



Request for Proposals (RFP)

INTERNATIONAL CALL FOR TENDER CRS SOUTH SUDAN_CONSULTANCY

Solicitation Number -SS-4016131-06-2021

1. Introduction

Catholic Relief Services (CRS) seeks to contract a third-party consultancy service provider to undertake the final project evaluation of the Resilience and Food Security Program (RFSP) in South Sudan. The program is funded under United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Bureau of Humanitarian Assistance (BHA) and has been implemented in South Sudan by a consortium of CRS and Save the Children since 2017.

The program's goal is to improve food security for conflict-affected households (HH) in Greater Jonglei. RFSP is an integrated multisector program with interventions in disaster risk reduction (DRR), agriculture, livestock, fisheries, nutrition, water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) and social cohesion. This program has been designed as a flexible response to address the interlocking problems of conflict and displacement, recurring food insecurity and vulnerability to shocks in the target counties of Greater Jonglei in South Sudan.

The final evaluation seeks to assess the impact and efficiency of RFSP interventions implemented since February 2017. The evaluation will also assess how the management, implementation and external factors affected results to inform future food security programming.

2. Scope of Work (SOW)

Please find the full SOW in Annex A.

3. Communication

The contractor's technical point of contact will be the CRS Chief of Party (CoP) and monitoring evaluation accountability and learning (MEAL) manager. Communication will include regular internet based meetings and submission of deliverables. Because of COVID-19, the contractor is required to adhere to COVID-19 restrictions and follow the guidelines from the South Sudan Ministry of Health, USAID, CDC and WHO. All internal travel within South Sudan by the contractor will require prior authorization from CRS.

4. Deadline for submission of bids

Bidders are required to submit an expression of interest comprising a narrative technical proposal demonstrating understanding of the SoW and a financial proposal indicating all costs associated with consultancy in PDF format via email to: sds_bids@crs.org on or before **30th July 2021 at 5:00 PM**. The bid must have the subject line "USAID Resilience and Food Security Program: Final Evaluation Proposal Submission: SS-4016131-06-2021." No hard copy submission will be accepted

Bidders are responsible for ensuring that their offers are received in accordance with the instructions stated herein. Late submissions after the deadline date and time will not be considered by CRS. If your organization should encounter any problems in submitting the proposal, please contact the CRS South Sudan Procurement Unit via email at southsudanPRs@crs.org;



CRS realizes that potential bidders may have additional questions after reading this RFP. Interested bidders can submit questions to CRS South Sudan's Procurement Unit via-email to southsudanPRs@crs.org. CRS will respond to all relevant questions by email from all companies or organizations that have expressed interest.

This RFP does not obligate CRS to execute a contract, nor does it commit CRS to pay any costs incurred in the preparation and submission of the proposals. Furthermore, CRS reserves the right to reject all offers, if such action is considered in the best interest of CRS.

Below is the provisional calendar of events for this RFP.

| | |
|--|--|
| July 12 th 2021 | Request for proposals (RFP) issued |
| July 19 th 2021 | Deadline to submit any questions related to the RFP |
| July 21 st , 2021 | CRS provides bidder specific responses |
| July 30 th , 2021 "Closing Date" | Electronic copies (Adobe PDF) of the proposals submitted via email to: sds_bids@crs.org . The subject line should read "USAID Resilience and Food Security Program -Final Evaluation Proposal Submission: SS-4016131-06-2021." |
| August 2 nd – 13 th 2021 | Review of proposals by CRS bid committee |
| August 23 rd , 2021 | Contract winner determined and notified, and contract negotiations begin |

5. Modification

If at any time prior to award CRS deems there to be a need for significant modification to the terms and conditions of this RFP, CRS will issue such a modification as a written RFP amendment to all competing bidders. No oral statement from any person shall in any manner be deemed to modify or otherwise affect any RFP term or condition, and no bidder shall rely on any such statement. Such amendments are the exclusive method for this purpose.

Resulting award Single contract: As a result of this solicitation, CRS anticipates engaging a single independent provider. Any resulting contract will be subject to the terms and conditions contained in Annex B: Form of Contract

Payment terms fixed price: CRS anticipates entering into a consultancy agreement with the selected bidder. Payment will be made according to milestones reached.

6. General requirements

Companies and organizations that submit proposals in response to this RFP must meet the following requirements:

- i. Are not in situations of conflict of interest, that is having prior family or business relationship to parties on tender committee or any person in CRS ;
- ii. **Are not on any list of sanctioned parties issued by the United States of America Government (USG), the United Nations (UN), or the European Union (EU) as detailed below:**
 - The website of the System for Award Management (SAM) formally known as the Excluded Party List System (EPLS): <https://www.sam.gov>;
 - The website of the United Nations Security (UNSC) sanctions committee established under UNSC Resolution 1267 (1999) (the "1267 Committee"): http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/aq_sanctions_list.shtml,



- The Office of Foreign Assets Control Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons List, <https://www.treasury.gov/ofac/downloads/sdnlist.pdf>

7. Proposal guidelines and instructions

a. See Annex 1 , in Annex A below for the detailed consultancy SoW, timeline of activities, team composition, deliverables, and reporting requirements and the technical proposal outline

b. Relationship disclosure

- Describe any current or past relationships your organization may have with CRS, and if it is a potential conflict of interest. If there is a potential conflict of interest, please explain how this risk will be mitigated
- Describe any personal or familial relationships any employee of the bidder has with any employee of CRS. If there is a relationship, please explain how any conflict-of-interest risk will be mitigated.
- *Disclosure does not automatically disqualify offeror.*

Per ADS 201.3.5.14, all team members will be required to provide to CRS and USAID a signed statement attesting no conflict of interest or describing an existing conflict of interest relative to the project or activity being evaluated (i.e., a conflict-of-interest form).

8. Cost proposal

Bidders pricing should be based on the following:

- Rate \$ (US dollars Only) per day

9. Evaluation criteria

In evaluating the proposals, CRS will seek the **best value for money** rather than the lowest priced proposal. CRS will use a three-stage selection procedure.

- The first stage will consider the completeness of the bid submission.
- The second stage will evaluate the technical proposal.
- The third stage will evaluate the cost proposal for proposals that pass the technical proposal evaluation.

Specifically, CRS will evaluate each technical proposal upon the following criteria.

| Criteria | Weight |
|--|------------------|
| <p>Bid submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bid submitted on time ○ Offeror is eligible to receive funding per background checks ○ Bid includes Team CVs, writing samples and technical approach to SoW ○ Any potential conflict of interest ○ References | <p>Pass/Fail</p> |



| | |
|---|------|
| Qualifications – CVs and skill of evaluation team | 25% |
| Past performance – Writing samples, past evaluations, and related deliverables | 15% |
| Technical approach – Bidders will be evaluated based on their responsiveness to deliverables | 50% |
| References – three (3) client references | 10% |
| Total weight | 100% |

The evaluators will tally all the individual scores for each section and calculate the average score. The total average scores will be added to obtain the total points achieved by the individual supplier.

The score for the **cost proposal** will be calculated in the following manner.

Cost proposal score = $100 \times \text{lowest proposed cost} / \text{proposed cost under consideration}$. The lowest proposed cost will receive the full 100 points.

The total score will be calculated as follows:

Total score = Technical proposal score of the proposal under consideration multiplied by 80% plus (+) Cost proposal score of the proposal under consideration multiplied by 20%.

10. Negotiations

CRS anticipates that a contract will be awarded solely on the basis of the original offers received. However, CRS reserves the right to request clarifications prior to award. Furthermore, CRS reserves the right to conduct a competitive range and to limit the number of bidders in the competitive range to permit an efficient evaluation environment among the most highly rated proposals. Highest-rated bidders, as determined by the technical evaluation committee, may be asked to submit their best prices or technical responses during a competitive range. At the sole discretion of CRS, bidders may be requested to conduct oral presentations. If deemed an opportunity, CRS reserves the right to make separate awards per component or to make no award at all. CRS is not bound to accept the lowest or any proposal and reserves the right to accept any proposal in whole or in part and to reject any or all proposals. CRS shall not be legally bound by any award notice issued for this RFP until a contract is dually signed and executed with the winning offeror.

11. Protest

By submitting a response to this request for proposals, bidders understand that USAID is NOT a party to this solicitation. Bidders agree that any protest to this request for proposals must be presented in writing with a full explanation of the bidders concerns to CRS for consideration. At its sole discretion, CRS will make a final decision on the protest.

12. Terms



CRS reserves the right to cancel this solicitation at any point and is under no obligation to issue a contract as a result of this solicitation. CRS will not reimburse any expenses related to the preparation of any proposal related materials or delivery.

13. Additional due diligence

Upon completion of both the technical and financial evaluations, CRS may choose to engage in additional due diligence processes with a particular bidder. The purpose of these processes is to ensure that CRS engages with reputable, ethical, responsible consultancy firms with solid financials and the ability to fulfill the contract. Additional due diligence may take the form of the following processes, though it is not limited to these:

- Reference checks.
- Determination of relations and affiliations between bidders.

ANNEX A

Resilience and Food Security Program (RFSP)

Background

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Office of Food for Peace (FFP) awarded the consortium of Catholic Relief Service (CRS) and Save the Children (SC) the total of USD,135,125,960 for the RFSP in South Sudan, starting 1 February 2017 and scheduled to end January 2022. The program's goal is to improve food security for conflict-affected households (HH) in Greater Jonglei. RFSP is an integrated multisector program with interventions in disaster risk reduction (DRR), agriculture, livestock, fisheries, nutrition, water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) and social cohesion. This program has been designed as a flexible response to address the interlocking problems of conflict and displacement, recurring food insecurity and vulnerability to shocks in the target counties of Greater Jonglei in South Sudan.

RFSP worked to strengthen local capacity to prevent, prepare for, and respond to food security threats facing the target communities. Under RFSP, CRS and SC engaged with community-based structures and local authorities to build their capacity and facilitate local leadership of the program's design and implementation process. The program sequenced and layered interventions, with emergency humanitarian support complemented by activities which support livelihood recovery and resiliency building. RFSP targeted to assist 173,700 conflict affected HHs (benefitting 868,500 people), in six target counties to improve their food security in the short term while building HH resilience to respond to shocks in the longer term.

The program did not conduct a baseline survey to benchmark its outcome and impact indicators in 2017. Instead, it used its first beneficiary based bi-annual survey (BAS) to benchmark these outcome and impact indicators before starting implementation in April 2017. The program also conducted a second BAS in October 2017 to track the progress of those indicators while the last BAS was conducted in May 2018 to provide the end line figures for the indicator. In May 2019, the project conducted an annual beneficiary-based survey (ABBS) which is being used as a baseline for the period 2019-2022. For the period October 2020 to January 2022, RFSP has prioritized communities recovering from the 2019 flooding and the resultant food insecurity, while maintaining its focus on community resilience. The program's goal of improving the food security of conflict-affected households will be achieved through technical interventions and activities that contribute to short term and long-term objectives:

Strategic Objective 1 helps conflict-affected households meet immediate lifesaving needs. RFSP will provide food assistance to targeted conflict-affected and displaced households to meet their immediate acute food needs.

Strategic Objective 2 improves household resilience to shocks. RFSP will assist households to recover their livelihood and productive assets, promote the development of social cohesion by engaging unemployed youth in income generating skills and activities, and promoting community stabilization after conflict using connector projects.



Table 1: RFSP results framework

| GOAL: To improve food security of conflict-affected households | |
|---|--|
| SO1: Conflict-affected households meet immediate lifesaving needs | SO2: Households have improved resilience to shocks |
| IR1.1: Households have access to food assistance | IR 2.1 Households have improved livelihood capacity |
| IR1.2: Households and communities have adopted program promoted nutrition practices | IR 2.2 Households have improved access to markets |
| | IR 2.3 Vulnerable youth are engaged in alternative livelihood activities |
| | IR 2.4 Bomas and communities implement resilience and community development plans. |
| | IR 2.5 Communities have improved access to clean water and sanitation facilities |
| | IR 2.6 Community have improved capacity to mitigate trauma |

Table 2: Target groups for RFSP interventions

| Intervention | Target groups | Target number | Calculation |
|------------------------|---|----------------------|--|
| Resilience | Severely or moderately food insecure HHs. Able bodied adults (18-60 years), one per target HH; | 412,701 | |
| Nutrition | Members of 75 core groups. Members of 120 mother to mother support groups. Members of 110 fathers' groups and 120 mother in-law groups; | 6,600 | Additional participants in messaging activities not included |
| Social cohesion | RFSP project participants in another sector interventions. Traditional leaders and local officials; | 34,671 | |
| WASH | Members of 150 water point user committees. HHs that installed improved sanitation facility. Members of 30 school WASH clubs. Community members that benefit from 150 rehabilitated or newly drilled boreholes. RFSP participants in other sector interventions reached by messaging; | 159,210 | |
| Agriculture | Members of 350 farmer producer groups. Members of 40 seeds multiplication groups. Members of 20 youth farmer groups; | 40,000 | |



| | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|-------|--|
| SILC | Members of 285 SILC groups SILC field agents and supervisors and private sector providers; | 5,700 | |
| Livestock and fisheries | Members of 77 fishery- based producer groups. Members of 35 bee keeping groups; Participants in livestock credit restocking for youth and women. | 3,200 | |

Evaluation objectives

The final evaluation seeks to assess the impact and efficiency of RFSP interventions implemented since February 2017, in terms of achieving SOs and IRs and producing unintended results, whether positive or negative. The evaluation will also assess how the management, implementation and external factors affected results to inform future food security programming. In particular, the evaluation will look at the following.

- Evaluate relevance - assess the overall RFSP strategy in terms of its relevance to improve food security of conflict-affected households, producing unintended outcomes, while considering contextual changes that have occurred since the program began implementation (e.g. FY19, FY20 flooding and the associated population, COVID-19)
- Effectiveness - evaluate the effectiveness of strategies and interventions including transfer modalities and complementary interventions to achieve activity outcomes, their acceptability and perceived value to target individuals.
- Efficiency - assess efficiency, strengths, and weaknesses of RFSP structures and management systems and programming adaptations in contextual changes.
- Impact - evaluate RFSP's impact (intended and unintended) on project participants and communities served.
- Coherence - how well does the intervention fit? To what extent do other interventions (particularly policies) support or undermine the intervention, and vice versa? Includes internal coherence and external coherence.
- Sustainability – to what extent the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.
- Learning from experience - document best practices, lessons learned and challenges from activity design and implementation

Evaluation questions

The evaluation's objectives, questions and illustrative questions are presented in **Table 3** below.

Table 3: Evaluation objectives and questions

| Evaluation objectives | Evaluation questions | Illustrative questions |
|--|---|---|
| Evaluate the achievements against goal, objectives, result targets | Was the activity effective in achieving its planned goal, objectives and lower-level results? | To what extent do the activity's interventions appear to have achieved their intended outcomes? How effective was the targeting approach in achieving the activity goal? What are the wins and losses of integrated multi-sectoral design and delivery? |



| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Assess the overall RFSP strategy in terms of its relevance to improve food security of conflict-affected households, producing unintended outcomes, while considering contextual changes that have occurred since the program began implementation (e.g. FY19, FY20 flooding and the associated population displacements ,COVID-19)</p> | <p>Was the activity relevant and adapt in order to remain relevant to its targeted beneficiaries?</p> | <p>To what extent did the activity consider gender equity, protection, age, physical and emotional challenges of the participants, and risks to participation in various interventions in activity design and implementation?</p> <p>To what extent were beneficiaries needs met, including the needs of differential groups (e.g. men, women, etc.)?</p> <p>How did management adapt the activity design or implementation based on monitoring information and feedback from the targeted population during the life of project?</p> <p>To what extent did the intervention contribute to social cohesion?</p> |
| <p>Assess the efficiency, strengths, and weaknesses of RFSP structures and management systems and programming adaptations in contextual changes</p> | <p>Was the activity delivered efficiently?</p> | <p>To what extent have the activity’s interventions adhered to planned implementation schedules?</p> <p>What factors promoted or inhibited adherence to plans and targets?</p> <p>How were problems and challenges managed? What lessons were learned?</p> |
| <p>Evaluate the effectiveness of the project transfer modalities, and complementary interventions to achieve activity outcomes</p> | <p>What was the effectiveness of the strategies and interventions including transfer modalities and complementary interventions to achieve activity outcomes, their acceptability and perceived value to target individuals?</p> | <p>Did interventions (transfer modalities and complementary interventions) reach the appropriate target groups and individuals within the target areas?</p> |
| <p>Evaluate the impact of the project</p> | <p>What was RFSP’s impact (intended and unintended) on project participants and communities served.</p> | <p>What changes associated with the intervention, expected and unexpected, positive and negative, were experienced by targeted participants, community members and other stakeholders?</p> <p>What impact did the food transfers have on yielding peace dividends in Greater Jonglei?</p> |
| <p>Document best practices, lessons,</p> | <p>What were the challenges, lessons, and best practices</p> | <p>What were the greatest challenges in activity design and implementation and to what extent were they overcome?</p> |



| | | |
|---|---|--|
| learnt and challenges in activity design and implementation | learned during the life of this activity? | <p>What best practices, if any, were identified during this activity's implementation?</p> <p>What lessons were learned regarding activity design and implementation?</p> |
| Evaluate the sustainability of the activity | To what extent the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue. | <p>To what extent did the activity take advantage of other USG and non-USG investments in the same target areas to facilitate linkages with complementary services, layering with earlier investments, and implementing an exit strategy?</p> <p>To what extent are the groups formed under RFSP precursors to functioning civil society and enablers of accountability and good governance?</p> <p>What additional support would these groups need to move to the next stage?</p> |

1. Evaluation design and methodology

1.1 Study design

The final evaluation will include a preliminary desk review, and a mixed-methods data collection and analysis. The project will conduct the quantitative data collection and analysis, and an external consultant will conduct the desk review and the qualitative data collection and analysis.

(A) Desk

The project will provide the consultant with the following documents for the desk review:

- activity proposal.
- log frame and theory of change (ToC)
- M&E plan
- Annual results reports (ARR)
- Indicator performance tracking tables (IPTT)
- Baseline study report.
- Formative research studies and any other qualitative studies carried out during implementation including barrier analysis and knowledge, attitude and practice (KAP surveys).
- Monitoring data and success stories.
- Any other reports generated by the project.

(B) End line quantitative survey

The end line participant-household survey will collect data on the same indicators that were collected by the ABBS in FY 2019. The end line survey will be conducted during the same season as baseline survey to allow comparability of results. The project will use the same sampling frame, data collection instruments, level of statistical precision (95 percent confidence and 80 percent statistical power) as the baseline survey.

(i) Activity Indicators to be measured in the end line survey



The same indicators on which data were collected during the baseline survey will be used and are listed below in **Table 4** as per the indicator numbers in the log frame. Data on the FFP indicators will be collected using a set of standard FFP questions outlined in the Part I: Indicators for Baseline and End line Surveys for Development Food Security Activities (Originally published April 2015 Updated May 2020)

Table 4: RFSP baseline and end line indicators

| Indicator | Source of indicator |
|---|---------------------|
| 1. Average household dietary diversity score (HDDS) (impact) | (FFP #29) |
| 1b. Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age | (FFP #37) |
| 1.2a Percentage of men and women with children under two (CU2) who have knowledge of maternal and child health and nutrition (MCHN) practices (disaggregated by sex) (outcome) | (FFP #64) |
| 1.2b and 2.5c Percentage of children under age five (CU5) who had diarrhea in the prior two weeks (disaggregated by sex) (outcome) | (FFP #38) |
| 2.5.a. Percentage of households using an improved drinking water source(outcome) | (FFP #40) |
| 2.5.d Percentage of households using an improved sanitation facility (outcome) | (FFP #41) |
| 2.6a Average adult hope score (outcome) | RFSP |
| Addendum: additional indicators | |
| Percentage of all women who have control over household income, loans, and spending decisions | RFSP |
| Percentage of project participants reporting being aware of how to provide feedback and make complaints about the program and its staff through the feedback and response mechanism (FRM) | RFSP |
| Percentage of project participants that perceive the FRM as a safe and accessible way to provide feedback and make complaints about the program and its staff | RFSP |
| Percentage of project participants reporting they understand their rights and entitlements as a participant in RFSP | RFSP |
| Percentage of project participants reporting that RFSP food and non-food items are delivered in a safe and dignified manner | RFSP |

1.1.1.1 Sampling strategy

The project will use two stage cluster sampling as a cost-efficient way to sample geographically dispersed populations. The project will select sample clusters (bomas) from a list of all the operational bomas and then draw the primary sampling units, participant households or individuals, from the selected clusters. The estimated cluster design is set at 33 clusters with 29 HH per cluster (33*29=957), which the project considers to be a reasonable balance between statistical and operational efficiency for the estimated sample size of 938 households in the section below.



The survey will use a 95% confidence level, 80% power and multi-stage cluster design effect to calculate a representative sample.

1.1.1.2 Sample size determination

The program's IPTT indicators will be used for estimating sample sizes. This section gives details on the sampling frame, sample size and sampling methodology. The team will use the comparative sampling formulas for indicators expressed as percentages and indicators expressed as averages. The formula for calculating the sample for the survey is:

$$n_{initial} = D_{est} \left[\frac{z_{1-\alpha} \sqrt{2\underline{P}(1-\underline{P})} + z_{1-\beta} \sqrt{P_{1,est}(1-P_{1,est}) + P_{2,est}(1-P_{2,est})}}{\delta} \right]^2$$

Where,

$n_{initial}$ = is the initial sample size required by the survey for each of the two time points.

$\delta = P_{1,est} - P_{2,est}$ = minimum effect size to be achieved over the time frame specified by the two surveys.

$P_{1,est}$ = represents a survey estimate of the true population proportion P_1 at first survey [If such an estimate is not available from prior surveys, please use 0.5].

$P_{2,est}$ = represents a survey estimate of the true population proportion P_2 at second end line survey.

$$\underline{P} = \frac{P_{1,est} + P_{2,est}}{2}$$

$z_{1-\alpha}$ is the value from the normal probability distribution corresponding to a confidence level $1 - \alpha$. For $1 - \alpha = 0.95$, the corresponding value is $z_{0.95} = 1.64$.

$z_{1-\beta}$ is the value from the normal probability distribution corresponding to a power level of $1 - \beta$. For $1 - \beta = 0.80$, the corresponding values is $z_{0.80} = 0.84$.

D_{est} = is the estimated design effect (DEFF) of the survey. [If such an estimate is not available from prior surveys, please use 2].

The program selected FFP indicator #29 average household dietary diversity score (HDDS) to generate a reasonable sample in terms of size and cost (annex II). This was selected as it has a demand for the highest sample size as compared to the rest of the indicators¹. The team selected $P_{1,est}$ to be 0.4925 (5.91/12) and the estimated value at the time of the second survey $P_{2,est}$ to be 0.5758(6.91/12), aiming for an increase of 0.0833. Additional parameters that go into the calculation are $z_{1-\alpha}$ the normal probability value corresponding to $1 - \alpha = 1.64$ and $z_{1-\beta}$ the normal probability value corresponding to $1 - \beta = 0.84$, D_{est} , the design effect =2. The sample was adjusted for number of HHs to visits and the anticipated non-response rate of 5%. Using this formula and the corresponding adjustments the sample size was calculated to be 932.

¹ <https://www.fantaproject.org/sites/default/files/resources/FTF-PBS-Sampling%20Guide-Apr2018.pdf>



P₂ estimate in the IPTT submitted for the cost extension was 8.00, and the project is revising this down to 6.91. This decision has been based on the impact of COVID-19 restrictions which reduced all group- based activities including farming and food production as well as savings, resilience, and nutrition.

1.1.1.3 Sampling frame

The county will be the strata. The boma will be the cluster and the survey will select bomas with systematic PPS at first stage and participant HHs will be selected using fractional interval sampling at the second stage, and all individuals at the HH level for relevant indicators like children or women are selected.

The participant lists will be the sampling frame and it will contain the elements below:

- Unique HH identification number.
- HH contact information (including name, physical location);
- HH characteristics (household gender composition, size);
- Intervention(s) received.
- Participant target criteria met.

1.1.1.4 Quantitative data collection methods and instruments

The survey team will administer FFP structured questionnaires (see **Annex 2**) at HH level. This will include a screening section to identify and administer separate questionnaire modules to respondents where certain indicators are applicable. The survey will organize questionnaire modules by respondent group and include an informed consent statement to be administered at the start of the survey as well as a HH roster. The survey will use Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance Project II (FANTA) guidelines and FFP standard survey questions and questionnaires to collect data on FFP's standard indicators. The survey will use questionnaire modules to measure custom indicators as defined and described in the respective performance indicator reference sheet (PIRS). The questionnaire will then be coded into CommCare. Survey teams will collect the data using data collection devices and will sync the data to the cloud at the end of each day at the county offices. RFSP will consolidate the data to form the overall annual survey dataset. To ensure accuracy and data cleanliness, the program will include systematic checks, validation syntax, display logic in the data collection system on Comcare.

As the sample size has been calculated adjusting for the contingency of non-response, the program will not substitute alternatives if the selected HHs are not available at the time the survey is being undertaken. Instead, the survey team will make up to three callback attempts to interview the HHs sampled for the survey, if these cannot be reached on the first contact.

1.1.1.5 Quantitative data management, tabulation, sample weight and analysis

The survey will organize survey data from CommCare into a secure database, following data management best practices. The team will systematically clean the data through checking for valid data ranges, checking if logic was adhered to and resolve any logical inconsistencies in the data before further analysis which will be done using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). The survey team will also check for any outliers and remedy per statistical standards.

The survey team will construct sampling weights which will be used in the construction of estimates of each indicator to account and compensate for unequal probabilities of selection at each stage of sampling. The purpose of constructing these sampling weights will be to consider the distortion imposed by the unequal sampling probabilities for different units in the respondent population. Following Feed, the Future /FFP guidelines the team will calculate the probabilities of selection of:

- i. Cluster based on bomas
- ii. HHs in the bomas
- iii. Response/interviewed individuals and/or HHs



Selected individuals and HHs who do not respond and selected individuals and HHs who respond to the survey will be tracked to build sample weights for adjustments for non-responses at the individual and HH levels. If some bomas are not accessible during the survey period, the survey team will assume that any inference that is made reflects the total population excluding the inaccessible bomas.

1.1.1.6 Sampling weight and management of non-response

The team will compute and use the sampling weights in the data analysis. Weights will be computed separately according to the unique sampling scheme appropriate for the associated sampled household or individual. This will involve computing an overall sampling weight for each distinct sampling group by taking the inverse of the product of the probabilities of selection from each stage of sampling (boma selection and HH selection). Sample weights will be calculated and used in the construction of estimates of each indicator to account and compensate for the following probabilities of selection at each stage of sampling and non-response at the individual beneficiary level:

- Calculating sample weights to reflect probabilities of selection: The individual sample weight of each respondent will be multiplied by each value of the respondent's data before the quantity is summed across all respondent beneficiaries to form an estimate of a total. RFSP will use four-step process suggested by Feed the Future (FtF) and FFP for calculating sample weights to reflect probabilities of selection for surveys that have two stage sampling processes.
- Adjusting survey weights for non-response: The methodology anticipates non-responses in this survey. These include target respondents that will be unreachable, unavailable, or unwilling to respond to any or all the survey questions. RFSP requires that interviewers visit HHs or point of interview up to three times to complete an interview with the selected beneficiaries. Despite these efforts, the project still anticipates a non-response rate of up to 10%. To manage non-responses, weights will be calculated and adjusted to compensate for HH and individual level non-responses.
- To calculate the weight adjustments for non-response, the survey will track both the selected sampled respondents who do not respond and the sampled respondents who do respond. Both respondents and non-respondent have probabilities of selection but as no interview has been conducted with non-responding selected respondents, the sample weights of the respondents are inflated to compensate for those who do not respond. The weight adjustment for non-response for survey design will be calculated as follows:

$$w_{non-response} = \frac{\text{number of respondents selected to be interviewed (in a sampled cluster)}}{\text{number of respondents actually interviewed (in a sampled cluster)}}$$

Calculating the final sampling weights: The final sample weights to be used in data analysis will be calculated by multiplying the sample weights (inverse of the probabilities of selection) by the weight adjustment for non-response as per the following formula: $w_{final} = w_{ProbSelection} * w_{non-response}$

1.1.1.7 Comparison of baseline and end line data at final evaluation

Table 5: Baseline and end line data comparison

| Indicator | Indicator Source | Indicator Title | Statistical Test |
|---|------------------|---|----------------------------|
| 1. Average household dietary diversity score (HDDS) (impact) | (FFP #29) | HDDS raw score | Two sample T-test |
| 1b. Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age | (FFP#37) | % of children 0-5 months of age who are | Pearson's chi-squared test |



| | | | |
|---|-----------|--|----------------------------|
| | | exclusively fed with breast milk | |
| 1.2a Percentage of men and women with children under two (CU2) who have knowledge of maternal and child health and nutrition (MCHN) practices | (FFP#64) | % of men and women with CU2 who have knowledge of MCHN | Pearson's chi-squared test |
| 1.2b Percentage of children under age five (CU5) who had diarrhea in the prior two weeks | (FFP#38) | % of CU5 who had diarrhea in the prior two weeks | Pearson's chi-squared test |
| 2.5.a. Percentage of households (HH) using an improved drinking water source | (FFP#40) | % of HHs using an improved drinking water source | Pearson's chi-squared test |
| 2.5.c Percentage of children under age five who had diarrhea in the prior two weeks | (FFP #38) | % of children under age five who had diarrhea in the prior two weeks | Pearson's chi-squared test |
| 2.5.d Percentage of HHs using an improved sanitation facility | (FFP#41) | % of HHs using an improved sanitation facility | Pearson's chi-squared test |
| 2.6a Average adult hope score | RFSP | Raw average adult hope score | Two sample T-test |
| Percentage of all women who have control over HH income, loans and spending decisions | RFSP | % of all women who have control over HH income, loans and spending decisions | Pearson's chi-squared test |
| Percentage of project participants reporting being aware of how to provide feedback and make complaints about the program and its staff | RFSP | % of project participants reporting being aware of how to provide feedback and make complaints about the program and its staff | Pearson's chi-squared test |
| Percentage of project participants beneficiaries that perceive the FRM as a safe and accessible way to provide feedback and make complaints about the program and its staff | RFSP | % of project participants that perceive the FRM as a safe and accessible way to provide feedback and make complaints about the program and its staff | Pearson's chi-squared test |
| Percentage of project participants reporting they understand their rights and entitlements as a participant in RFSP | RFSP | Percentage of project participants reporting they understand their rights and entitlements as a participant in RFSP | Pearson's chi-squared test |
| Percentage of project participants reporting that RFSP food and non-food items are delivered in a safe and dignified manner | RFSP | % of project participants reporting that RFSP food and non-food items are | Pearson's chi-squared test |



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | delivered in a safe and dignified manner | |
|--|--|--|--|



1.1.1.8 Production of indicator estimates

Baseline and endline indicator estimates will be listed as below

Table 6: Baseline and end line indicator estimates

| Indicator | Source of indicator | Level of reporting | BL indicator value | BL 95% Confidence Interval | EL Indicator value | EL 95% Confidence Interval | Number of sampling units interviewed (n) | Test of difference of BL and EL |
|---|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| 1. Average HDDS (impact) <i>n=RFSP participants households</i> | (FFP #29) | overall | 5.91 | (5.57,6.26) | | | BL=1287 EL=?? | |
| Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age <i>n= children under six months old</i> | FFP#37 | overall | 75.1% | (58.8%,91.3%) | | | BL=50 EL= | |
| 1.2a Percentage of men and women with CU2 who have knowledge of MCHN practices (disaggregated by sex) (outcome) <i>n= RFSP nutrition participants with CU2</i> | (FFP #64) | overall | 73.9% | (63.7%,84.1%) | | | BL=268 | |
| | | men | 73.1% | | | | | |
| | | women | 74.0% | | | | | |
| 1.2b Percentage of CU5 who had diarrhea in the prior two weeks (disaggregated by sex) (outcome) <i>n= CU5 from HH who participate in WASH</i> | (FFP #38) | overall | 29.9% | (24.2%,35.6%) | | | BL=69 4 EL= | |
| | | boys | 28.4% | | | | | |
| | | girls | 31.5% | | | | | |
| 2.5.a. Percentage of HHs using an improved drinking water source(outcome) <i>n=RFSP WASH participants HHs</i> | (FFP #40) | overall | 42.5% | (35.3%,49.8%) | | | BL=1272 EL= | |
| 2.5.c Percentage of CU5 who had diarrhea in the prior two weeks (disaggregated by sex) (outcome) ² | (FFP #38) | | | | | | | |
| 2.5.d Percentage of HHs using an improved sanitation facility (outcome) <i>n= RFSP WASH participants HHs</i> | (FFP #41) | overall | 34.3% | (25.6%,43.0%) | | | BL=1272 EL= | |
| 2.6a Average adult hope score (outcome) <i>n =RFSP social cohesion participants</i> | RFSP | overall | 45.35 | (44.13,46.57) | | | BL=812 EL= | |
| Percentage of all women who have control over HH income, loans and spending decisions <i>n= RFSP women participants.</i> | RFSP | women | 15.1% | (12.3% 17.8%) | | | BL=1080 EL= | |

² See indicator 1.2b



| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|---------|-------|---------------|--|--|----------------|--|
| Percentage of project participants reporting being aware of how to provide feedback and make complaints about the program and its staff <i>n=RFSP participants</i> | RFSP | overall | 42.6% | (37.6%,47.9%) | | | BL=1545 EL= | |
| Percentage of project participants that perceive the FRM as a safe and accessible way to provide feedback and make complaints about the program and its staff <i>n=RFSP participants</i> | RFSP | overall | 73.6% | (69.7%,77.1%) | | | BL=1545 EL= | |
| Percentage of project participants reporting they understand their rights and entitlements as a participant in RFSP <i>n=RFSP participants</i> | RFSP | overall | 75.8% | (69.9%,80.8%) | | | BL=1545 EL= | |
| Percentage of project participants reporting that RFSP food and non-food items are delivered in a safe and dignified manner <i>n=RFSP participants</i> | RFSP | overall | 92.3% | (90.0%,94.2%) | | | BL=1545 EL= | |
| Percentage of HHs that can obtain drinking water in less than 30 minutes (round trip) <i>n=RFSP WASH participants HHs</i> | (FFP #44) | overall | 70.8% | (65.0%,75.7%) | | | BL=1272 EL= | |
| Percentage of HHs practicing correct use of recommended household water treatment technologies <i>n=RFSP WASH participants HHs</i> | (FFP #43) | overall | 32.3% | (27.5%,37.1%) | | | BL=1272 EL= | |
| Percentage of HHs with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members <i>n=RFSP WASH participants HHs where observations were made.</i> | (FFP #42) | overall | 17.5% | (4.6%,30.4%) | | | BL=93 EL= | |



1.1.2 Qualitative inquiry

RFSP will use qualitative methods to collect information to interpret quantitative results and to answer evaluation questions that are qualitative in nature. The evaluator will design the overall qualitative study approach and will use focus group discussions (FGD), key informant interviews (KII), direct observations, and case studies. The respondents will include both individuals who directly participated in the activity and those not specifically targeted with any intervention. The purpose of interviewing non-participants or indirect participants is to understand whether non-participants acquired knowledge, techniques, and behaviors from the activity promoted interventions, and whether the activity negatively affected community members who did not directly participate in the activity's interventions. In addition, the evaluation team will interview key informants including project staff, knowledgeable people from the community, local government staff and community leaders. It is anticipated that the evaluator will conduct two FGDs per cohort of youth (male and female) and adults (male and female) in the 33 bomas targeted for the evaluation.

1.1.2.1 Sampling for qualitative methods

RFSP will purposively select activity participants and their HH members, non-participating neighbors, relevant stakeholders, including community leaders, local government official as well as project implementing staff to collect enriched information.

The program will use quota sampling to reflect the overall characteristics of the community being studied. Quota sampling conducts estimations of various strata or cohorts within the community (e.g., male/female, youth, elderly, ethnic groups, wealthy, poor) and then selects quotas of participants in order to approximate these same characteristics.

1.1.2.2 Qualitative data collection methods and instruments

RFSP will use FGDs and KIIs, case studies and direct observations of access roads created or rehabilitated, water ponds, flood dikes, drip irrigation schemes, and other field activities to collect data. The program will conduct four FGDs in each county using cohorts of youths (men and women) and adults (men and women) to give a total of 24 FGDs in the 33 clusters sampled for the survey. RFSP will carry out three KII in each county to give at least 18 KII in the 33 bomas and additional KII will be conducted as necessary. KII will be conducted with farmer group leaders, CMDRR committee leaders, project staff, extension agents and project staff

1.1.2.3 Qualitative data management, tabulation, and analysis

RFSP will use the matrix (manual) approach to organize both data entry and analysis of the collected qualitative data. This approach ensures that all team members are recording information consistently and in a manner that directly responds to key research questions. This approach enables identification of important patterns in responses and specific contextual information that may help to explain quantitative or secondary data. The qualitative data matrices also allow responses from FGDs and KIIs, to be triangulated to determine whether information is reliable.

Before analysis of qualitative information begins, designated research leader will aggregate the data into qualitative data matrices by location. During the analysis, RFSP will use completed matrices to ensure that qualitative information can be concisely and coherently presented either on its own or integrated with quantitative survey results.

2 Evaluation timeline

RFSP plans to conduct the quantitative survey in the dry season period of **March to /May 2021** and the qualitative survey during the harvest period of October to November 2021. See **Annex 1** for the consultant scope of work and timeline of activities.



3 Composition and roles of the evaluation team

The program’s MEAL team will conduct the quantitative survey using sampling frames. The MEAL lead will draw first-stage cluster sampling units and second-stage respondent HHs, finalize the data collection methodologies and tools including survey manuals and data quality assessment checklists with the support of CRS’s regional MEAL Technical Advisor. The MEAL lead will facilitate field-testing of data collection tools, translation of data collection tools and manuals, provide training to survey enumerators and supervisors, and monitor the overall survey exercise. The MEAL team will also clean and analyze the quantitative data and provide the stated deliverables as per the minimum FANTA guidelines and FFP requirements.

The qualitative survey will be conducted by an external consultant or research firm consisting of a team leader and three team member subject matter specialists in either WASH, nutrition, social cohesion or livelihoods. The external consultants will design the overall qualitative study approach using FGD, KII, direct observations, and case studies. The external consultants will draft and finalize the qualitative evaluation survey report

4 Intellectual property

CRS and USAID hold the intellectual property rights produced under the final evaluation. CRS will retain the rights, title, and interest to data that are first acquired or produced under the award. USAID reserves a royalty-free, worldwide, nonexclusive, and irrevocable right to use, disclose, reproduce, prepare derivative works, distribute copies to the public, and perform publicly and display publicly, in any manner and for any purpose, and to have or permit others to do so.

CRS deems it unethical for any member of the evaluation team to use information gathered from citizens during the review assignment for anything other than the purpose of the final evaluation. Should a justifiable reason present itself for using the information obtained during the final evaluation for other purposes, the evaluation members must obtain CRS’s authorization for this use in writing.

5 Research ethics and protocol

The script in the text box will be read aloud to potential survey participants prior to the administration of the survey to obtain their consent.

Good Morning/Good Afternoon.
My name is _____ and I am conducting annual beneficiary-based survey for the Resilience and Food Security Program in this community. You have been selected randomly and by chance from the list of households in this boma for this interview. The purpose of this interview is to obtain information about your household regarding food security, livelihoods, and ability to produce own crops and livestock. This information will guide future RFSP interventions in this community. The information you give will be confidential – and will only be used to prepare a report of general findings – but will not include any specific names. There will be no way to identify that you gave this information in the reports produced. Could you please spare some time (around 1 hour) for the interview?

RFSP will strip the dataset of all the personal identifiable information to ensure there are no granularity or linkages that could make it possible to identify individuals so that the datasets can be made public.

6 Ethical guidelines



Every member of the evaluation team must adhere to ethical guidelines as outlined in the *American Evaluation Association’s Guiding Principles for Evaluators* as listed below.



- a) Systematic inquiry: Evaluators conduct systematic, data-based inquiries.
- b) Competence: The evaluation team possesses the education, abilities, skills, and experience appropriate to undertake the tasks proposed in the evaluation. Evaluators practice within the limits of their professional training and competence and decline to conduct evaluations that fall substantially outside those limits. The evaluation team collectively demonstrates cultural competence.
- c) Integrity/honesty: Evaluators display honesty and integrity in their own behavior and attempt to ensure the honesty and integrity of the entire evaluation process.
- d) Respect for people: Evaluators respect the security, dignity, and self-worth of respondents, activity participants, clients, and other evaluation stakeholders. Evaluators regard informed consent for participation in evaluations and inform participants and clients about the scope and limits of confidentiality.

Responsibilities for general and public welfare: Evaluators articulate and consider the diversity of general and public interests and values that may be related to the evaluation.

Annexes

| Annex # | Document title | Description | Document |
|---------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| 1 | RFSP final evaluation consultancy SoW | Detail's consultant scope of work, the timeline of activities, team composition, deliverables, and reporting requirements |  RFSP Final evaluation consulta |
| 2 | End line HH Survey Questionnaire | Survey questionnaire as per FFP standards and as at baseline |  Annex 2 Endline HH Survey Questionnair |