# **Draft TOR for CVA Lessons Learned Review**

# ***<insert NS name and CVA programme/year>***

Summary

|  |
| --- |
| **Purpose**: This review will examine progress, opportunities and challenges identified during the course of *<insert NS and name of programme/year>* response and capture learning in order to ensure any required adaptations or improvements are made to both CVA forthcoming responses and to CVA preparedness (CVAP) activities. **Type of review:** **Deeper, with a focus on impact)/Standard, with a focus on process/Light touch or remote** *<select which applies>***Review facilitators:** For a deeper, with focus on impact review:- Minimum two senior staff: e.g. NS CVA Focal Point and PMER Manager. If expertise is not available in the NS, it can be supported by IFRC regional/global CVA staff and/or partner NS delegates /technical advisors.For standard and light touch reviews: - In country PNS representative and/or NS CVA Cash Focal Point + Programmes/DM Manager and/or other relevant CVA project staff member**Example timeframes**: 10 days, incl. 2 days travel (Deeper focus on impact); 5 days, incl. 2 days travel (Standard); ½ day (Remote/online) *<select which applies>****How to use the TOR****Depending on context, the review can either take a* ***deeper (with a focus on impact)****,* ***standard (with a focus on process)*** *or* ***light touch/ remote*** *format. Factors such as funding, timeframe, NS capacity, partner availability, travel and access issues will influence which style review should be taken.**The TOR template is based on a generic format, with options for a deeper focus, light touch or remote versions provided throughout. NS and relevant partner/s should discuss which review option is most suitable for them at design stage, adapting the relevant style TOR as appropriate*. |

# Background

The NS CVAP programme *<insert name of project>* is taking place between *<insert month and year> and <insert month and year>* and is funded by*<insert partner NS name and/or IFRC>* The CVAP programme follows the standard model of building CVA preparedness capacity along the five CVAP Areas of leadership commitment; processes, systems and tools; financial and human resources and capacities; CEA, coordination and partnerships; test, learn and improve.

# Description of project

*Brief overview of project – location, who targeted and how many targeted, objectives/components*

# Purpose and objectives of the review

The purpose of the review is to enable the NS and partners to review a key recent CVA intervention to date to ensure that the NS builds on strengths and addresses challenges around the use of different CVA response modalities and in so doing ensures that future CVA programming is of the highest possible quality. Interventions may include the use of both cash and vouchers for different sectoral or multi sector and/or multipurpose objectives.

To specific objectives of the review are:

* To capture learning from a recent CVA based intervention, both strengths and weaknesses (including recipient feedback)
* To systematically use this learning to assess the NS organisational capacity and systems for delivering CVA
* To identify priorities for improving CVA programming both in the immediate term and medium term
* To identify priorities for improving the capacity of the NS to use CVA as a preferred response modality

**Option for deeper, with focus on impact review:**

NS who are very experienced in CVA or where there is capacity for a deeper focus review (e.g. funding, longer timeframe, willingness of staff to participate, NS with a commitment to learning) can consider including more than one CVA intervention (if the purpose is to improve their cash preparedness).

# Users and uses of the review

The main users of this review are the NS and partners. The main methodology will be facilitated learning, e.g. this will be an internal self-review, in some cases supported by the partner NS, but in many cases driven and led by the NS themselves, with minimal or remote support. The extent of partner support to the review will depend on both NS capacity, as well as funding.

**Methodology, scope and approach**

The review approach involves first identifying gaps in terms of the desired outcomes on communities and then working back to the NS organisational level, by examining aspects of the CVA response which gave rise to these gaps, at each stage of the project cycle. How this can be done will vary based on whether the review is deeper focus or light touch/remote.

The review methodology will be both qualitative and quantitative. The main three steps for the full review include:

1. Review of secondary data, including **PDM results** (quantitative and qualitative),

2. **Field visits** to collect primary data from CVA recipients and other key informants

3. **Learning workshop** facilitated by the NS and PNS, or just the NS

Key recommendations from the workshop will be documented which can be used to address CVA areas that require strengthening. These can then be used to update NS CVA preparedness work and feed the CVAP Plan of Action.

Specific areas to be explored are:

* The impact, relevance and use of CVA provided as support to households’ basic needs, recovery or other sectoral outcomes
* NS operational capacity to deliver relevant, timely cash and vouchers assistance to the most vulnerable households

The proposed approach can be divided into two components: the CVA response and the capacity of the NS to deliver the assistance through CVA.

**Component 1: Assess the community satisfaction with the response including its effectiveness and impact**

The community satisfaction aspect will draw on secondary data, including PDMs, but will also include questions at field level, such as (this will need to be adjusted to the programme objectives):

1. Did the assistance provided help your household to cover the XXX needs of its members during the time of the programme? (That your household would not have been able to cover without the assistance, or resorting to negative coping mechanisms?) What was the cash largely used for?
2. What were you not able to cover that you consider to be essential?
3. Was the assistance timely? Did your household experience difficulties while waiting for assistance?
4. Was your household able to find the items you needed in local markets?
5. What were you not able to cover that you consider to be essential for your family?
6. Does the community view the intervention as fair? Who decided on the vulnerability selection criteria? Were these criteria well communicated, and those households most in need of assistance received it? Were potentially vulnerable people missed? (i.e. children, those who could not make it to apply whether for mobility reasons or transport? etc.)
7. What could have been done better? (Were distribution sites visible? Safe? Convenient? Were there additional unexpected costs, financial or time wise, involved in obtaining the cash assistance?)
8. Was there a feedback/complaints mechanism in place? How was this chosen? Who used it? How were complaints dealt with and was this satisfactory?
9. Is there anything you think the RedCross could have done better?
10. In future, what is your opinion of cash assistance becoming the default modality of support?

Primary data can be collected during field visits from the following key informants:

* Communities, including both men and women, elderly, disabled and any minority groups
* Community leaders,
* Volunteers, branch and NHQ level staff
* Financial service providers (FSPs)
* Local government officials
* Any relevant Ministries and any other national Government authorities considered relevant
* Market actors
* Other PNS
* WFP or other UN partner agency (where relevant)
* Other donor/s

**Secondary data**

In addition to PDM results, secondary data can be used to triangulate field data from the following sources:

* Assessment
* Project reports
* Feedback mechanism analysis reports
* FSP agreements

# See also [*Annex 1\_ Field Visit Preparation and Data Collection*](https://cash-hub.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2024/02/Annex-1-_Field-preparation-and-data-collection.docx) for further details on planning field visits.

**Options for standard, with a focus on process review:**

When field visits are not possible, and there is review or evaluation already available that was led by external consultants that covered impact and effectiveness, and/or time/staffing is more limited:

* Use PDM findings only, combined with other secondary data.
* Include communities only from the key informant list. Purposeful sampling should be used to ensure a representation of different groups and geographical spread, as much as possible.
* Do only the workshop and try to include community members as participants.

**Options for light touch or remote review:**

Workshop can be reduced to an online format, lasting half a day, conducted with NS staff and volunteers from NHQ, districts as well as PNS (remote) colleagues.

* For online format:
	+ Present a summary of the field information collected based on the community questions. One slide on statistics should be enough (including reach and gender disaggregation) and then present key findings. Pull out issues, areas of concern/interest and anything unusual as a basis for discussion.
	+ If field data collection was not possible, PDM findings can be used where possible to answer the community questions.

***Component 2: Identify Gaps in NS CVA Capacity***

The second phase will focus on the NS CVA capacity for timely CVA programming. This part will combine community information from the first component, interviews with NS members and a two-day workshop with NS staff in the project region to draw on this information in order to assess the operational system that was used to bring about the desired outcomes of the response. These will then be used to create a list of recommendations that can be generated to close the quality gaps identified from the community information.

To inform the workshop, data collection for this component will focus on the following key questions:

Leadership and vision:

1. Does the National Society have a specific agreed upon goal as to what CVAP means in terms of specific capabilities and qualities of interventions?
2. Has the Governing board and senior management a vision on what the organisation wants to archive in terms of CVA?

Plans, systems and tools:

1. How well is the National Society preparing in advance for responding to potential needs of vulnerable households?
2. Are risk scenarios regularly discussed, updated, and activities in place to help respond rapidly with relevant assistance interventions? Are contingency plans, SoPs (tools and systems (including quick delivery systems) in place?

Resources and capacities

1. How well prepared is the National Society for implementing CVA? (i.e. people in place with required skills, financial and IT resources in place)?

Internal / external coordination and partnerships; community engagement and accountability (CEA)

1. Are stakeholders and donor relations and coordination in place?
2. Is a robust beneficiary communication and accountability system for CVA functional? (Including feedback mechanism)

Piloting

1. Has the NS the opportunity to pilot and learn from experience?
2. What are the NS’ strengths and weaknesses in terms of operational capacity throughout the project cycle?

If the NS has an updated CVA capacity self-assessment this can be used as the basis for gathering the above review data.

**Lessons learned workshop**

Workshops should be held over 2 days, with a difference in emphasis depending on if the review is deeper focus or light touch.

The approach for the workshop will combine two conceptual frameworks: 1) the CVA project cycle (assessment, response analysis, implementation and M&E) and 2) the ‘5Rs’ (right time, right approach, right people, right amount and right way).

In this way, each stage of the project cycle can be explored to identify what works well from what does not. The project cycle steps also help structure the 5Rs across a timeline approach, although it should be noted that some Rs do not fit neatly into one cycle step. The information from this approach can be used to help identify and prioritize which specific gaps in NS organisational preparedness capacity and operational readiness need to be addressed to improve future quality of CVA outcomes in the future and to generate recommendations for CVA NS capacity building.

**Options for deeper, with focus on impact review:**

As deeper focus reviews will have more extensive fieldwork, the focus will be more on analysing findings in relation to response outcomes and NS operational capacity, as well as making recommendations.

Deeper focus reviews may also wish to use a wider range of participatory workshop session formats, if time allows. See: **Additional lessons learned workshop session options**

**Options for standard, with focus on process review:**

Lighter touch reviews should focus more on what available findings mean for the NS – what went well, what were the challenges and what recommendations are needed.

* NS to decide what areas they want to focus on for the workshop.
* Focus on process, rather than results/impact (No need to use the 5Rs framework from the deeper option)

**Options for light touch or remote review:**

* Workshop can be reduced to an online format, lasting half a day, conducted with NS staff and volunteers from NHQ, districts as well as PNS (remote) colleagues.
* For remote:
	+ Check with the NS which areas of focus they want to discuss. What is the most important learning for them?
* For light touch:
	+ Prioritise which 5Rs are most important, and just focus on these: e.g. right people, right way

Example areas to explore during a light touch or remote workshop could include:

**Response Analysis & Design Information**

* Discuss advantages and disadvantages of different delivery mechanisms adopted
* Reflect whether vouchers were appropriate in the given context
* Reflect whether the value of the voucher was sufficient
* Identify main gaps, success factors and lessons, and main recommendations for future

**Delivery mechanism**

* Reflect on the engagement and quality of the services provided by vendors
* Reflect on how the engagement with FSPs went

**Participants Targeting, Registration and Verification Information**

* Reflect on whether the population targeted was the most in need
* Recap on how targeting, registration and verification processes were done
* Identify main gaps, success factors and lessons, and main recommendations for future

**Monitoring & Community Engagement and Accountability (CEA)**

* Assess how CEA was mainstreamed throughout the intervention
* Reflect on the process of project monitoring - consider where monitoring/feedback led to adjustments in the intervention
* Identify main gaps, success factors and lessons, and main recommendations for future

**Learning**

* Has the NS had the opportunity to pilot and learn from experience?
* Specific learning around pre-agreements with FSPs
* What are the NS strengths and weaknesses in terms of operational capacity throughout the project cycle?
* How were lessons from previous LLW incorporated to the programme currently being analysed?

# See also

* [*Annex 1\_ Field Visit Preparation and Data Collection*](https://cash-hub.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2024/02/Annex-1-_Field-preparation-and-data-collection.docx)
* [*Annex 2\_ Workshop Example Agendas*](https://cash-hub.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2024/02/Annex-2_-Example-workshop-agendas.docx)
* [*Lessons Learned Workshop Facilitation Guide*](https://cash-hub.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2024/02/5.2.b-Lessons-Learned-Workshop-facilitators-guide.docx)

**Expected outputs**

A report should be completed for the review, detailing the type of review undertaken, and including findings, learnings and recommendations for strengthening CVA. The draft report should also be passed to partner NS or IFRC for feedback and support in compiling the final version.

**Timeframe**

*Generic review timeframe to adapt: Standard and light touch/remote timeframe should be shortened accordingly.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Day** | **Activity** |
| 1 | Arrival of any external facilitator/s in country, if required Review team briefing and work (NHQ) |
| 2 | Briefings with NS and in country PNSField visit preparation |
| 3 | Finalise FGD/KII field questionnaires and workshop preparation Final preparations for workshop |
| 4 | Travel to field  |
| 5 | FGD/KII with communities |
| 6 | FGG/KII with other stakeholders and finalisation of workshop preparations |
| 7-8 | Lessons learnt workshop |
| 9 | Return to NHQ and debrief |
| 10 | Departure of external facilitator/s |