

Terms of Reference

Joint Evaluation of the Humanitarian Cash-Based Response

Somalia Response 2017

1. Background

A famine alert was issued for Somalia in January 2017. This was the third rainy season in a row that was below average. The cumulative effect was that crop harvests and livestock productivity declined sharply. By May 2017, 6.7 million people were considered to be at risk of food insecurity. Following the post-Gu assessment by FSNAU in August 2017, an estimated total 6.2 million people were in need of humanitarian assistance, and over 3.1 million people were facing acute food insecurity and classified as being in Emergency Phases 3 and 4 as per the Integrated Phase Classification (IPC). Overall, some 388,000 acutely malnourished children were in need of critical nutrition support, including life-saving treatment for more than 87,000 severely malnourished children. Since November 2016, 1.2 million people have been internally displaced, mainly by drought but also by conflict. Cholera/acute watery diarrhea and measles outbreaks also remained a big concern.

The humanitarian community mobilized quickly when the famine alert was raised in an effort to prevent famine and save lives. A significant part of the response was delivered as cash based assistance (CBA)¹. CBA has been used in humanitarian response in Somalia since 2003. During the 2017 famine prevention response, the use of CBA significantly scaled up, reaching up to three million individuals each month. Somalia's robust markets and dependence on imported foods unaffected by drought, as well as humanitarian access constraints across much of the country limit the transport of in-kind assistance and mean that CBA is seen as an essential tool to meet needs across much of the country.

The large majority of the 2017 CBA (75-85% each month) has been delivered through the food security cluster with the objective of meeting food security needs. However, CBA is also used to meet water and sanitation, shelter, education and protection needs, as well as multipurpose cash intended to cover multiple basic needs. The assistance is delivered as cash or vouchers, and through various transfer mechanisms, including electronic payment cards, mobile money or cash-in-hand. Data collected through the clusters shows that the vast majority of CBA delivered during the response has been unconditional and about half of the CBA has been restricted (primarily vouchers) and about half unrestricted.

¹¹ Cash Based Assistance (CBA): CBA refers to all programs where cash (or vouchers for goods or services) is directly provided to beneficiaries. In the context of humanitarian assistance, the term is used to refer to the provision of cash transfers or vouchers given to individuals, household or community recipients; not to governments or other state actors. CBA covers all modalities of cash based assistance, including vouchers. This excludes remittances and microfinance in humanitarian interventions (although microfinance and money transfer institutions may be used for the actual delivery of cash).

The term can be used interchangeably with Cash Transfer Programming, Cash Based Interventions, and Cash and Voucher Programming. Please refer to the Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) glossary of cash transfer programming: <http://www.cashlearning.org/resources/glossary#CTP>

The inter-agency Cash Working Group (CWG) started convening in February 2017, on the backdrop of the increase of agencies using CBA to respond to the drought. The CWG is intended to provide a forum for agencies engaged in CBA in Somalia to engage, share learning and coordinate activities. The CWG also provides guidance on transfer values, produces a monthly markets dashboard, discusses CBA-related M&E and risk management, and engages with mobile money providers etc. The group meets every two to three weeks.

As part of its work to share lessons learned and identify areas for CBA delivery improvement, the CWG is commissioning this joint evaluation of CBA to the 2017 famine prevention response for Somalia. The evaluation is joint in nature and will not evaluate individual agencies' responses but rather take a collective view of the CBA delivered in the 2017 response.

2. Objectives of evaluation

The overarching objective of this evaluation is to review the joint performance and impacts of the humanitarian CBA in the 2017 response as the basis for improved CBA programming and delivery, as well as to examine the sustainability and different ways forward for how to continuously use CBA on a large scale in Somalia. It will support CWG partners to identify areas for improvement and shape the on-going response in 2018.

The Humanitarian Response Plan 2017 for Somalia outlined the following overall objectives, across sectors and modalities:

1. Provide life-saving and life-sustaining integrated multi-sectoral assistance to reduce acute humanitarian needs among the most vulnerable people.
2. Reduce acute malnutrition levels in settlements for internally displaced and host communities through integrated multi-sectoral emergency response.
3. Reinforce the protection of the displaced, and other vulnerable groups at risk.
4. Support the restoration of livelihoods, promote basic services to build resilience to recurrent shocks, and catalyze more sustainable solutions

In particular, **objective 1** and to some extent **objective 4** were supported with CBA amongst other modalities. The evaluation is intended to focus mainly on these two overarching objectives and primarily on objective 1. In addition, the evaluation will examine agency-specific objectives related to the CBA. It is important that the evaluation be mindful that CBA comprises response *cash modalities* and is used alongside other modalities (in-kind assistance and services) to achieve given objectives.

Against this background, the evaluation will be undertaken against the five DAC evaluation criteria²:

- 1. Relevance**
- 2. Effectiveness**

² As per OECD/DAC, additional criteria to review within the context of a humanitarian evaluation include Connectedness, Coherence and Coverage. These criteria should also be considered during the evaluation. Please refer to the ALNAP Guide for Humanitarian Agencies on Evaluating Humanitarian Action using the OECD/DAC Criteria <https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/eha-2006.pdf>

3. **Efficiency**
4. **Impact**
5. **Sustainability**

Within the overarching framework of the DAC criteria, the evaluation is expected to answer the following **primary questions**:

- P1. How did the CBA **perform against** the stated objectives, OECD DAC Criteria and Grand Bargain Commitments on cash³?
- P2. How did the CBA **impact** Somali households and markets, as well as meet the recipients' needs? Analysis can include (but is not necessarily limited to) emergency response outcome indicators and coping strategies, impacts on markets, trade, and population movements, and protection outcome indicators.
- P3. To what extent has the CBA **built systems and capacity** for improved resilience in the future, and which are the **concrete actions** that can improve cash programming in Somalia, particularly with a view to longer-term programming and strengthening of linkages between humanitarian, recovery, resilience and social protection interventions?

After answering the primary questions, the evaluation will also seek to examine the following **secondary questions**:

- S1. What analysis underpinned decision making on transfer modalities (cash, voucher, in-kind)?
- S2. How was feedback from affected communities used to inform changes to the response over time?
- S3. How was CBA utilised to reach targeted populations?
- S4. What impact did the role of community structures, exclusion/inclusion of social groups, gender and age have on access to and utilisation of CBA?
- S5. Did different or varying transfer amounts lead to different outcomes?
- S6. How did inter-agency cash coordination perform and how can this coordination improve?
- S7. What are the opportunities, comparative advantages and limitations of using CBA to meet humanitarian objectives across all sectors in Somalia in future cash based programming?

While answering these primary and secondary questions, the evaluation must take into account **differences between types of CBA** (cash vs vouchers, different transfer mechanisms) and differences in targeted populations. To the extent possible, the analysis should be disaggregated by gender and age.

³ The Grand Bargain Commitments on Cash: (1) Increase the routine use of cash alongside other tools, including in-kind assistance, service delivery (such as health and nutrition) and vouchers. Employ markers to measure increase and outcomes. (2) Invest in new delivery models which can be increased in scale while identifying best practice and mitigating risks in each context. Employ markers to track their evolution. (3) Build an evidence base to assess the costs, benefits, impacts, and risks of cash (including on protection) relative to in-kind assistance, service delivery interventions and vouchers, and combinations thereof. (4) Collaborate, share information and develop standards and guidelines for cash programming in order to better understand its risks and benefits. (5) Ensure that coordination, delivery, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are put in place for cash transfers. (6) Aim to increase use of cash programming beyond current low levels, where appropriate. Some organisations and donors may wish to set targets.

https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Grand_Bargain_final_22_May_FINAL-2.pdf

3. Scope

The evaluation will cover the humanitarian CBA made by CWG partner agencies as part of the 2017 Somalia drought response, e.g. transfers taking place from the beginning of 2017 until the time of the evaluation. CBA refers to all programs where cash (or vouchers for goods or services) is directly provided to beneficiaries. In the context of humanitarian assistance, the term is used to refer to the provision of cash transfers or vouchers given to individuals, household or community recipients⁴. It will describe how cash assistance has been used in the 2017 drought response, including the reach, types and modalities of CBA, the partners involved and the objectives of the assistance. As part of the background analysis, the evaluation should comment on the evolution of CBA in Somalia since the last major drought crisis in 2011. In addition, the evaluation is expected to give further consideration to the one-year period immediately before the 2017 response, with a view on early warning, planning and preparedness measures which were or could have been undertaken with regard to CBA.

While the evaluation covers CBA by CWG partner agencies, the evaluation is expected to take into account other types of assistance (and by other actors) delivered as part of the 2017 response, as well as remittances sent by the Somali diaspora. This assistance is not the subject of the evaluation, but it is important that the evaluation recognizes their existence as well as possible overlap, complementarities or synergies with the CBA.

The evaluation is joint in nature and will not evaluate any individual agency's response or performance. It will take a collective view of the CBA delivered, drawing on examples and lessons learned from the agencies engaged in the evaluation.

The evaluation should seek to complement, not overlap with, ongoing or planned evaluations by CWG partners. CWG partners should avail any research, studies or evaluations relevant to the evaluation team to ensure complementarity.

4. Methodology

The evaluation will employ mixed-methods, and consist of the following:

1. A desk review of existing literature and key partner documents;
2. Interview with key stakeholders;
3. Meta-analysis of existing primary data sources (from CWG partners' data collection);
4. Qualitative primary data collection through focus group discussions and engagement with different social groups in the field;
5. Quantitative primary data collection to the extent possible through existing partner set-ups, including but not limited to call centres, post-distribution monitoring and others. Where appropriate and time and budget permits, primary quantitative data can be collected through household/trader surveys.

⁴ Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) glossary of cash transfer programming:
<http://www.cashlearning.org/resources/glossary#CTP>

As much as possible, the evaluation will leverage and work with existing field presence and data collection mechanisms of partners, while still maintaining neutrality in the collection and collation of information. Data collected, analysed and presented should be disaggregated by gender and age, wherever feasible.

Consultation with Somalis at all levels should be prioritized, including but not limited to beneficiaries, community leaders and government, frontline and senior staff. Interviews with private sector actors and partners should also form part of the evaluation, particularly mobile money operators, hawallas and banks, and retailers. The evaluation team is expected to engage with affected social groups on their experience of cash within the wider context of change in their lives and their insights on how cash programming can be more effective and improved. Diligence should be taken when focus groups are composed, allowing participants to share their experiences and opinions freely and honestly. Due consideration must be given to balancing genders, ages and social groups.

The review should meet high ethical standards and avoid assessment fatigue of affected populations. CWG member agencies will be expected to be available, facilitate logistics when necessary and participate in the review.

5. Deliverables

The consultants are expected to deliver the following deliverables over the course of the contract:

Inception:

1. A maximum 5 page inception report

Action learning:

2. A one-day Learning & Action workshop for CWG partners/other key stakeholders.

Finalisation:

3. A maximum 30 page final report (excl. annexes) including a two-page executive summary
4. A one-day final event presenting and working on final report recommendations.

The deliverables are described in detail below:

Inception report: Once contracted the Consultants should provide a maximum five page Inception Report demonstrating understanding of this TOR and propose participatory and inter-active methodologies to address each of the evaluation questions. This should include an evaluation matrix/analytical framework with the targeted sources of evidence/data, methods/tools, constraints, dependencies, risks and opportunities associated with answering each question. Any limitations of the process should be identified. Both qualitative and quantitative methods should be applied, and the balance between the two clearly stated and justified. To the extent possible, the evaluation should leverage CWG partners' own data collection (feedback mechanisms, baseline findings, post distribution monitoring data etc.)

Learning & Action workshop: A participatory learning and action workshop with CWG partners/key stakeholders to present interim findings and allow work on the key findings and recommendations. The

workshop will act as a learning forum for the evaluation findings and is aimed to ensure participation, and buy-in from all stakeholders on the recommendations of the final report.

Final report: A maximum 30 page clearly written final report (excluding annexes), evidence based, referenced, to the point and utility focused written in plain English is required, with the chapter/section headings reflecting each of the evaluation questions/criteria. Any data tables or graphs should be limited and convey essential points simply. The Executive Summary should concisely present key findings, key recommendations and learning in easily accessible language for wide dissemination with a broad audience. A table setting out each key finding and recommendation (informed by the Learning and Action Workshop), should allow the CWG to state which findings and recommendations it accepts fully, partially or rejects for improving cash based programming in Somalia.

Final event: One-day event for CWG partners and other key stakeholders presenting final report and key findings.

6. Dissemination and uptake of evaluation findings

The evaluation will be a crucial document for the humanitarian and development community in Somalia and will help move forward and improve cash programming in the country. CWG partners will be able to use findings and recommendations to make real-time adaptations to cash programming. The evaluation will also help the community understand how cash programming can be leveraged for building longer-term resilience.

The evaluation is expected to be disseminated widely. The final presentation of results will be for participating CWG partners, but also be open for a wider audience. The two-page executive summary will be disseminated widely, including to government officials, humanitarian and development partners and private sector. The two-page summary will be translated into Somali by two CWG partner agencies (TBD). In addition, a maximum 10 minute long video of the presentation of the final report will be produced by two CWG agencies (TBD) and narrated in English and Somali, to further help broad dissemination.

An uptake plan for the CWG partners and management will be further developed by the evaluation Steering Committee and discussed with the evaluation team during its mission.

7. Management of evaluation

The evaluation team will be guided by an inter-agency Steering Committee who will engage at the contracting phase, inception phase, during field work to the extent required and on draft report feedback.

The Steering Committee will function as a conduit for feedback from the CWG and facilitate engagement between the evaluation team and CWG partners. The evaluation team is accountable towards the Steering Committee for carrying out the evaluation and for quality control, and concerns or issues arising should be referred to the Steering Committee.

The evaluation contract will be held by Steering Committee member CARE. Contractual and compliance issues are referred to CARE. The evaluation is funded jointly by participating CWG agencies.

8. Timeline

The evaluation is structured in three phases: i) the inception phase, ii) the main evaluation mission including field work (primary and secondary data collection and preliminary analysis), and iii) the reporting phase concluding with a final report and presentation hereof. The three phases are expected to take no longer than the timeline outlined below:

- i. Inception phase: From contracting to inception report delivered, maximum 2 weeks (14 calendar days)
- ii. Main evaluation phase: maximum 6 weeks (42 calendar days)
- iii. Reporting phase: maximum 3 weeks (21 calendar days)

Maximum expected time is 11 weeks, or 77 calendar days.

The evaluation team is expected to spend minimum 50% of their time in Somalia.

9. Consultant qualifications

Consultancy firms and individual consultants are eligible to apply. A team consisting of minimum two consultants are required. The below specifications are required in any configuration of applying agencies or team of individuals.

Evaluation team specifications:

- 10 years multi-sector international humanitarian and development experience for each applying consultant
- Proven humanitarian evaluation experience
- Solid experience and understanding of cash policy and delivery, including various delivery mechanisms
- Solid experience and understanding of CBA and its inter-connectedness to other sectors especially food security, nutrition and livelihoods
- Strong Somalia knowledge and experience (teams including Somali speakers are desirable and if unfeasible, it should be outlined how the team will obtain local feedback in their methodology)
- Knowledge and understanding of the World Humanitarian Summit's Grand Bargain and OECD DAC Criteria
- Knowledge and experience within the humanitarian cluster system
- Ability to see the big picture and make practical recommendations for delivery and improvements on the ground
- Ability to absorb, consolidate and communicate large amounts of data and information simply and concisely
- Experience and ability to operate in insecure environments
- Experience of working with local partners and private sector in particular the financial/payments sector
- Excellent inter-personal skills
- Willingness to travel to Somali under the security framework of a partner agency and the necessary security certificates required to work in Somalia (e.g. SSAFE or HEAT)
- Good participatory facilitation and workshop design skills
- Excellent English report writing skills

10. Application procedure

The consultancy contract will be held with CARE Somalia.

Short Expressions of Interest showing technical understanding of the TOR and a proposed timeline, CVs, cover letter demonstrating requirements of the consultants specification, Daily Rate in \$USD and a relevant report sample should be sent to somconsultants@care.org by COB **5th January 2018**. All assignment related economy class travel, feeding and accommodation costs will be covered directly. Only those short-listed will be contacted for interview. Please indicate **“Joint Evaluation of the Humanitarian Cash-Based Response”** as the subject heading”.

11. Initial list of documents to be consulted

- Humanitarian Response Plan Somalia 2017
- Cash Working Group for Somalia - TOR
- Cash Working Group for Somalia – meeting minutes
- Monthly Cash 3W presentations and information products
- Cash Working Group for Somalia - Transfer value guidance (all versions)
- Scaling up CTP In Somalia: Reflecting on the 2017 Drought Response (CaLP)
- Looking back to move forward: Building on learning from 2011 to strengthen the 2017 drought response in Somalia learning report (CaLP)
- Using cash and vouchers in Somalia in 2017: The need to build on learning from the 2011-12 Somalia drought response (CaLP)
- Checking Back. Using cash and vouchers in Somalia: Recommendations from the 2011-12 Somalia Drought Response March 2017 (CaLP)
- Humanitarian Country Team Somalia –Centrality of Protection Strategy
- Famine in Somalia, Dan Maxwell and Nisar Majid, 2016

12. Participating agencies and Steering Committee

The following CWG partner agencies are participating in this evaluation:

1. ADESO
2. ACTED
3. CaLP – the Cash Learning Partnership
4. CARE
5. CESVI - Cooperazione e Sviluppo
6. Concern World Wide
7. CRS – Catholic Relief Services
8. DFID – Department for International Development
9. ECHO
10. FAO – Food and Agriculture Organisation of the UN
11. NRC – Norwegian Refugee Council
12. OCHA – Office of Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
13. REACH
14. The World Bank
15. World Vision

CWG Joint Evaluation of the Humanitarian Cash response – Terms of Reference

16. UNHCR
17. UNICEF
18. USAID
19. VSF Suisse
20. WFP – the World Food Programme

The evaluation Steering Committee is composed of the following eight members:

1. ADESO
2. CaLP
3. CARE (representing SomRep partners: ACF, ADRA, CARE, COOPI, DRC, Oxfam, World Vision)
4. DFID
5. FAO
6. NRC (representing BRCiS partners: CESVI, CWW, NRC, IRC, SCI)
7. OCHA
8. WFP