CTP preparedness evaluation ToR template

|  |
| --- |
| *Use this table to summarize the information contained in the ToR.* **Description:** **Location:** **Duration and timing:** **Summary outputs:****Evaluation team/profile:** |

### Background

*Provide an overview of the CTP preparedness project as well as any CTP operations that have been conducted by the National Society.*

### Purpose

*Provide an overview of the purpose of the evaluation here. Potential areas for examination by the evaluation include:*

**Impact** – How has the National Society’s operational readiness for CTP changed over the period where investment has been made in CTP preparedness efforts? Is there any evidence that the National Society has improved its CTP delivery as a result of the preparedness project? (For example, compare emergency operations that show a faster ability to deliver cash and/or a scale-up in the case-load of the National Society’s use of CTP in its emergency response.)

**Effectiveness** – How effective has the project been in terms of its approaches and its achievements, and its support of the National Society in overcoming its resistance to CTP? What approaches should be continued and which ones revised?

**Efficiency** – How efficient has the project been in its approaches? Could the inputs be used more efficiently in the future?

**Sustainability** – How has the project incorporated efforts to institutionalize CTP and capacity building as parts of its approach? How could this be improved to ensure the National Society is better prepared for scalable, immediate cash-based programming? How sustainable are the achievements and what recommendations could be made to improve sustainability?

*When considering the evaluation’s purpose, the evaluation team will need to consider how operational readiness will be measured. In line with the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement CTP preparedness guidance, there are four pillars in which this measurement can take place. Consider the following four pillars and select those questions that are most relevant to your National Society and the evaluation.*

**Track 1: Enabling systems**

Enabling systems provide the environment where strategies, plans, systems and procedures are ready to support a rapid CTP response, similar in scale, time-frame and effectiveness to the more traditional in-kind distributions. This includes incorporating CTP into National Society strategic plans, preparedness and contingency plans as well as developing, testing and approving organizational standard operating procedures (SOPs) for CTP. Enabling systems also include the identification and selection of appropriate cash delivery or payment mechanisms to facilitate the rapid and secure distribution of cash transfers.

Questions the evaluation should ask include:

* Has the leadership and management of the National Society become more familiar with cash-based programming and can any shift in attitude be attributed to the cash preparedness project (e.g., training, participation in SWOT and SOPs meetings)?
* Have the National Society senior management teams supported the development of tools and systems that are key to mainstream and institutionalize CTP across the National Society (SOPs, inclusion of CTP into operational tools, CTP and capacity building included in training plans for next year, etc.)
* Does the National Society have a CTP focal person (formal or informal)? Are the different departments aware of the potential use of CTP as part of their operational emergency response?
* Does the National Society have CTP SOPs (either in draft or officially approved) developed in consultation with relevant departments?
* Are CTP and market considerations included in the National Society National Response Plan or contingency/preparedness plans (if any has been developed/adapted during the pilot time-frame)?
* How many non-programmatic departments have been involved in CTP preparedness activities? Is there a shift in their understanding and acceptance of CTP?
* Has the National Society participated in events or shared its CTP preparedness plan and activities with other stakeholders in the country or the region, or internationally?

Documentation/key contacts:

* National Society CTP SOPs (draft/approved version) and CTP considerations integrated into the National Response Plan and into contingency/preparedness plans of the National Society pilot
* CTP considerations mainstreamed into trainings of national response teams and also into the tools and templates of the National Society
* minutes of any CTP meetings (National Society, CaLP, IFRC)
* pre-agreements in place for potential CTP transfer modalities and transfer mechanisms – tested through simulation or pilot programming
* CTP and market baselines completed in targeted locations
* simulated or real-time cash-based programming distributions.

**Track 2: Programme tools**

Predefined and tested CTP programme tools are critical to being operationally ready to respond rapidly. It is vital that standard business processes and tools are discussed and set up in advance, ready to be adapted to different emergency contexts. Where possible, specific CTP elements should be included in all relevant National Society tools throughout the preparedness and emergency response cycle (e.g., in assessment/VCA, programme design and implementation, and monitoring).

Questions the evaluation should ask include: Has the National Society developed the tools necessary for effective and efficient CTP? Have CTP elements been integrated into existing and widely used tools? Are these tools updated, based on operational learning and review?

Questions that could be used to measure or respond to this:

* Has the National Society mainstreamed CTP into its emergency response tools (NDRTs, templates and processes used for evaluation of needs, response analysis, monitoring, evaluation – PDM, etc.)?

Documentation/key contacts:

* National Society CTP toolbox developed and integrated into existing National Society programming tools (tools, steps and documents on cash-based programme and markets).

**Track 3: Resources and capacity**

Adequate resources need to be mobilized to support effective CTP capacity building and operational readiness in a National Society. Significant financial investment is needed initially to build the CTP capacity of a National Society; this can be achieved in a variety of ways, such as face-to-face and online training, practical learning-by-doing, coaching and mentoring, etc. However, some of the most critical preparedness actions have limited financial costs but need the time and dedication of senior management and technical staff from the relevant National Society departments (CTP SOPs, adapting financial and logistics systems, etc.).

Questions the evaluation should ask include: Has the capacity of the National Society to deliver cash-based programmes increased as a result of the investment in training delivery and capacity building through this project? What were the main challenges and learning from the experience? Are there recommendations that can be used to inform future National Society CTP capacity-building initiatives?

Questions that could be used to measure or respond to this:

* What are the main challenges in building/strengthening the capacity of the National Society in CTP? What learning and recommendations have resulted from the preparedness project? What could be done differently?
* What number of staff members and volunteers participated in the training for the action and for their roles (linkages to institutionalization)?
* What were the results of any post-training survey or evaluation: gained learning, skills and practice?
* Has the training provided an opening for other capacity-building opportunities (even if not linked directly to the action but to the CTP: i.e., market analysis, preparedness, etc.)
* Have the trainings been inclusive and attended by members from outside the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement? Has this resulted in improved information-sharing and coordination after the training is over?
* Have the CTP focal points in the National Society increased their knowledge, skills and ability to deliver CTP sessions and trainings as well as to support on-the-job CTP learning?

Documentation/key contacts:

* IFRC learning platform CTP e-learning course reports (especially for the months of the trainings)
* face-to-face training reports
* key informant interviews with IFRC focal point in the country, National Society CTP focal person, volunteers and staff members who participated in training and capacity-building activities (face-to-face and on-the-job training).

**Track 4: Communication and coordination**

Coordination and communication contribute to a better overall understanding of CTP responses throughout a National Society and the humanitarian community. Coordination is important, not only to ensure a coherent approach among CTP responders working in the same area, but also to minimize security and other risks, such as market inflation, etc. In parallel, advocacy and communication promote a better understanding among stakeholders of CTP and its objectives and required processes and gives the affected population the opportunity to have a voice and participate in decision-making. Also, coordination, advocacy and communication are important for engaging donors and mobilizing resources, as well as for disseminating key information and messages around CTP responses. Advocacy also encourages the regular consideration of CTP as one of the potential emergency response options that should be considered routinely in any response context; it is becoming increasingly necessary to justify the reason that CTP is not appropriate if CTP is not selected.

Questions the evaluation should ask include: Is the National Society’s institutionalization of cash-based programming resulting in strengthened operational capacity and advocacy for CTP, internally and externally, as a result of the investment in the project? What were the main challenges, learning and recommendations that can be used to inform future National Society CTP preparedness initiatives?

Indicators/questions that could be used to measure or respond to this:

* Has cash-based programming been included in the agenda of the National Society’s national and regional/provincial meetings and is CTP included in the future plans of the National Society after the project has finished?
* Does the National Society have any CTP advocacy key messages and tools for promoting cash-based programming inside and outside the organization (documents, audiovisual material, case studies, evaluations, etc.)? Does the National Society have any evidence of CTP advocacy (internal and external)?
* Is news related to cash-based programming included regularly on the National Society website or shared regularly with the National Society network – headquarters, departments, branches, etc.?
* Does the National Society or IFRC delegation participate actively in humanitarian and government forums that can be used to share CTP learning and experience or to promote and coordinate CTP in emergency response? Has the National Society shared its CTP institutionalization and preparedness with other stakeholders in the country and region? Is the National Society seen as leading the way to promote and advocate for the use of CTP in the country? (If yes, provide examples of this.)
* What are the main challenges in CTP institutionalization for the National Society? What learning and recommendations have resulted from this pilot? What could be done differently?

Documentation:

* In addition to those already noted above: advocacy and other CTP materials that were used to promote and disseminate the use of CTP in emergency response (e.g., National Society’s own media, website, case studies or evaluations, etc.).
* Agenda and/or minutes of internal and International Red Crescent and Red Crescent Movement coordination meetings where CTP has been included
* Agenda/minutes/reports of National Society’s participation (or chairing) at external CTP coordination meetings – CaLP, government, humanitarian forums, etc. (agenda/minutes).

### Evaluation criteria

The following OECD DAC criteria[[1]](#footnote-1) should be used to carry out this evaluation:

**Impact**[[2]](#footnote-2) – to assess the impact of pilot projects on National Society capacity to deliver timely cash-based assistance at scale during relief operations

**Efficiency**[[3]](#footnote-3) – to assess whether or not the inputs (financial, human and material) are appropriate in relation to the expected outputs and results, with lessons and recommendations for future application by the IFRC secretariat to support the National Society preparing for cash programming

**Effectiveness**[[4]](#footnote-4) – to assess to what extent the pilot National Society’s acceptance, skills/knowledge/practice, systems and processes have been developed or improved to meet the main objective of reaching more people, more quickly after a disaster

**Connectedness**[[5]](#footnote-5) – to assess to what extent: previous operational learnings have been applied; other partner National Societies and IFRC support has been provided in this area; the sustainability of the pilots has been considered; and continuation plans have been developed.

### Methodology

Good evaluation methodologies will include a mix of both primary and secondary data collection methods. For preparedness evaluations, the evaluation methodology should include a secondary data review of key project documents from the National Society. Key informant interviews should be held also with stakeholders, including National Society leadership and focal points, and IFRC secretariat staff in the country and in relevant offices. Other key country partners can be interviewed to gather their perceptions of the programme. An online survey may be used also to solicit anonymous feedback from stakeholders, as well as enable more systematic feedback from those countries not visited during the evaluation.

### Evaluation team – roles and responsibilities

*The expected roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team should be laid out here. This includes the number of expected team members and their specific contributions to the evaluation. Generally, this includes a team leader as well as any other evaluation team members who will conduct primary or secondary research.*

### Time-frame

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Month** | **Number of days** |
| **Task** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total days** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### Outputs and audiences

*Detail here what outputs you require from the evaluation. The following is just an example of what you may include:*

1. The **evaluation report** should be no more than 20 pages long (excluding annexes) and include:
* executive summary
* key recommendations (ten maximum)
* introduction – scope, purpose, methodology
* presentation of main findings
* detailed recommendations for the IFRC and National Society.

This evaluation will be shared through the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and with key donors, and will be used to demonstrate progress towards our own and our donors’ objectives.

1. The **case study** should present each of the four pilot countries, should be approximately ten pages in length (in published form, approximately 4,000 words maximum) and should include:
* executive summary of the aim of the pilot programme
* initial position of the National Society before the CTP preparedness project
* outline of investments made by the National Society and IFRC/partner National Societies and their impacts
* main learning points, from the National Society and IFRC/partner National Societies, as appropriate
* recommendations for the National Society (and IFRC, if relevant) on its approach to institutionalizing CTP, and its capacity building and preparedness for a cash approach
* recommendations for other National Societies investing in cash preparedness.

This case study is for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, CaLP and the wider cash community of practice. As such, the tone of this output is expected to differ from that of the evaluation.

### Evaluator profile

### Duration

1. <http://www.alnap.org/pool/files/eha-2006.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Impact looks at the wider effects of the project – social, economic, technical and environmental – on individuals, gender groups, age-groups, communities and institutions. Impacts can be intended and unintended, positive and negative, macro (sector) and micro (household). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Efficiency measures the outputs – qualitative and quantitative – achieved as a result of inputs. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving an output, to see whether or not the most efficient approach has been used. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Effectiveness measures the extent to which an activity achieves its purpose, or whether this can be expected to happen on the basis of the outputs. Implicit within the criterion of effectiveness is timeliness. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Connectedness refers to the need to ensure that activities of a short-term emergency nature are carried out in a context that takes longer-term and interconnected problems into account. Connectedness has been adapted from the concept of sustainability – the idea that interventions should support longer-term goals and, eventually, be managed without donor input. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)