaluation

13. Under the new phase of the refugee operation (PRRO 200737), WFP is scaling up the use of cash. Unlike the FFV pilot that targeted a specific subset of the population, WFP is now substituting part of the General Food Distribution (GFD) cereal ration—provided to 100% of the camp populations—with an electronic value voucher.⁴ Camp populations at the moment stand at 160,000 in Kakuma, and 276,000 in Dadaab. Kakuma is expected to continue to grow (due to the conflict in South Sudan) and relocation from Dadaab, and Dadaab is expected to continue to shrink, as the Government of Kenya continues to pursue its repatriation activities.
14. Substitution began conservatively, with cash replacing approximately 10% of the cereals ration in August 2015 (valued at USD1/person/month) in Kakuma and January 2016 in Dadaab. This has gradually increased over time as markets adjust to the new demand. The cash is provided through a closed loop system and hence cannot be cashable, but can only be used to purchase food through select and contracted traders. The vouchers will remain part of the GFD ration throughout the 3 years of the PRRO, and WFP aims for substitution to reach at least 30% (approximately USD3/person/month) by mid-2017, the final year of the project.
15. WFP has contracted legitimate food retailers in the camps, to facilitate a competitive market and enhance beneficiaries' bargaining power. A total of 755 traders in Dadaab and 237 in Kakuma that have established food businesses in the camps have been contracted so far. WFP has implemented a “small retailer friendly” procurement process to ensure that the programme is as inclusive as possible, and new businesses have the opportunity to enter the programme. Retailers in the camps are a blend of host community members, and refugees. Wholesalers supplying the camps are invariably from the host community.
16. The cash is delivered using Sure Pay platform that sits on Safaricom's well-known M-Pesa platform. A survey done in November 2014 indicated that 70% of refugee households in the camps own mobile phones. There are 25 M-Pesa agents in Kakuma, and 80 in Dadaab, so it is clear that refugees are already very familiar with the platform. Building on an existing delivery mechanism has proved to be more feasible than introducing something completely new (such as smartcards). In addition to a secure and familiar mechanism for receiving and redeeming vouchers, the advantages of having mobile phones in each household are many: efficient communication with beneficiaries, access for every household to WFP's helpline, and monitoring through mobile phones particularly where WFP's movement in the camps is restricted due to security (such as in Dadaab).

⁴ The government expressed strong reservations about using cash transfers in the camps, so an electronic cash voucher is being used instead.

17. WFP began disbursing “cash” transfers as part of the mix food assistance package in Kakuma in August 2015, and expanded to Dadaab in January 2016. Trader selection took place in Kakuma in April-May 2015, and in Dadaab in August-September.
18. Protection and gender assessments in both camps indicated that introduction of cash has generally improved family relations due to the enabled purchasing power or improved food diversity at household level making men feel less pressured to provide and women more tolerant to their husbands limited income sources. However, effects on decision-making need to be further monitored as there has been an increase in collective decision making as well as men’s interest in household decisions. Introduction of cash was also perceived to have contributed to women’s empowerment because women with small businesses were specifically targeted during the selection of traders, however, their participation and voice in the trader committees need to be enhanced.

4. Evaluation Approach

4.1. Scope

19. This evaluation aims at assessing the effects (intended or unintended, positive and negative) of cash transfer modality of the GFD activity of PRRO 200737 on the local economies, food & nutrition security, income and social aspects for both refugees and host community. It will also assess how scaling up of cash transfers affects the net distribution of costs and benefits and develop a model that will help WFP determine the most effective and efficient mix between food and cash, given available resources. With key consideration on how men, women, boys and girls are affected differently in terms of access to and control over resources as well as decision making at the household and community level.
20. This evaluation will cover the period from August 2015 to September 2016. The evaluation will cover both Kakuma (and Kalobeyei) and Dadaab refugee camps (if the ongoing repatriation exercise and security in Dadaab allows) and the host communities. The evaluation will build on the initial work done by an independent firm to develop the evaluation methodology.

4.2. Evaluation Criteria Questions

21. **Evaluation Criteria** The evaluation will apply international evaluation criteria of Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Impact.⁵ Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (GEEW) shall be mainstreamed throughout.
22. **Evaluation Questions:** The key evaluation Question will be: how does the cash transfer modality affect the net distribution of costs and benefits as it scales up? Specifically
 - How are the costs and benefits distributed across the groups (Refugees, traders and host community and households of different levels of vulnerability in terms of both income, access to vouchers and food markets? ⁶

⁵ For more detail see:

<http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm> and <http://www.alnap.org/what-we-do/evaluation/eha>

⁶ Greater weight should be put in the analysis of effects on refugees

- What is the impact of the cash transfer scheme on the markets?
- What are the likely influence of exogenous factors on the cash transfer scheme?
- What are the most critical potential risk for implementing a cash transfer scheme in a refugee operation?
- How does the cash transfer modality affect the relationships between men, women, boys and girls in the camps; in terms of gender relations, roles, status, inequalities and discrimination in access to and control of resources? Are inequalities in relationships that create the risk of or exacerbate food insecurity reproduced?
- Are the effects different for different groups i.e ages groups, persons with disabilities etc

23. In addition to the above, the evaluation will also address the following key questions (In table below), both of which will be further developed by the evaluation team during the inception phase. Collectively, the questions aim at assessing the effects (intended or unintended, positive and negative) of cash transfer modality of the GFD activity of PRRO 200737 on the local economies, social, food & nutrition security and income aspects for both refugees and host community. It will also assess how scaling up of cash transfers affects the net distribution of costs and benefits and develop a model that will help WFP determine the most effective and efficient mix between food and cash, given available resources .

Criteria	Evaluation Questions
Relevance	To what extent is the change of transfer modality and value in line with the needs of beneficiaries (men, women, boys and girls)? To what extent is this aligned with Government, WFP, partner UN agency and donor policies and priorities?
Effectiveness	Is GFD, with the change of transfer modality and value, achieving its objectives and outcomes of protecting livelihoods in emergencies and stabilized or improved food consumption over assistance period for targeted households and/or individuals respectively? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the outcomes/objectives of the intervention? Are the local markets able to supply the populations in and around the camps with the desired type and quality of food at reasonable prices? What are the net distribution costs and benefits as the transfer value increases?
Efficiency	Are activities cost-efficient?

	<p>Is the cash transfer modality being implemented in the most efficient way? What were the external and internal factors influencing efficiency?</p>
Impact	<p>What were the short- and medium term effects of change in cash transfer modality and value on;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Household' food intake and nutrition • local economies, markets, incomes , employment opportunities and relations between camp and host communities, and communities within the camps <p>What are reasons for observed effects? Are there any negative effects occurring for beneficiaries? What, if any, were the gender-specific effects on participation and influence at household and community level, especially regarding women's empowerment? What are the main drivers of positive impacts?</p>

4.3. Data availability

24. The following are the sources of information available to the evaluation team. The sources provide both quantitative and qualitative information and should be expanded by the evaluation team during the inception phase.

- 2015 Standard Project Reports (SPRs).
- Food Security Outcome Monitoring (FSOM) reports produced 3 times a year
- Kenya PRRO 200174 Operation evaluation (2011-2014)
- M&E and Market price reports
- mVAM monitoring reports
- PRRO 200737 project document and log frame
- M&E plan for the refugee cash scale up
- WFP Strategy for diversifying Food Assistance Transfer Modalities in Kenya Refugee Operation, July 2014
- Report on Design of an Impact Evaluation to evaluate the scaling up of WFP voucher programme in Kakuma and Dadaab, August 2015
- WFP Dadaab and Kakuma Refugee Camps Market assessment, June 2014
- The WFP Kenya “cash transfer module” (CTM)
- The SurePay platform
- Protection and Gender Assessments in Dadaab and Kakuma 2015/2016
- UNHCR Participatory assessment
- DRC market assessment,
- WB studies
- UNHCR/WFP Inspection of biometrics

The scope of this evaluation will include collection of new primary data outside that from the monitoring system and other sources available.

4.4. Methodology

25. A comprehensive approach and methodology that will effectively respond to the ToRs should be elaborated with a strong methodology for a cost benefit analysis. Reference should be made to the study design report proposed by an independent team in 2015

⁷ The methodology should:

- Demonstrate impartiality and lack of biases by relying on a cross-section of information sources (stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries, etc.)
- Use mixed methods (quantitative, qualitative, participatory etc.) to ensure triangulation of information through a variety of means.
- Apply an evaluation/evaluation matrix geared towards addressing the key evaluation questions taking into account the data availability challenges, the budget and timing constraints;
- Ensure through the use of mixed methods that women, girls, men and boys from different stakeholder groups participate and that their different voices are heard and used; and
- Mainstream gender equality and women's empowerment ensuring the data collected and analysis is gender sensitive.

26. Given the broad set of evaluation questions, both qualitative and quantitative approaches should be utilized. The integration of qualitative and quantitative methods would help to achieve a thorough understanding of the design, operational, or contextual factors that may be contributing to the effects of the scale up.

27. Qualitative methods should be used to better understand the knowledge, attitudes, priorities, preferences, and perceptions of target beneficiaries and other stakeholders. Qualitative methods are particularly important for understanding the perceptions and attitudes towards the programme, as well as unexpected direct and indirect impacts on household or community dynamics.

28. Quantitative methods will be used to measure corporate and programme related indicators and will mainly be at household and trader level, using statistically valid sampling

29. Secondary data - e.g. WFP monitoring data on inputs and activities - will be used to complement primary data collected. Data from all sources and methods will be systematically triangulated to verify findings and deepen insights. The qualitative data seeks to deepen the understanding and analysis of the data generated by the other methods and to add substance to the indicators.

4.5. Quality Assurance

30. This evaluation will use the Office of Evaluation's "Evaluation Quality Assurance System" (EQAS). This system defines the quality standards expected from this evaluation and sets out processes with in-built steps for quality assurance, templates for evaluation/evaluation products and checklists for the review thereof. It is based

⁷ Design of an Impact Evaluation to evaluate the scaling up of WFP voucher programme in Kakuma and Dadaab report, August 2015

on the UNEG norms and standards and good practice of the international evaluation community (DAC and ALNAP) and aims to ensure that the evaluation/evaluation process and products conform to best practice and meet OEV's quality standards. EQAS does not interfere with the views and independence of the evaluation team.

31. The evaluation team should be assured of the accessibility of all relevant documentation within the provisions of the directive on disclosure of information. Refer to WFP Directive (#CP2010/001) on Information Disclosure.
32. EQAS should be systematically applied to this evaluation and the evaluation manager will be responsible to ensure that the evaluation progresses is in line with its process steps and to conduct a rigorous quality control of the evaluation products ahead of their submission to WFP.
33. Concerning the quality of data and information, the evaluation team should systematically check accuracy, consistency and validity of collected data and information and acknowledge any limitations/caveats in drawing conclusions using the data.

5. Phases and Deliverables

34. The evaluation will proceed through the 5 following phases. The evaluation schedule (below) provides a detailed breakdown of the proposed timeline for each phase over the full timeframe. A summary of the deliverables and deadlines for each phase are as follows:

Figure 1: Summary Process Map



- i. Preparation phase (August 2016- January 2017): The evaluation manager will conduct background research and consultation to frame the evaluation; prepare the TOR; select the evaluation team and contract the company for the management and conduct of the evaluation.
- ii. Inception phase (February- March 2017): This phase aims to prepare the evaluation team for the evaluation phase by ensuring that it has a good grasp of the expectations for the evaluation and a clear plan for conducting it. The inception phase will include a desk review of secondary data and initial interaction with the main stakeholders (beneficiaries, government, donors, UNHCR, WFP and ERG).
- iii. Evaluation phase (March/April 2017): The fieldwork will span over a month and will include visits to project sites and primary and secondary data collection from local stakeholders. A debriefing session will be held upon completion of the field work.
- iv. Reporting phase (May 2017): The evaluation team will analyse the data collected during the desk review and the field work, conduct additional consultations with stakeholders, as required, and draft the evaluation report. It will be submitted to the evaluation manager for quality assurance. Stakeholders will be invited to

provide comments, which will be recorded in a matrix by the evaluation manager and provided to the evaluation team for their consideration before report finalisation.

- v. Follow-up and dissemination phase: The final evaluation report will be shared with the relevant stakeholders. The management responsible will respond to the evaluation recommendations by providing actions that will be taken to address each recommendation and estimated timelines for taking those actions. The evaluation report will also be subject to external post-hoc quality review to report independently on the quality, credibility and utility of the evaluation in line with evaluation norms and standards. The evaluation report will be published on the WFP public website. Findings will be disseminated and lessons will be incorporated into other relevant lesson sharing systems.

6. Organization of the Evaluation

6.1. Evaluation Conduct

35. The evaluation team will conduct the evaluation under the direction of its team leader and in close communication with the WFP evaluation manager. The team will be hired following agreement with WFP on its composition and in line with the evaluation schedule in Annex 1.

6.2. Team composition and competencies

36. The Team Leader should be a senior researcher with at least 10 years of experience in evaluations, cost benefit analysis and demonstrated expertise in managing multidisciplinary and mixed quantitative and qualitative method studies, complemented with good understanding of cash transfer and refugee programmes and additional significant experience in other development and management positions.
37. The Team leader will also have expertise in designing methodology, data collection tools and demonstrated experience in leading similar studies. She/he will also have leadership and communication skills, including a track record of excellent writing and presentation skills. Her/his primary responsibilities will be: i) defining the evaluation approach and methodology; ii) guiding and managing the team; iii) leading the evaluation mission and representing the evaluation team; iv) drafting and revising, as required, the inception report, exit debriefing presentation and evaluation report.
38. The team must include strong demonstrated knowledge of cost benefit analysis, qualitative and quantitative data and statistical analysis. It should include both women and men and at least one team member should have previous WFP experience.
39. The team will be multi-disciplinary and include members who together include an appropriate balance of expertise and practical knowledge in the following areas:
 - Cash and refugee Programming
 - Economic analysis and statistics

- Gender expertise, food security and nutrition
 - All team members should have strong analytical and communication skills, evaluation experience and familiarity with Kenya or the Horn of Africa.
40. The team members will bring together a complementary combination of the technical expertise required and have a track record of written work on similar assignments.
41. Team members will: i) contribute to the methodology in their area of expertise based on document review; ii) conduct field work; iii) participate in team meetings and meetings with stakeholders; iv) contribute to the drafting and revision of the evaluation products in their technical area(s).

6.3. Security Considerations

42. **Security clearance** where required is to be obtained from WFP Kenya office.
- As an ‘independent supplier’ of evaluation services to WFP, the evaluation company is responsible for ensuring the security of all persons contracted, including adequate arrangements for evacuation for medical or situational reasons. The consultants contracted by the evaluation company do not fall under the UN Department of Safety & Security (UNDSS) system for UN personnel. Consultants hired independently are covered by the UN Department of Safety & Security (UNDSS) system for UN personnel which cover WFP staff and consultants contracted directly by WFP.
 - Independent consultants must obtain UNDSS security clearance for travelling to be obtained from designated duty station and complete the UN system’s Basic and Advance Security in the Field courses in advance, print out their certificates and take them with them.⁸
43. However, to avoid any security incidents, the evaluation Manager is requested to ensure that:
- The WFP CO registers the team members with the Security Officer on arrival in country and arranges a security briefing for them to gain an understanding of the security situation on the ground.
 - The team members observe applicable UN security rules and regulations.
 - The evaluation team will be encouraged to plan their field itinerary in view of the current prevailing security situation of the evaluation sites or points selected.

7. Roles and Responsibilities of Stakeholders

44. The Kenya Country Office:

The Kenya country Office management (Deputy Country director) will take responsibility to:

- Ensure an independent evaluation Manager for the evaluation:
- Compose the internal evaluation committee and the external evaluation reference group

⁸ Field Courses: Basic <https://dss.un.org/bsitf/>; Advanced <http://dss.un.org/asitf>

- Approve the final TOR, inception and evaluation reports.
- Ensure the independence and impartiality of the evaluation at all stages, including establishment of an evaluation Committee and of a Reference Group
- Participate in discussions with the evaluation team on the evaluation design and the evaluation subject, its performance and results with the evaluation Manager and the evaluation team
- Organise and participate in two separate debriefings, one internal and one with external stakeholders
- Oversee dissemination and follow-up processes, including the preparation of a Management Response to the evaluation recommendations

45. Evaluation Manager:

- Manages the evaluation process through all phases including drafting this TOR
- Ensure quality assurance mechanisms are operational
- Consolidate and share comments on draft TOR, inception and evaluation reports with the evaluation team
- Ensures expected use of quality assurance mechanisms (checklists, quality support etc.)
- Ensure that the team has access to all documentation and information necessary to the evaluation; facilitate the team's contacts with local stakeholders; set up meetings, field visits; provide logistic support during the fieldwork; and arrange for interpretation, if required.
- Organise security briefings for the evaluation team and provide any materials as required
- Chairs the External Reference Group meetings

46. An Internal evaluation Committee has been formed as part of ensuring the independence and impartiality of the evaluation. The membership includes evaluation manager, technical unit in charge of refugee operations and the Cash scale up, Deputy (country director programmes), One staff each from finance and logistics unit. The key roles and responsibilities of this team, includes providing input to evaluation process and commenting on evaluation products.

47. An External Evaluation Reference group will be formed with representation from UNHCR, ECHO, USAID, DFID, Germany Embassy, Japanese Embassy, CARE, World Vision, Government of Kenya, WFP Country office and Regional Bureau and will review the evaluation products as further safeguard against bias and influence (See annex 2; External reference Group TOR)

48. The Regional Bureau. The RB management will be responsible to:

- Assign focal point for the evaluation.
- Participate in discussions with the evaluation team on the evaluation design and on the operation, its performance and results. In particular, the RB should

participate in the evaluation debriefing and discussions with the evaluation manager and team, as required.

- Provide comments on the TORs, inception report and the evaluation report.

49. **Headquarters.** Some HQ divisions might, as relevant, be asked to discuss WFP strategies, policies or systems in their area of responsibility and to comment on the evaluation TOR and report.

50. **Other Stakeholders** (Donors, Government, NGOs and UN agencies) will be identified for interviews by the evaluation team in addition to the list provided by WFP which will be based on the preliminary stakeholder analysis detailed in table 1.

51. **The Office of Evaluation (OEV).** OEV will advise the evaluation Manager and provide support to the evaluation process where appropriate. It is responsible to provide access to independent quality support mechanisms reviewing draft inception and evaluation reports. It also ensure a help desk function upon request from the Regional Bureaus.

8. Communication and budget

8.1. Communication

52. To enhance the learning from this evaluation, the evaluation team should place emphasis on transparent and open communication with key stakeholders. These may for example take place by ensuring a clear agreement on channels and frequency of communication with and between key stakeholders.

53. Communication with evaluation team and stakeholders should go through the evaluation manager.

54. Following the approval of the final evaluation report, dissemination will be broad and workshops will be conducted both internally and with partners, looking at the recommendations and the way forward.

8.1. Budget

55. **Budget:** The evaluation will go through a tender, using WFP Procurement procedures and therefore the budget will be proposed by applicants

Annexes

Annex 1: Evaluation Schedule

<u>SN #</u>	<u>Output</u>	<u>Due date</u>
	<u>1.Preparation</u>	
<u>1.1</u>	<u>First draft of TOR</u>	<u>August 2016</u>
<u>1.2</u>	<u>Final TOR</u>	<u>January 2017</u>
<u>1.3</u>	<u>Award of contract to conduct evaluation</u>	<u>January 2017/February 2017</u>
	<u>2.Inception</u>	
<u>2.1</u>	<u>Inception report</u>	<u>February-March 2017</u>
	<u>3.Data Collection</u>	
<u>3.1</u>	<u>Quantitative and qualitative data collection</u>	<u>March /April 2017</u>
	<u>4.Reporting</u>	
<u>4.1</u>	<u>Preliminary Evaluation report</u>	<u>May 2016</u>
<u>4.4</u>	<u>Final reports</u>	<u>May/June 2016</u>

Annex 2 M&E plan

FOOD ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES (PRRO 200737): MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN FOR VOUCHER SCALE UP **ACTIVITY**

The voucher scale up is planned for the refugee operation beginning June 2015 for Kakuma camp and October 2015 for Daadab camp. The voucher activity will entail substitution of a portion of the cereal ration for the General Food Distribution activity for vouchers. The objective of the scale up is to increase cost effectiveness of food assistance in Kenyan Refugee Operations. The following are the expected outcomes:

- ❖ Adequate food consumption over assistance period for targeted households
- ❖ Increased livelihood opportunities for refugee and host communities;
- ❖ Increased capacity of markets to supply quality fresh and other foods to camp populations.

This Monitoring and Evaluation plan (M&E plan) shows the M&E processes for the voucher scale up activity. It gives details of the processes and activities that will be carried to obtain data for performance reporting as per the voucher scale up log frame. It spells out the frequency, the reporting and the responsible persons for data collection, reporting and coordination. It shows the nature of reports expected and various uses of the results obtained from each of the processes.

The M&E plan is a sub set of the PRRO 200737 M&E plan. M&E processes for this scale up will therefore build on the existing GFD M&E processes with a few additions that are voucher specific and for triangulation purposes including mystery shopping and complaints and feedback mechanism. Specifically, Outcome monitoring which will be done through WFP led 1. Food Security and Outcome Monitoring (FSOM) 2. Market surveys 3. Beneficiary Contact Monitoring (BCM) and 4. Partner led nutrition surveys. Baselines for all the outcome indicators will be obtained by May 2015 for Kakuma and by September 2015 for Daadab. Process monitoring will be done through, distribution monitoring, Beneficiary Contact Monitoring (BCM) and market monitoring. These will include monitoring of gender, protection and accountability indicators. Mystery shopping and satisfaction surveys through the hotline will be used to triangulate findings from the other processes. mVAM will be used for some of the above processes. Output data will be derived from cooperating partners (CP) and WFP reports related to the scale up. Impact evaluation will be done to evaluate the multiplier effect of the voucher scale up. This will be on top of any other evaluation planned for the PRRO 200737 programme.

Below is the plan with all the details. This plan will be the framework that will be used for tracking monitoring and evaluation activities for the scale up.

Indicator No.	Performance Indicators	Baseline	Target	Data Source and process	Collection Method (Sample size)	Responsibility for Collection and reporting	Responsibility for coordination and reporting	Frequency of collection	Analysis /reports	Dissemination (When/How/Who)
Objective: Increased cost effectiveness of food assistance in Kenyan refugee operation										
OI1	Average cost per beneficiary per month	TBD from April or May reports	Equal or reduced	Project reports	Review of project reports	Innovations unit/Refugee unit	Innovations	Monthly, Mid and End of project	Voucher scale up monthly reports, Mid and end term evaluations, impact evaluation	Voucher scale up reporting/inclusion in reports/Innovation teams
Cross Cutting: Gender (Gender equality and empowerment improved)										
CCG1	Proportion of assisted women, men or both women and men who make decisions over the use of cash, and or vouchers	TBD from April BCM results	Women: 80 Men 10: Women and men 10	Beneficiaries/ Beneficiary contact monitoring (BCM)	Beneficiary interviews during food distribution. 10 beneficiaries per site	WFP Field Monitors	M&E	Monthly	M&E monthly monitoring reports	Monthly M&E meetings with programme units/Programme meeting/ Annual SPR
CCG2	Proportion of assisted women, men or both women and men who make decisions over the use of food within the household	TBD from April BCM results	Women: 80 Men 10: Women and men 10	Beneficiaries/ Beneficiary contact monitoring (BCM)	Beneficiary interviews during food distribution. 10 beneficiaries per site	WFP Field Monitors	M&E	Monthly	M&E monthly monitoring reports	Monthly M&E meetings with programme units/Programme meeting, Annual SPR

Indicator No.	Performance Indicators	Baseline	Target	Data Source and process	Collection Method (Sample size)	Responsibility for Collection and reporting	Responsibility for coordination and reporting	Frequency of collection	Analysis /reports	Dissemination (When/How/Who)
CCG3	Proportion of women beneficiaries in leadership position of project implementation committees	TBD from April 2015 project results	>50%	Distribution registers	Review of CP reports and record aggregation	CP	Refugee unit	monthly	CP distribution report	Refugee operations monthly reports
CCG4	Proportion of women project committee members trained on modalities of food, cash or voucher distribution	0	> 60	Training reports	Review of CP reports and record aggregation	Innovations/ CP	Refugee unit	At inception/ Monthly	CP distribution /training report	Refugee operations monthly reports
Crosscutting: Protection and accountability to affected population (WFP assistance delivered and utilized in safe, accountable and dignified conditions)										
CCPA1	Proportion of assisted refugees who do not experience safety problems travelling to, from and or at WFP programme sites	TBD from April BCM results	>90%	Beneficiaries/ Beneficiary contact monitoring (BCM)	Beneficiary interviews during food distribution. 10 beneficiaries per site	WFP Field Monitors	M&E	Monthly	M&E monthly monitoring reports,	Monthly M&E meetings with programme units/Programme meeting, Annual SPR
CCPA2	Proportion of assisted refugees informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, where people can complain) desegregated by sex	0	>90%	Beneficiaries/ Beneficiary contact monitoring (BCM)	Beneficiary interviews during food distribution. 10 beneficiaries per site	WFP Field Monitors	M&E	Monthly	M&E monthly monitoring reports	Monthly M&E meetings with programme units/Programme meeting/ Annual SPR

Indicator No.	Performance Indicators	Baseline	Target	Data Source and process	Collection Method (Sample size)	Responsibility for Collection and reporting	Responsibility for coordination and reporting	Frequency of collection	Analysis /reports	Dissemination (When/How/Who)
Cross Cutting: Partnership (Food assistance interventions coordinated and partnerships developed and maintained)										
CCP1	Proportion of project activities implemented with the engagement of complementary partners	0	100%	Project reports	Review of project reports	Innovations unit/Refugee unit	Refugee unit	Monthly, Mid and End of project	Voucher scale up reports	Voucher scale up reporting/inclusion in reports/SPR
CCP2	Amount of complementary funds provided to the project by partners (including NGOs, INGOs, Civil Society, Private Sector organizations, International Financial Institutions, Regional development banks)	0	TBD	Project reports	Review of project reports	Innovations unit/Refugee unit	Refugee unit	Monthly, Mid and End of project	Voucher scale up reports	Voucher scale up reporting/inclusion in reports/Innovation teams/SPR
CCP3	Number of partner organizations that provide complementary inputs and services	0	TBD	Project reports	Review of project reports	Innovations unit/Refugee unit	Refugee unit	Monthly, Mid and End of project	Voucher scale up reports	Voucher scale up reporting/inclusion in reports/SPR
Outcome 1: Adequate food consumption attained or maintained over assistance period for targeted households										

Indicator No.	Performance Indicators	Baseline	Target	Data Source and process	Collection Method (Sample size)	Responsibility for Collection and reporting	Responsibility for coordination and reporting	Frequency of collection	Analysis /reports	Dissemination (When/How/Who)
O11	Food Consumption Score (FCS) disaggregated by sex of household head: (percentage of households with poor FCS)	TBD from May 2015 FSOM results	Reduced prevalence of poor consumption of targeted household by 80%	Households/ FSOM	Household interviews	WFP Field staff and partners	VAM& M&E	3 times a year	FSOM reports, 3 times a year	Annual SPR, Voucher scale up reporting, Donor reporting
O12	Food Consumption Score (FCS) disaggregated by sex of household head: (percentage of households with acceptable FCS)	TBD from May 2015 FSOM results	80%	Households/ FSOM	Household interviews	WFP Field monitors and partners	VAM& M&E	3 times a year	FSOM reports, 3 times a year	Annual SPR, Voucher scale up reporting, Donor reporting
O13	Daily Average Diet Diversity disaggregated by sex of the household head	TBD from May 2015 FSOM results	Increased Score of targeted households	Households/ FSOM	Household interviews	WFP Field monitors and partners	VAM& M&E	3 times a year	FSOM reports, 3 times a year	Annual SPR, Voucher scale up reporting, Donor reporting
O14	Coping Strategy Index (CSI): Average CSI	TBD from May 2015 FSOM results	Reduced/Stabilized	Households/ FSOM	Household interviews	WFP Field monitors and partners	VAM& M&E	3 times a year	FSOM reports, 3 times a year	Annual SPR, Voucher scale up reporting, Donor reporting
O15	Prevalence of acute malnutrition among children <5(weight - for-height)	TBD through Available results as at April 2015	15%< GAM Rate	Nutrition Survey	Household interviews	Nutrition Partners	VAM Nutrition	As and when survey are commissioned	Nutrition survey reports	Donor reporting

Outcome 2: Increased capacity of markets to supply fresh and other foods to the refugee population

Indicator No.	Performance Indicators	Baseline	Target	Data Source and process	Collection Method (Sample size)	Responsibility for Collection and reporting	Responsibility for coordination and reporting	Frequency of collection	Analysis /reports	Dissemination (When/How/Who)
O21	Prices of key food commodities	TBD through a Market survey by April 2015	Neutral or positive impact	market monitoring	Trader and beneficiary interviews	WFP field monitors	VAM Markets	Weekly and monthly	Monthly Market monitoring reports	Monthly market report, Donor reporting
O22	% of beneficiaries satisfied with 1. Vouchers 2. Traders	0	vouchers 90%: Traders 90%	Beneficiaries/ Beneficiary contact monitoring (BCM), Mystery Shopping	Beneficiary interviews during food distribution. 10 beneficiaries per site	WFP Field Monitors	M&E	Monthly	M&E monthly monitoring reports	Monthly M&E meetings with programme units/Programme meeting
O23	Number of months where markets experienced food commodity shortages	TBD through a Market survey by April 2015	0	Mid and End term Market studies	Trader and beneficiary interviews	WFP field monitors	VAM Markets	Mid and End of project	Market monitoring reports	Monthly market report, Donor reporting
Outcome 3: Increased livelihood opportunities for refugees and host communities										
O31	Proportion of targeted traders employing additional staff in their business	0	100%	Mid and End term Market studies	Trader and beneficiary interviews	WFP field monitors	VAM Markets	Mid and End of project	Market monitoring reports	Voucher scale up reporting, Donor reporting
O32	Monthly turnover/profits as reported by traders	TBD through a Market survey by April 2015	% increase	Mid and End term Market studies	Trader and beneficiary interviews	WFP field monitors	VAM Markets	Mid and End of project	Market monitoring reports	project reporting, Donor reporting
Output 1: Preparation for scale up for voucher distribution completed										

Indicator No.	Performance Indicators	Baseline	Target	Data Source and process	Collection Method (Sample size)	Responsibility for Collection and reporting	Responsibility for coordination and reporting	Frequency of collection	Analysis /reports	Dissemination (When/How/Who)
OP11	Operational plan for the scale up in place	No	Yes	Final operational plan is circulated	Check existence of operation plan	Innovations unit	Innovations unit	One Off	Voucher scale up reports	project reports, Donor reporting
OP12	Systems and process design and development are complete	0	yes	The systems are operational	Check if systems are operational	Innovations unit	Innovations unit	Continuous	Voucher scale up reports	Project reports, Donor reporting
OP13	Communication strategy completed	0	yes	The final strategy is communicated to stakeholders	check existence of a communications strategy	Innovations unit	Innovations unit	One Off	Voucher scale up reports	Project reports, Donor reporting
Output 2: Vouchers distributed										
OP21	% of planned Value of vouchers distributed	0	100%	Financial Service Provider records	Reconciliation	Financial Service Provider/ Finance unit	Finance unit	Monthly	Distribution report	project reports, Donor and SPR reporting
OP22	proportion of planned beneficiaries/refugees receiving vouchers	0	100% (500,000)	COMPAS reports, CP and monthly monitoring reports	Record aggregation	Financial Service Provider/ Logistic unit/Refugee Unit	Refugee Unit	Monthly	Distribution report	project reports,, Donor and SPR reporting
PROCESS										

Indicator No.	Performance Indicators	Baseline	Target	Data Source and process	Collection Method (Sample size)	Responsibility for Collection and reporting	Responsibility for coordination and reporting	Frequency of collection	Analysis /reports	Dissemination (When/How/Who)
P1	% beneficiaries aware of the existence of a Complaints and Feedback Mechanism (CFM) which includes hotline, CPs and WFP staff	TBD from April BCM results	90	Beneficiaries/ Beneficiary contact monitoring (BCM), Mystery Shopping	Beneficiary interviews during food distribution. 10 beneficiaries per site	WFP Field Monitors	M&E	Monthly	M&E monthly monitoring reports	Monthly M&E meetings with programme units/Programme meeting, CFM Quarterly Reports
P2	% complaints received that are logged into the CFM	0	100	CFM Database	Records tallying	Innovations	Innovations/M&E	Bi-Weekly	M&E monthly monitoring reports	Monthly M&E meetings with programme units/Programme meeting, CFM Quarterly Reports
P3	% complaints received on food vouchers that are acted upon	0	100	CFM Satisfaction Surveys	Beneficiary interviews	Innovations	Innovations/M&E	Quarterly	M&E monthly monitoring reports	Monthly M&E meetings with programme units/Programme meeting, CFM Quarterly Reports
P4	% complainants who are satisfied with WFPs response to their complains	0	100		Beneficiary interviews	Innovations	M&E		M&E monthly monitoring reports	Monthly M&E meetings with programme units/Programme meeting, CFM Quarterly Reports
P5	Average time taken to pay traders after redemption of vouchers	0	TBD	Finance Reports/Trader/Market Interviews/ Mystery Shopping	Trader interviews	WFP Field Monitors/Innovation	Innovations	Monthly	Market /trader reports, Mystery shopping reports	Monthly M&E meetings with programme units/Programme meeting

Indicator No.	Performance Indicators	Baseline	Target	Data Source and process	Collection Method (Sample size)	Responsibility for Collection and reporting	Responsibility for coordination and reporting	Frequency of collection	Analysis /reports	Dissemination (When/How/Who)
P6	Proportion of households that sell food commodities purchased with the vouchers	0	To informed by the results of the first BCM after Distribution	Beneficiaries/ Beneficiary contact monitoring (BCM)	Beneficiary interviews during food distribution. 10 beneficiaries per site	WFP Field Monitors	M&E	Monthly	M&E monthly monitoring reports	Monthly M&E meetings with programme units/Programme meeting
P7	Proportion of households that share food commodities purchased with the vouchers	0	To informed by the results of the first BCM after Distribution	Beneficiaries/ Beneficiary contact monitoring (BCM)	Beneficiary interviews during food distribution. 10 beneficiaries per site	WFP Field Monitors	M&E	Monthly	M&E monthly monitoring reports	Monthly M&E meetings with programme units/Programme meeting
P8	% of beneficiaries that prefer voucher alone as a transfer modality	TBD from April 2015 BCM	To informed by the baseline results	Beneficiaries/ Beneficiary contact monitoring (BCM)	Beneficiary interviews during food distribution. 10 beneficiaries per site	WFP Field Monitors	M&E	Monthly	M&E monthly monitoring reports	Monthly M&E meetings with programme units/Programme meeting
P9	% of beneficiaries that prefer food alone as a transfer modality	TBD from April 2015 BCM	To informed by the baseline results	Beneficiaries/ Beneficiary contact monitoring (BCM)	Beneficiary interviews during food distribution. 10 beneficiaries per site	WFP Field Monitors	M&E	Monthly	M&E monthly monitoring reports	Monthly M&E meetings with programme units/Programme meeting
P10	% of beneficiaries that prefer with voucher and food as a transfer modality	TBD from April 2015 BCM	To informed by the baseline results	Beneficiaries/ Beneficiary contact monitoring (BCM)	Beneficiary interviews during food distribution. 10 beneficiaries per site	WFP Field Monitors	M&E	Monthly	M&E monthly monitoring reports	Monthly M&E meetings with programme units/Programme meeting

Indicator No.	Performance Indicators	Baseline	Target	Data Source and process	Collection Method (Sample size)	Responsibility for Collection and reporting	Responsibility for coordination and reporting	Frequency of collection	Analysis /reports	Dissemination (When/How/Who)
EVALUATION										
	Midterm evaluation					Successful consultant firm	Innovation& M&E			
	Impact evaluation (Scoping mission and development of evaluation TOR)					Successful consultant firm	Innovation& M&E			
	Impact evaluation implementation					Successful consultant firm	Innovation& M&E			

Annex 4: Evaluation Design Report (attached and send together with this TOR)