



Terms of Reference to undertake final evaluation of the Resilience for People and Landscapes Programme (REPLAP)

Summary

Organization	International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), http://www.iucn.org
Project	Resilience for People and Landscapes Programme (REPLAP) Project No: 2677-00/2018
Position type	Short term consultancy
Study/assessment	Final evaluation for REPLAP Programme
Position location	Lower Tana and Aswa Catchments in Kenya and Uganda respectively
Duration	60 days
Countries	Kenya and Uganda
Application deadline	30 th June 2022
Funder	Austrian Development Agency
Starting date	15 th July 2022

1. Background

The International Union for Conservation of Nature, IUCN, is the world's oldest and largest global environmental organization that focuses on finding pragmatic solutions to our most pressing environment and development challenges. IUCN has three programme areas: (1) Valuing and conserving nature; (2) Effective and equitable governance of nature's use and (3) Deploying nature-based solutions to global challenges in climate, food and development.

IUCN mandate is achieved by supporting scientific research, managing field projects all over the world, and creating a platform for governments, NGOs, the UN and companies to work together to develop policy, laws and best practice. IUCN's Eastern and Southern African Regional Office (ESARO) have thematic programmes with various projects and programmes in the region. One such programme is the Resilience for People and Landscapes Programme (REPLAP) funded by Austrian Development Agency (ADA).



The REPLAP (Sept 2019-August 2022) is a three year programme being implemented in the Lower Tana sub-catchment in Kenya and Upper Aswa-Agago sub-catchment in Uganda. These are arid and semi-arid (ASAL) areas where communities within the catchments face multiple challenges including recurrent droughts and floods and resource use conflicts that hinder development and livelihood strategies.

The REPLAP builds on a two phase Building Drought Resilience (BDR) Project which was implemented in the same landscapes between 2012-2018. BDR phase 1 (2012-2014) targeted to build resilience of dryland communities within the river catchments to the impacts of increasingly severe and frequent drought, through strengthened ecosystem management and adaptive capacity and used IUCN resilience framework as building. The BDR phase 1 project proved a success hence recommendation to scale up the successful approaches and consolidate the achievements of BDR Phase 1 was made by the Mid-Term Review in July 2014. Phase 2 (2015-2018) consolidated the gains and scaled up the approaches at landscape level in Lower Tana sub-catchment in Kenya and 5 districts in Upper Aswa-Agago sub-catchment located in Nile Water Management Zone in Uganda.

REPLAP is a foundational contribution to the regional multi-year Resilience Programme in Eastern and Southern Africa's rangelands which will contribute to increasing natural resource management capacity of communities and stakeholders within the target catchments. The overall objective of the REPLAP is to strengthen *the resilience of communities to the impacts of increasingly severe and frequent climate disasters within well-managed and functioning river catchments and ecosystems over a 3-year period. The output areas of the programme are:*

Output 1: Institutional governance strengthened for climate resilience. Consolidation of the climate-responsive mitigation and adaptation plans developed to support institutional strengthening, capacity building and learning at national and sub-national levels.

Output 2: Sustainable catchment restoration and management: Integrity, functioning and productivity of catchments and ecosystems is enhanced by appropriate techniques for restoration, and sustainable management

Output 3: Climate adaptive livelihoods systems supported: Climate resilient value chains that promote enterprise development are strengthened and are underpinned by innovative inclusive finance models including the CECF.

2. Location

In Kenya, the REPLAP build on the BDR project sites which are located in the Lower Tana River Basin (Tana River and Garissa Counties), particularly in the six sub-catchments of Tula, Al-Amin Moju, Bangale, Saka, Kasha and Khorweyne and an additional 4 sub catchments where the REPLAP will be scaled up, targeting a total of 124,000 beneficiaries. The main implementing partner is Water Resource Management Authority (WRMA) and other partners including national and county government institutions (National Drought Management



Authority, Water, Forest and Wildlife, Livestock, Agriculture, Irrigation, NEMA, Administration), civil society organizations and communities. In Uganda, the BDR project was implemented in 8 parishes within 5 districts of Lira, Otuke, Alebtong, Agago and Amuria/Kapelebyong within the Aswa-Agago sub catchment. The REPLAP will scale up to an additional 5 parishes within the same 5 districts in the landscape, targeting a total of 80,000 beneficiaries.

3. Purpose and objectives of the evaluation

The purpose of the programme evaluation is to assess the impact of the REPLAP programme in delivering its intended objectives at scale, based on the project objectives and log frame. The evaluation will help in understanding to what extent the project phase has delivered its intended results, and whether and how it has responded to actual needs in an effective manner in the two countries (Kenya and Uganda) selected for the evaluation. It will help to identify critical evidence and learning on what implementation strategies have worked and may not have worked, which can be considered in any potential future phases of the project.

By looking at longer-term sustainability and collecting evidence on successful strategies, the evaluation will also help to inform future project strategies that are sustainable and responsive to the needs of local communities.

In line with IUCN's Requirements for Monitoring and Evaluation, all projects with a value over CHF500,000 have to undergo evaluation at the end of the project.

This evaluation is forward looking and will effectively capture lessons learnt as well as challenges faced. This evaluation is intended to be independent external reflection on the project, which will complement internal reflection cycles implemented by the IUCN, and more so engagements with ADA for potential of next phase of the project. The evaluation reflects on 3 years of implementation, assessing against the OECD DAC criteria¹ of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, Efficiency, impact, efficiency, and sustainability of the program.

4. Evaluation scope.

The final evaluation is being commissioned by IUCN with approval of ADA in order to understand and document the main results and impact of the programme on the target landscapes and beneficiary communities. It will further explore how IUCN and stakeholders have contributed to those impacts or roles they have played in those changes. This will inform IUCN, ADA, project partners (WRA) and local communities on key impact areas and support in understanding improvement needs for future similar programming.

The final evaluation will focus on assessing the programme as a whole and will assess formative aspects (assesses the design and theory of change of the programme), process (assesses the implementation process of the programme) and impact / results brought by it.

¹ INCLUDE HERE THE FOOTNOTE TO WHERE THE OECD DAC EVALUATION CRITERIA ARE DEFINED.
<https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf>



The period that the final evaluation will cover is focused on the implementation process from the 1st September 2019 to 31st August 2022.

5. Intended Users:

The evaluation is intended to benefit the primary users who have been instrumental in implementing the programme, as well as secondary users whose actions, plans and programmes can benefit at scale from the findings of this evaluation. The primary users for the evaluation are ADA, IUCN programme teams, local target communities, Water Resource Users Associations, Water Resource Authority in Kenya, and other local stakeholders; County governments of Garrisa and Tana river in Kenya. Likewise, in Uganda, this includes Ministry of Water and Environment, District Local Governments in Lira, Otuke, Alebtong, Amuria and Agago in Uganda as well as Aswa Catchment Management Committee. The secondary users include other government institutions, private sector, academia, and civil society organisations operating within the target landscape, other government.

6. Evaluation Methods

The evaluation will mostly rely on guided evaluation questions aimed at providing detailed impact of the programme as listed below;

Relevance:

- To what extent has the project responded to the actual needs of target stakeholders and beneficiaries, including specific needs based on gender and diversity aspects?
- To what extent was the theory of change / spheres of influence model relevant?
- Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?

Effectiveness:

- To what extent have the project objectives and expected results been achieved?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of different the objectives? Reflection on various factors: internal and external, operational and programmatic, components of the project etc.
- To what extent has the project contributed to building the resilience of the people, ecosystems and livelihoods within the project area?
- How have the project outcomes influenced or been influenced by the specific government programmes within project area on drought resilience, catchment management, natural resource governance and livelihoods enhancement?

Efficiency (of Project Implementation):

- Was the process of achieving results efficient? Specifically did the actual or expected results (outputs and outcomes) justify the costs incurred? Were the resources effectively utilized?



- Did project activities overlap and duplicate other similar interventions (funded nationally and/or by other donors)? Are there more efficient ways and means of delivering more and better results (outputs and outcomes) with the available inputs?
- Could a different approach have produced better results?
- How efficient were the management and accountability structures of the project?

Impact:

- What difference/changes or effects has the project made or is making in the target landscapes or ecosystems?
- What real difference/changes has the activity made to the lives of the target group?

Sustainability

- What is the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of project outcomes and benefits after completion of the project?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project (including covid 19)

Gender mainstreaming

- To which extent was the project design and implementation been responsive to gender and social inclusion? How successful was the project in implementing its gender action plan?

Environmental and social safeguards:

- How effective was the project in the compliance or implementation of relevant environmental and social safeguards?

Methodology:

The evaluator(s) are invited to **propose their methodology for the conduct of the final evaluation**. Ideally, a **mixed-method approach** will be followed balancing suitable bio-physical and socio-economic quantitative and qualitative methodologies and allowing to draw on different sources and triangulating information. Additionally, a participatory approach will be followed throughout the evaluation, coupled inclusive (consultations with all stakeholders, such as gender, youth, age, disability and other vulnerability considerations), sensitive of social norms and practices, and ethical in data collection practices (safety, informed consent, etc). This is especially important for the methodology of the evaluation, for example, it is encouraged to suggest different methods which include local community members being active agents for data collection and even analysis as well such as engagement of local enumerators. Findings and analysis will be disaggregated by age and gender.

Evaluators will be encouraged to use participatory and qualitative methods for data collection and data analysis, along with quantitative methods for measuring the changes, in line with the overall theory of change of the project. Additionally, since one of the objectives of the final evaluation is to understand the contribution of the project towards change at various levels in the project's theory of change, the evaluator is encouraged to suggest different methodologies, which can provide answers in a valid and reliable manner.



Evaluator will be provided with secondary sources including:

- Project proposal
- Project baseline report and data
- M&E results framework
- Log frame and direct activity reports among others.
- Project theory of change
- All reports submitted to ADA as part of semi-annual reports.

At the same time, the evaluator shall consider other relevant internal or external secondary data sources. Specifically, the evaluation will compare baseline (pre-project intervention) data in both project treatment and non-treatment groups with end-line data to demonstrate the treatment effect/impact of the project as a result of the various project interventions

The primary sources of data will include IUCN staff, partners and project stakeholders such as Water Resource Authority in Kenya, Aswa Catchment Management Committee in Uganda, local water resource user associations, County governments of Garrisa and Tana River (Kenya) and District Local Governments in Lira, Otuke, Alebtong, Amuria and Agago (Uganda). All data collection methods will be gender appropriate.

7. Logistics:

Logistical arrangements for transportation to and from the locations of data collection within the country will be partly arranged by the IUCN in Kenya and Uganda, depending on the location and its accessibility. The group discussions and meetings with community members will be arranged together with IUCN and partner organizations. These arrangements will be pre-agreed before starting the field works.

8. Deliverables

The evaluators are expected to deliver following deliverables:

Inception report (Refer to ADA project evaluation guidelines, Annex 5 page 46)²

Validation workshop: This will include virtual workshop with stakeholders and project teams to share the information and validate the findings in most appropriate manner.

Results Assessment Form (Refer to ADA Project guidelines, pages 32-33)

Evaluation Final Report, not more than 30-35 pages, written in simple English. Any additional information should be provided in Annexes.

In addition, the final report shall contain following outline:

²https://www.entwicklung.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Dokumente/Evaluierung/Evaluierungs_Leitfaeden/Guidelines_for_Programme_and_Project_Evaluations_ADA_2020.pdf



1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
3. Background and Context Analysis
4. Evaluation Design and Approach
 - 4.1. Methodological Approach
 - 4.2. Data Collection and Analysis Tools
 - 4.3. Limitations, Risks and Mitigations Measures
5. Findings
6. Conclusions
7. Recommendations
8. Annexes
 - Results Assessment Form
 - Presentation of evidence along assessment grid per evaluation question
 - Instruments for data collection
 - List of interview partners (anonymised)
 - Bibliography
 - Evaluation ToR Additional annexes as deemed useful

The contract agreement between IUCN and the evaluator/s will be based on these deliverables.

9. Evaluation team

IUCN encourages competent and experienced M&E companies/firms to apply for this consultancy service. The main requirement is the experience in the region, and usage of innovative and mixed methods approaches.

The evaluator (or enumerators engaged in the data collection) is expected to speak *Kiswahili* language in Kenya and *Luo* for Uganda. If required, IUCN can also provide support in finding the local enumerators / data collection team

The team will consist of at least 3 people, including (1) Team leader with a postgraduate degree (at least Master's degree in M&E, Natural Resource Management, Water Resources Management or related field) from recognized university and with over 10 years' demonstrated experience in participatory evaluation and research methodologies in Kenya or Uganda, demonstrated experience in designing, gender sensitive research methodologies, tools and analysis; demonstrated experience in conducting / analysing outcomes mapping evaluations / outcomes harvesting assessments (Desirable); excellent English communication and writing skills. The team leader will have the overall responsibility for the design and implementation of the evaluation, writing of the report, and timely submission of the draft and final version. Detailed responsibilities of each team member shall be determined at the beginning of the mission and outlined in the methodology.

(2) A Kenyan and a Ugandan with a postgraduate degree (at least Master's degree in environment and natural resources or related fields) from recognized university and with over 10 years' of experience and background in climate change adaptation or resilience in ASALs. The team will have complementary skills covering programme design and implementation,



programme review, natural resources management especially community participation, policy and institutional processes more so in natural resources management in ASALS. The international expert will be the team leader, with considerable prior experience in evaluation methodologies and principles.

(3) A socio-economist or gender expert with at least 10 years' experience in undertaking programme evaluations, preferably within ASALS in Kenya and Uganda

(4) The evaluation team shall provide evidence and reference for previous mid-term or end of project evaluation for projects of similar nature or scope in the last 3 years.

NB: Only a single firm/teams of consultants will be hired, with one expert/team focussing on Kenya and another expert/team focusing on Uganda. A single report will be produced covering findings for both Kenya and Uganda components of the project. Therefore on your technical and financial proposals, please specify which country you are applying for and if for both, also mention in the proposals.

10. Evaluation Criteria

N0.	Criteria	Points
1.	Clarity and completeness of the Proposal	10
2.	Approach and Methodology	
2.1	Critical analysis of the project objectives and the TOR	10
2.2	Conceptual and methodological approach Description of the conceptual and methodological approach including experimental designs, sample size and power calculations (30 pt.)	30
2.3	Operationalisation of the approach and Methodology Working programme / working schedule for delivery of outputs (20 pt.) , Staffing schedule and task assignment descriptions (5 pt.) , Work organisation, back-up services, quality control, logistics (5 pt.)	30
3.	Consultants Competencies	
3.1	Education: Master's in relevant field (10 pt.) ; Work experience: 10 years relevant experience including Mid-term or end of project evaluations Impact assessments, socio-economic and biophysical assessments, (10 pt.) .	20
Total (maximum)		100



The total score will be calculated as the weighted sum of both technical score and financial score using relative weights 70% for Technical proposal and 30% for the financial proposal.

11. How to apply

Interested candidates should submit their combined technical and financial proposal, inclusive of all statutory taxes by **5:00 PM EAT time, on the 30th Day of June 2022** through:

esaro@iucn.org; info.esaro@iucn.org

The interested candidates shall provide:

Technical Proposal:

Methodology, methods, tools (or approaches), timeline, management and data collection & analysis plans;

Financial Proposal in USD (Kenya VAT is 16% for firms and 5% for individuals)

Organization profile with CV of lead evaluator / CV in case of individual consultant, along with the list of previous similar experiences