



## **END OF PROJECT EVALUATION FOR ENTERPRISING MIGORI PROJECT (EMP)**

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE(TOR)**

#### **1.0: Introduction**

**Country:** Kenya

**Location:** Migori

**Duration of the field mission:** appr. 28 days

**Under responsibility of:** Alfred Juma, Programme and Partner support Manager

**Africa Hub Support:** Byrone Wayodi, Head of MEL

#### **1.1 Ripple Effect**

Ripple Effect is an international organization fighting global poverty, food and nutrition insecurity while promoting gender equity and care for the planet. Ripple Effect and her partners work with vulnerable communities to address underlying causes of poverty, hunger, and malnutrition, and promote development. They as well as mitigate suffering caused by drought and displacement. Ripple Effect's approaches bring smallholder farmers together to learn more, grow more and sell more. So, they can feed their families nutritious food, and with a surplus to sell, they can invest in their farms, send their children to school, and build sustainable agri-businesses. Ripple Effect distinguishes the importance of building local capacities for sustainable change.

#### **1.2 The project being evaluated**

**Title:** Enterprising Migori project (EMP)

**Project duration:** September 2020 – August 2024

Enterprising Migori Project (EMP) is a four-year project implemented in Kakrao and West Kanyamkago wards of Suna East and Uriri sub-counties of Migori county respectively. The project will consolidate the gains made in the Kakrao Sustainable Livelihoods Project (KLP 2017 – 2020), deepening the impact and expanding reach to cover more vulnerable families in the nearby West Kanyamkago ward.

The project rides on the existing positive Government goodwill and leverages on KLP impacts including increased farm productivity, improved hygiene and sanitation, HIV/AIDS awareness, empowering PLWHIV to take the lead in campaigns for sharing and reducing stigma, improve health seeking behaviour etc.

It targets to reach 9,000 households both directly and through indirect mechanisms. The targets will be supported to attain sustainable livelihoods by utilizing natural resources to increase farm production and productivity, improve nutrition and health and establishment of own farm businesses.

### **1.2.1 Project target**

This project aims to reach a total of 9,000 households with approximately 45,000 people. This means an average of 5 people per household. 30% of the target population to be people impacted by HIV/AIDS. These are stratified as follows:

1. 1000 direct households (5000 people), these participants will be reached through participation in training on sustainable agriculture, primary health care with emphasis on HIV/Aids and WASH, environmental management, enterprise development, and gender and social inclusion (GSI). The project will consolidate learning from the Kakrao livelihoods project in Kakrao ward while scaling impact and learning to West Kanyamkago ward.
2. 8000 indirect households (40,000 people), these people will be reached through open learning days (field days, trade fairs, demonstrations and by peer farmers outreach PFTs and CHVs project outreaches, community health outreach events i.e. mobile clinics.

### **1.2.2 Project goal**

To reduce poverty and secure sustainable livelihoods of 9,000 vulnerable farming families (45,000 people)

Project objectives

- Improve food and nutrition security
- Enhance knowledge and practice of appropriate natural resource management
- Improve social resilience and health of especially women and people living with HIV/Aids
- Establishment of small businesses and diversifying income sources

### **1.2.3 Project Outcome**

Migori community with increased resilience to economic, social and environmental shocks.

#### **1.2.3.1 Outcome indicators**

- % of households with a household dietary diversity score (HDDS) of 6 and above: 70% SHG and 50% community
- % of farmers reporting 'confident' or 'very confident' that their farm can meet all their food and income needs: 100% SHG and 60% community
- % of farmers earning more than \$2 per day: 60% SHG and 40% community
- % of women involved in the decision making
- type and number of effective community soil and water structures established
- % HIV+ clients receiving minimum Positive Health Dignity & Prevention package.

#### **1.2.4 Project outputs**

- Small-holder farmers (30% HIV positive) have increased income and food security because of improved productivity from their farms (livestock and crops)
- Small-holder farmers (30% HIV positive) have increased knowledge and practice natural resource management
- Small-holder farmers have increased social resilience contributing towards change in attitude towards women and those with HIV
- Smallholder farmers establish small businesses and diversify sources of income

## **2.0 Objectives of the Evaluation**

Ripple effect Kenya is commissioning this end of project evaluation to assess the project objectives against the OECD evaluation criteria of relevance & coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. This study is therefore meant to collect endline data for the project's participants (full cohort) sampled target to be analyzed against the log frame indicators (provided). This therefore will measure the achievement of the project and draw learnings that can be replicated or used to improve programming. This evaluation therefore seeks to assess the impact and effectiveness of the project over its four-year duration.

This evaluation should determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, developmental efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. The evaluation should also provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of Ripple Effect.

**2.1 The Core Principles:** the core principles underpinning the approach to the evaluation are:

- **Propriety:** ensuring evaluation is conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard to the welfare of those involved as well as those affected by the results
- **Utility:** ensuring the evaluation serves the information needs of the intended users and be owned by them
- **Feasibility:** ensuring that the evaluation is realistic, prudent, diplomatic, and frugal
- **Accuracy:** ensuring that the evaluation reveals and conveys technically adequate information about the features that determine worth or merit of the project.

Focus Area	Evaluation Questions
<b>Relevance</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To what extent were the project objectives, activities, outputs and outcomes aligned with the priorities and policies of the target group in Migori?</li> <li>2. To what extent did the project objectives align with Ripple Effect, Donor and SDG strategies?</li> <li>3. To what extent are project objectives, planned activities and planned outputs consistent with the intended outcome and impact?</li> <li>4. Are the objectives and design relevant given the social, economic, financial and environmental context?</li> <li>5. To what extent were the interventions fit for purpose and align with other existing systems, structures or local initiatives?</li> <li>6. To what extent was the intervention consistent in promoting of inclusion?</li> <li>7. 2. Were the project activities relevant to the needs and circumstances of the beneficiaries?</li> </ol>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To what extent did the project achieve its stated objectives?</li> <li>2. What were the key factors contributing to or hindering the achievement of the project objectives?</li> <li>3. How effective were the strategies and interventions implemented in achieving the desired outcomes?</li> <li>1. 4.What has happened because of donor funding that wouldn't have otherwise happened?</li> <li>4. What is the social return on investment?</li> <li>5. To what extent did the project actively engage stakeholders?</li> <li>6. To what extent did the project build the capacity of community structures?</li> <li>2. 8. To what extent were the project beneficiaries and collaborators/ partners satisfied with the project results?</li> </ol>

<b>Efficiency</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How well were the project resources (financial, human, and material) utilized in achieving the project outcomes?</li> <li>2. Were the project activities implemented in a cost-effective manner?</li> <li>3. Were there any delays or cost overruns, and how were they managed?</li> <li>3. 4. What were the difficulties/ challenges in the execution of the project (planning, implementation, monitoring etc.)?</li> </ol>
<b>Impact</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What changes occurred in the lives of the beneficiaries because of the project?</li> <li>2. How did the project contribute to improving income, food and nutrition security, health, and social resilience among the target beneficiaries?</li> <li>3. What non-visible changes (e.g. attitude, behavior etc.) were realised as a result of the project?</li> <li>4. Were there any unintended positive or negative impacts resulting from the project activities?</li> <li>5. To what extent has the project contributed to building the capacity of Ripple Effect partners?</li> <li>6. What would otherwise have happened if the project had not carried out the activities?</li> </ol>
<b>Sustainability</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What measures were put in place to ensure the sustainability of the project outcomes?</li> <li>2. To what extent are the project benefits likely to continue after the project ends?</li> <li>3. How well did the project build the capacity of local stakeholders and beneficiaries to sustain the outcomes?</li> <li>4. Any learnings that can inform Ripple Effect's future work in the Migori County, and any other county in similar contexts when responding to challenge(s) in a particular location?</li> </ol>

## 2.2 Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of this end-of-project evaluation is to:

- Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project implementation.
- Measure the impact of the project on the target beneficiaries.
- Identify key lessons learned and best practices.
- Provide recommendations for future similar projects.

## 2.3 Focus of the Evaluation

The evaluation will focus on the following areas:

- **Relevance:** Assess the extent to which the project activities and outcomes were suited to the priorities and policies of the target group.
- **Effectiveness:** Measure the extent to which the project achieved its objectives.
- **Efficiency:** Evaluate the project's use of resources in achieving the desired outcomes.
- **Impact:** Determine the changes brought about by the project in the lives of the beneficiaries.

- **Sustainability:** Assess the likelihood of the project benefits continuing after the project ends.

### 3.0 Methodology of the Evaluation

The evaluation will use a mixed-method and participatory approaches, including:

- Desk review of project documents, reports, and data.
- Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with project staff, stakeholders, and beneficiaries.
- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with community members.
- Household surveys to gather quantitative data.
- Field visits to project sites.

### 3.1 Stakeholders' Involvement

Key stakeholders to be involved in the evaluation include:

- Project beneficiaries (households and SHGs)
- Ripple Effect(Formerly Send A Cow) project team
- Local government officials
- Community leaders
- Partner organizations (NGOs and CBOs)

These is detailed as follows

**3.1.1 Preparation phase:** will include secondary data review, briefing with Ripple Effect Kenya head office personnel and Migori field office team, writing an inception report for evaluation outlining methodology study, sampling design and stating the sources of information, tools for data collection. The proposed methodology of evaluation must allow a mutual understanding between Ripple Effect teams and the consultant, regarding the objectives, scope, time and expected results of the evaluation. Clear indication of how the consultant plans to ensure full participation across gender, age, inclusion including HIV/Aids participants and those with disability. The consultant to indicate clearly how they will ensure ethical issues and confidentiality.

**3.1.2 Field phase:** (Migori): Meeting key stakeholders, especially government implementing departments, local authorities, participants, and other relevant persons using Household questionnaires, KIIs and Focus Group Discussions (FGD).

**3.1.3 Analysis and debriefing phase:** Indicate the system to be used for date collection, handling, analysis, storage and sharing. Please indicate how validation of the results will be done, to who, where and how.

A debriefing in the Kenya headquarter and Africa Hub will be organized (Hybrid) to discuss the results and the recommendation before a final report is shared in Hard and soft copies.

## 4.0 Deliverables

The consultant will be expected to deliver the following:

- **Inception report** detailing the evaluation design, methodology, and work plan with timelines before the commencement of evaluation.
- **Draft interim evaluation report** within 3 weeks from commencing the evaluation but before validation workshop for review and feedback.
- **Full data set** for review and record
- Document **case studies** and **best practices** identified in the project in collaboration with the Ripple Effect Communication department.
- **Final evaluation report** incorporating feedback and recommendations.
- Presentation of findings to key stakeholders.

## 5.0 Indicative Timetable

The successful consultants shall submit inception report and work plan to Ripple Effect within 5 working days of signing the contract. The evaluation is to be done within 30 consecutive days including inception report, data collection, analysis, drafting of the report and a validation meeting with the Ripple Effect team, project participants and partners. The evaluation therefore is expected to take place over a period of 4 weeks, with key milestones as follows:

- Week 1: Inception phase and desk review
- Week 2: Training enumerators and field data collection
- Week 3: Data analysis and drafting of the report
- Week 4: Validation and submission of draft report
- Week 5: Finalization and presentation of the final report

## 6.0 Final Evaluation Report

A detailed quality final report shall have the following components.:

- Executive summary: a strongly crafted, to-the-point, free-standing document (about 25 pages excluding annexes), including the key issues of the evaluation, summary of results, conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations.
- Introduction: the purpose of the evaluation, evaluation scope and key questions. Short description of the project to be evaluated and relevant frameworks.
- Evaluation design/methodology,
- Key results/findings: relating to the questions pointed out in the ToR
- Conclusions based on evidence and analysis,
- Recommendations regarding future steps/activities/follow-up carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, relevant and feasible (if possible, for each conclusion a recommendation),
- Lessons learnt (generalizations of conclusions applicable for wider use),

- Annexes (ToR, list of persons/organizations/address consulted, gender distribution and social representation of the respondents, literature and documentation consulted etc.)

## 7.0 Specification/ profile of the Consultants

A consultancy with a team of consultants in diverse qualification, competency and experience is desirable. The lead consultant should have:

- A postgraduate qualification in Agricultural Economics, Rural Development, Economics, Statistics, Monitoring and Evaluation, gender studies, value-chain or relevant fields (at least A master's degree in a relevant field).
- A minimum of 7 years of experience in evaluating similar projects, particularly in agricultural and livelihoods projects. Knowledgeable and experience in evaluating integrated agriculture, environment, health (especially HIV/AIDS) and the context in Kenya is an added advantage. Previous experience working with rural communities is compulsory.
- Strong qualitative and quantitative research skills.
- Excellent analytical and report-writing skills.
- Familiarity with the socio-economic context of Western Kenya.
- Ability to communicate effectively with diverse stakeholders.

## 8.0 How to Apply

Interested consultants should submit:

- A technical proposal outlining their understanding of the TOR, proposed methodology, and work plan.
- A financial proposal detailing the costs associated with the evaluation.
- CVs of the lead consultant and team members.
- Samples of previous relevant work.

Interested and qualified consultant(s) or firms should send their application by email as a single pdf file (Maximum 25 pages including CVs and Budgets) addressed to:

1. [kenya@rippleeffect.org](mailto:kenya@rippleeffect.org) and copy to
2. [Alfred.Juma@rippleeffect.org](mailto:Alfred.Juma@rippleeffect.org) , (Program and partner support Manager Ripple Effect Kenya)
3. [Titus.Sagala@rippleeffect.org](mailto:Titus.Sagala@rippleeffect.org) , (Country Director Ripple Effect Kenya)
4. [Byrone.Wayodi@rippleeffect.org](mailto:Byrone.Wayodi@rippleeffect.org) (The Regional Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning and program Effectiveness Lead Ripple Effect Africa Hub)

**Applications should reach by close of business on 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2024.**