

# **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

## **ENDLINE EVALUATION CONSULTANCY- TOR NAPAD/RACIDA/K-AFM-2024-4027/01**

**PROJECT TITLE: CROSS-BORDER  
EMERGENCY RESPONSE FOR CONFLICT-  
AFFECTED COMMUNITIES IN MANDERA  
COUNTY (KENYA) AND BELET HAWA  
DISTRICT (SOMALIA)**

### **IMPLEMENTING ORGANIZATIONS:**

**NOMADIC ASSISTANCE FOR PEACE AND  
DEVELOPMENT (NAPAD) – SOMALIA,**

**RURAL AGENCY FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
AND ASSISTANCE (RACIDA) – KENYA**

**&**

**DONOR: DIAKONIE KATASTROPHENHILFE (DKH)**

**PROJECT DURATION: 17/11/2025 TO 18/05/2026**

***ISSUE DATE: 8TH MAY 2026  
SUBMISSION DEADLINE: 21ST MAY 2026***

## INVITATION TO TENDER

### REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO. NAPAD/RACIDA/K-AFM-2024-4027/01

NAPAD/RACIDA invites proposals for “*Cross-Border Emergency Response for Conflict-Affected Communities in Mandera County (Kenya) and Belet Hawa District (Somalia)*” from qualified consultants of consultancy firms. The specifications are detailed in the Tender Document. Interested and eligible bidders may access the document through RACIDA website at “<https://www.racida.org/calls-for-proposals/>” or NAPAD website at <https://napad-int.org/vacancies-and-tenders/>” to inspect, review and submit their proposal for free of charge. Completed proposal documents should be submitted *via Email* to “[procurement@racida.org](mailto:procurement@racida.org)” and “[info@napad-int.org](mailto:info@napad-int.org)” and addressed as below.

#### PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

PROPOSAL NO. *NAPAD/RACIDA/K-AFM-2024-4027/01*

TENDER NAME: *Cross-Border Emergency Response for Conflict-Affected Communities in Mandera County (Kenya) and Belet Hawa District (Somalia)*”

#### **Closing Date for Submission of RFP**

No late submissions of RFP will be accepted. Bidders are therefore advised to ensure that they have taken all steps to submit their proposals in advance of the closing date and time, so that it is received not later than **1700hrs on 21<sup>st</sup> May 2026 (deadline)**

NAPAD/RACIDA may, at their own discretion, extend this closing date for the submission of RFP by notifying all bidders thereof through the website.

***Bid offers submitted as joint ventures will not be accepted!***

NAPAD/RACIDA reserves the right to accept or reject any application, tender, or proposal, in whole or in part, and is under no obligation to provide reasons for its decision.

**Table of Contents**

Background and Rationale .....4

Purpose of the Internal Baseline Study .....4

Specific Objectives .....5

Scope of the Baseline Study .....9

Methodology ..... 10

Sampling and Data Management ..... 10

Roles and Responsibilities ..... 11

Key Deliverables ..... 12

Timeline..... 13

Ethical Considerations ..... 13

Use of Baseline Findings ..... 14

## **1.0 BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE**

Communities in Mandera East Sub-County (Kenya) and Belet Hawa District (Somalia) are facing intersecting humanitarian pressures linked to armed conflict, cross-border displacement, recurrent drought, and weakened access to basic services. The July 2025 conflict in Belet Hawa triggered population movements across the Kenya–Somalia border, disrupting livelihoods, markets, and traditional coping mechanisms that communities have historically relied upon to manage shocks.

In Mandera East, the influx of displaced households placed additional strain on already limited water sources, food systems, health services, and community support structures. This situation led to households increasingly relying on negative coping strategies, including reduced food consumption, sale of productive assets, and borrowing. In Belet Hawa, prolonged insecurity and repeated displacement left many households without stable access to food, safe water, or psychosocial support, particularly women-headed households, persons with disabilities, and households with young children.

In response, RACIDA and NAPAD implemented a cross-border emergency response funded by Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe (DKH), focusing on food security through cash and voucher assistance, emergency access to safe water, and strengthening community-based psychosocial support and protection systems. In terms of execution of the project, NAPAD implemented the project in Somalia in Belet-Hawa District in three villages, Haji Garas, Tuulo Jibril, Dhagahley and War Cadey. In Kenya, RACIDA implemented the project in Mandera East Sub County in Barwaqo, Bulla Kamor villages. This was a six-month project that began in November 2025 and is ending in May 2026. In Kenya, RACIDA provided 2 cycles of multipurpose cash transfer to support food access to 384 households. In addition, 300 individuals received psycho social support services. In Somalia, NAPAD provided emergency water to 1000 households, provided psychosocial support to 300 individuals and supported 269 households to access food by distributing 2 cycles of E-Vouchers .

As the project ends, RACIDA and NAPAD would like to conduct endline evaluation through an external consultant to determine how the project performed in regard to the objectives.

---

## **1.1 PURPOSE OF THE ENDLINE EVALUATION**

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to assess the degree to which the project met the objectives as outlined in the project proposal/log frame, with particular emphasis on appropriateness/relevance, timeliness, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and coherence of the interventions carried out. The evaluation is also aimed at assessing qualitatively as well as quantitatively the project's achievements. Additionally, because this is the first joint cross-border pilot project for RACIDA and NAPAD, the evaluation will prioritize learning by examining what worked well and what did not work well across the various objectives and outcomes, including factors that enabled or hindered cross-border coordination, harmonization of assistance modalities, and joint implementation, so that actionable lessons can inform future emergency response programming.

## 1.2 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

The endline evaluation will:

- Assess project performance against the logframe indicators by analyzing outputs, outcomes, and overall impact, including comparison with baseline data (where available) and routine monitoring data.
- Assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, coherence, and sustainability of the project interventions in line with OECD/DAC evaluation criteria.
- Evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of different assistance modalities (multipurpose cash transfers, e-vouchers, and in-kind water support), including their impact on beneficiaries and local markets.
- Examine accountability to affected populations, including the accessibility and effectiveness of feedback and complaints mechanisms, and the level of community participation and satisfaction.
- Assess the effectiveness of cross-border coordination and partnership between implementing organizations, including harmonization of approaches, joint planning, and information sharing.
- Identify key lessons learned, best practices, and actionable recommendations to inform future programming, policy, and strategy development.

## 1.3 Project Indicators

The following table shows the project indicators whose level of achievements will be assessed.

	Description	Indicators
<b>Overall Objective</b>	To contribute to the protection and recovery of conflict-displaced and vulnerable host community households in Belet-Hawo District (Somalia) and Mandera East Sub-County (Kenya) by improving access to life-saving food assistance, safe drinking water, and community-based psychosocial support services.	
<b>Project Objective 1</b>	To reduce critical food insecurity, and improve access to water and psychosocial wellbeing among vulnerable communities affected by the humanitarian crisis in IPC 3 and 4 categorized locations.	% of targeted households reporting an improved rCSI (reduced coping strategy index) score in the last PDM conducted
		% of beneficiaries (disaggregated by sex, age and disability) reporting that humanitarian assistance is delivered in a safe, accessible, accountable and participatory manner throughout all phases of the project
		% of sampled households achieving acceptable Food Consumption Score ( $\geq 35$ )
		% of target households are able to access potable water for 30 days at water points through water trucking being funded by DKH
		% of target beneficiaries that report atleast 3 better ways to cope effectively with life challenges (for example, through skills in communication, stress management, problem-solving, conflict management or vocational skills)
<b>Result 1.1</b>	Improved purchasing power and access to food among 653 targeted Households	% of hhs report being able to meet the basic needs of their households, as they define and prioritize them in the last PDM conducted

	during the 2 cycle support period– 384 in Mandera, 269 from Belet Hawa	# of HHs redeeming E-Vouchers in line with the MEB by the end of the 2 cycles of the support period
		% of affected population that report that food provided is of appropriate quality and meets local preferences
		# of HH reporting to have received MPCT in line with the MEB by the end of the 2nd cycle of the project.
<b>Result 4.2</b>	Improved access to safe water for 1000 households in IPC $\geq$ 4 during water critical shortages for 30 days, 7.5L per person per day	# of HH living in Dhagahley village and War Cadey village supported with 1350 M3 of water and each household received 45 litres per day for 30 days
<b>Result 4.3</b>	Improved access to psychosocial support services to children, women, and other vulnerable groups affected by the crisis	# of CHVs/CHWs trained in PFA principles.
		% of CHVs/CHWs demonstrating improved knowledge and practical application of PFA/PSS skills post-training
		# of affected people surveyed who report receiving accessible information in a timely manner about self-help approaches for positive coping and/or well-being
		# of individuals reached through stress management awareness sessions
		% of participants reporting improved psychosocial well-being or coping skills after interventions

#### 1.4 Evaluation criteria

The following OECD/DAC evaluation criteria will guide the evaluation process.

##### Relevance

- To what extent were the objectives, planned activities and planned outputs consistent with the intended outcome and impact?
- The extent to which humanitarian activities met and are tailored to local needs and context, increasing ownership, accountability and cost-effectiveness accordingly.
- To what extent the project was coherent with the particular risks / vulnerabilities / needs, expectations and priorities of the target communities, local authorities, and other actors?
- To what extent was the project aligned with the existing systems, policies, structures of the Government including National, Regional, County and District?
- To what extent were the selected modalities (cash, e-vouchers, water trucking) appropriate to local market conditions and service availability?
- To what extent did beneficiary preferences influence the choice of assistance modalities?

### **Effectiveness**

- Did the activities achieve satisfactory results in relation to stated project objectives (outcomes) / results (outputs)? How did the project perform against the log frame indicators? Were there any unintended outcomes?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- To what extent have the activities contributed to enhancing local capacities (of communities, specific community groups, and local agencies)?
- To what extent have the activities contributed to enhancing local coordination and planning processes?
- Which modality (cash, e-voucher, or in-kind water support) was most effective in achieving intended outcomes, and why?
- Were there differences in effectiveness between implementation areas (Mandera vs Belet Hawa)?

### **Efficiency**

- Were there any delays?
- Could the same or better results have been achieved with same or lower inputs or by doing things differently?
- Were the effects being achieved at an acceptable cost compared to alternative approaches of accomplishing the same objectives?
- How efficient and reliable were the delivery mechanisms (e.g., M-Pesa, e-voucher platform, water trucking systems)?
- What were the key operational challenges in delivering assistance, and how were they mitigated?

### **Impact**

- What has happened as a result of the project? (Intended and unintended impacts on individuals, communities, institutions, improvement of social and economic indicators, health, poverty reduction, resilience, capacities, assets, cross-sectoral impact, impact on Gender and equal opportunities for women and men, age-groups, or other relevant cross-cutting issues)
- What real difference/changes has the activity brought about for the beneficiaries? (What would have happened without the activity?)
- How many people have been affected? Planned target group vis à vis really addressed?
- What effects did cash and voucher assistance have on local markets, including prices, availability of goods, and vendor capacity?
- Did the intervention contribute to strengthening or distorting local market systems?

### **Coherence**

- How coherent are the interventions with regards to humanitarian standards?
- Are the approaches applied in the different components of the interventions coherent?

- Are these approaches coherent with environmental standards, protection principles, and humanitarian principles as well as human rights considerations?
- To what extent were interventions harmonized across Kenya and Somalia in terms of targeting, transfer values, and implementation approaches?
- How effective was coordination between implementing partners in ensuring a coherent cross-border response?
- What added value did the cross-border approach bring to achieving project outcomes?

### **Sustainability**

- To what extent will the positive impacts or changes of the project (are likely to) continue?
- Which measures are implemented in order to support sustainability?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?
- Are the project approaches and interventions likely to continue after the end of the external funding?
- Are there sufficient forums /structures capabilities to maintain the changes produced over time?
- Are the decision-making processes by communities likely to be continued into the future, and how/why?
- How was the exit strategy defined, and how was this managed at the end of the funding period?

### **Accountability to Affected Population**

- To what extent were beneficiaries aware of and able to access complaints and feedback mechanisms?
- How effective and responsive were these mechanisms in addressing beneficiary concerns?
- To what extent did beneficiaries feel consulted and involved in project decisions?

### **Protection from sexual exploitation, abuse and harm**

- Did beneficiaries feel safe and dignified when accessing assistance?
- Were there any unintended protection risks associated with the interventions (e.g., cash handling risks, exclusion, social tension)?

### **Age, Gender, and Disability Inclusion**

- To what extent were project activities (cash transfers, e-vouchers, water trucking, psychosocial support) accessible to and appropriate for different age groups (children, youth, adults, elderly), women and men, and persons with disabilities?
- Did the project collect and use disaggregated data (by age, sex, and disability) to inform targeting, adapt activities, and measure outcomes differently for different groups?

### **Inclusion of Women and Girls**

- To what extent did women and girls participate meaningfully in project decision-making processes, including beneficiary selection, feedback and complaints mechanisms, and community awareness sessions?
- Did the project address specific protection risks and vulnerabilities faced by women and girls, such as gender-based violence, unequal access to resources, or exclusion from cash/voucher assistance due to household power dynamics?

### **Cross-Border Coordination & Partnership**

- How effective was collaboration between NAPAD and RACIDA in planning, implementation, and monitoring?
- What challenges were encountered in cross-border coordination, and how were they resolved?
- How did cross-border coordination influence efficiency, coverage, and quality of implementation?
- Learning & Adaptive Management
- What key adaptations were made during the project in response to emerging needs, risks, or contextual changes, and how effective were these adjustments?
- What operational and strategic lessons can be drawn from the implementation of different intervention components (cash, e-vouchers, water support, and psychosocial services)?
- What best practices can be identified from the project in relation to delivery systems, community engagement, cross-border coordination, and service provision?
- What actionable recommendations can be developed to improve future programming, particularly in similar cross-border and emergency response contexts?
- How can lessons learned from this project inform future policy, program design, and implementation strategies for RACIDA, NAPAD, and partners?

---

## **2.0 SCOPE OF THE ENDLINE EVALUATION**

The endline evaluation will cover all geographic locations, population groups, and intervention components under the project, with data collection conducted in all project areas for RACIDA and NAPAD.

### **The scope will include assessment of:**

- Household food security, expenditure patterns, and coping strategies;
- Access to safe water, water sources, and water-related challenges;
- Psychosocial wellbeing, stressors, and access to community-based support mechanisms;
- Protection risks and vulnerabilities affecting women, children, persons with disabilities, and other marginalized groups;
- Community-level service availability, access constraints, and seasonal or security-related risks.

### **NAPAD – Somalia**

The endline evaluation will cover targeted households and communities in Haji Garas, Tuulo Jibriil, Dhagahley, and War Cadey villages in Belet Hawa District. The assessment will focus on recipient households for food e-vouchers, households targeted for emergency water trucking, and individuals participating in psychosocial support and protection-related activities.

### **RACIDA – Kenya**

The endline evaluation will cover targeted households and communities in Barwaqo and Bulla Kamor villages, Mandera East Sub-County and will focus on households that received multipurpose cash assistance, as well as individuals that participated in psychosocial support and community awareness activities.

---

## **METHODOLOGY**

The evaluation will use a cross-sectional mixed-methods approach, tailored to operational realities in each location and these will include the following.

### **Quantitative Data Collection**

- Household surveys administered to a sample of targeted households using structured questionnaires.
- Questionnaires will align with project indicators, DKH reporting requirements, Sphere standards, and relevant Cash, Protection and WASH indicators.
- Data will be collected using digital tools (e.g., Kobo) to ensure data quality and rapid analysis.

### **Qualitative Data Collection**

- Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with community leaders, relief committees, water committee members, CHVs/CHWs, and local authorities.
- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with women, men, and youth to explore community perceptions, coping strategies, protection risks, and psychosocial needs.

### **Secondary Data Review**

- Review of recent assessments, situation reports, PDM data, IPC analyses, and internal monitoring data produced by RACIDA, NAPAD and other partners.

---

## **SAMPLING AND DATA MANAGEMENT**

### **Sampling Framework**

Sampling will be purposive and aligned with approved project targeting lists in each location. The Consultant is expected to use appropriate method to statistically determine the sample size for the respondents.

Data will be disaggregated by sex, age, and disability status in line with donor and organizational requirements of RACIDA and NAPAD. **Strict** Data protection and confidentiality protocols will be applied, including controlled access to datasets and anonymization of personal identifiers.

### **Data Collection and Enumerator recruitment**

The Consultant will develop data collection tools including Household Survey questionnaire, FGD and KII guides. The draft tools will then be shared with RACIDA and NAPAD team and supported by DKH for review and input before administered. The Consultant will recruit and engage Enumerators with experience in data collection and understand the local context including local language.

### **Data analysis**

The Consultant will conduct analysis of finalized quantitative data from the household survey and qualitative data from FGDs and KIIs. The findings will therefore be used to develop the Endline Evaluation report.

### **Final Report**

From the analysis, the Consultant will develop draft report which will be shared with RACIDA and NAPAD team for review supported by DKH team.

---

## **3.0 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **The Consultant**

- Give leadership to the technical team throughout the assessment
- Inform the Program Manager, and MEAL team in a timely manner of the progress made and any challenges encountered.
- Conduct the consultancy as per agreements in TOR, and contract, and if modifications are necessary, bring them to the attention of the Program Manager before making any changes.
- Report on a timely basis as per the ToR and the contract agreement.
- Declare any possible conflict of interest before signing the contract. Produce a draft report and discuss the feedback and general findings with RACIDA team before submitting the final report.
- Cater for his/her transport to the site or within his/her bid .The Consultant can indicate to RACIDA and NAPAD to provide i.e. transport to the communities and exclude costing on the same within the bid.
- Organize for his/her own accommodation and cater for other expenses they may likely incur during the assignment.

### **RACIDA and NAPAD Teams**

- Make sure the Consultant is provided with the necessary and required resources i.e. the project documents- proposal, reports and any other documents that the consultant may need.
- Give logistical information and attend to any concerns that may arise during the endline exercise.
- Facilitate the work of the consultant in accessing beneficiaries and other local stakeholders.
- Monitor the daily work of the consultant and bring to the attention of the consultant /RACIDA and NAPAD any concerns that may arise.
- Provide technical oversight in the review of all deliverables.
- Provide timely comments on the draft report.

---

## **4.0 KEY DELIVERABLES**

The following deliverables are expected from the consultant:

Inception report, detailing the endline survey design, sampling methodology and framework, survey tools, and agreed-upon budget and work plan.

Draft endline report that will contain the following elements: Maximum 35 pages

1. Table of contents
2. Executive Summary
3. Objectives of the endline, Methodology, and any challenges encountered in the field.
4. A presentation of the findings and the analysis.
5. Conclusions based on evidence and analysis
6. Recommendations with clear guidelines on how they can be implemented (Must be informed by the evaluation data findings). Recommendations should include recommendations:
  - Regarding future steps / activities / follow up
  - Regarding improvements of project design
  - Regarding approaches and methodologies
7. Lessons learnt
8. Report Annexes:
  - Copies of original and cleaned data sets (with a codebook for both quantitative and qualitative data), including original field notes for KIIs and FGDs, as well as recorded audio material, if available, should be submitted with the draft report and the data collection tools used in data collection
  - Hard and Digital Copies of Signed Consent provided by respondents.
  - PowerPoint presentation highlighting key findings from the endline, presented at a feedback meeting to be held after completing the draft report.

- Final endline Survey Report – submitted as one digital copy and 2 bound and signed hard copies submitted to RACIDA by the agreed submission deadline.
- Two case studies for the project

## TIMELINE

This consultancy is estimated to run for a maximum of **18 billable** days from the date of signing of the consultancy agreement by both parties. Below is the proposed milestones.

Phase	Activity	Duration (Days)	Key Deliverables / Milestones
<b>Phase 1</b>	Preparation, desk study, draft inception report and data collection tools	Within 2 days	Draft inception report & tools submitted to RACIDA/NAPAD for review
<b>Phase 2</b>	Training of enumerators and pretesting of tools	Within 4 days	Trained enumerators; pretested and finalised tools
	Fieldwork (data collection in Kenya and Somalia)	Within 9 days	Raw quantitative and qualitative data collected
	Follow-up workshop (with RACIDA/NAPAD teams)	Within 10 days	Initial findings shared and validated
<b>Phase 3</b>	Report writing (draft report)	Within 12 days	Draft endline report submitted
	Final review and validation workshop	Within 16 days	Feedback from RACIDA, NAPAD, DKH incorporated
	Final report submission	Within 18 days	Final report (digital + hard copies)

### Notes:

- The consultancy duration will be expected to take place within 4-weeks from the date of contract signing.
- The "follow-up workshop" and "final review workshop" may be conducted virtually if travel is not feasible.

## ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The assessment will adhere to humanitarian principles, including informed consent, confidentiality, and Do No Harm. Enumerators will be trained on safeguarding, PSEA, and referral pathways for protection and psychosocial cases. Participation will be voluntary, and sensitive data will be handled securely.

### Gender and human rights.

The evaluator should incorporate human rights, gender, and equity perspectives in the evaluation process and findings, particularly by involving women and other disadvantaged groups subject to discrimination. All key data gathered must be disaggregated by gender and age grouping and included in the draft and evaluation reports.

---

## USE OF ENDLINE EVALUATION FINDINGS

Findings from the endline evaluation will be used primarily for internal learning for improvement of future programs and to determine what could be replicated in other projects. Baseline indicator values will be compared to endline findings to determine progress and understand where challenges exist and come up with action plans on how to provide solution in future interventions.

Where relevant, summarized evaluation findings will be shared with local authorities, coordination forums, and community representatives to strengthen transparency, local ownership, and accountability to affected populations.

## 5.0 QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF CONSULTANT

The lead consultant should have a background and experience in Nutrition, DRR, WASH, Public Health, food security (CVA), protection, psychosocial support, agriculture & Livelihoods, or in a related field. The lead consultant must have a degree in public health, nutrition, disaster management, agriculture, WASH or related field and experience in Emergency Response and Recovery programming, with a broad understanding of WASH, Agriculture, Food Security, and Nutrition.

### Key Selection Criteria

The independent consultant/consultancy firm must demonstrate experience and expertise as follows:

- Degree in Public Health, Nutrition, Agriculture, Gender and development studies Water, disaster management, or another related field.
- Demonstrated experience in conducting high-quality endlines or related projects in the past five years (sample reports are required during the bid analysis).
- Extensive hands-on experience in the sectors of Nutrition, Health, Food Security, WASH, Protection and Psychosocial support, DRR, Agriculture and Livelihoods.
- Experience working in ASAL areas. Preferably with the capacity to conduct the evaluation both in Kenya and Somalia project locations.
- Fluency in English, Kiswahili. Knowledge of the local language is an added advantage. Knowledge and experience of developmental and humanitarian response in East Africa is preferred.
- Strong interpersonal and communication skills.
- The consultancy team must have a statistician to analyze quantitative and qualitative data.

## 6.0 EVALUATION CRITERIA

### Mandatory Application Requirements

Application materials shall include the following:

- Technical Proposal detailing the consultant’s understanding of the task, proposed methodologies, expected activities and deliverables, proposed workplan, and the composition of the consultancy team to be engaged. The outline of the Technical Proposal as outlined in 6.1 and the team composition requirements are outlined in 6.2.
- Financial Proposal detailing the costs that the consultant expects to be required to complete the assignment in both KES and USD. The financial proposal should be inclusive of all logistics, enumeration and travel costs associated with the assignment.
- Detailed CVs of all technical professional staff who will work on the consultancy team.
- Must submit a certificate of Incorporation/ Business Registration(Either for Kenya or Somalia)
- Must submit a valid certificate of Tax Compliance
- At least three professional references from previous clients and full contact details of the referees.
- Sample report

*Note: Failure to meet full mandatory requirements will lead to automatic disqualification*

### Technical Requirements/Criteria

Evaluation Criteria	Description	Score %
<b>Qualifications (15%)</b>		
Academic Qualifications (Lead Consultant)	Degree in Public Health, Nutrition, Agriculture, Gender and development studies, Water, Disaster management, or another related field (CV and certificates must be attached)	7
Academic Qualifications (Data analyst/Statician)	Degree in; Statistics, Econometrics, Mathematics or any other related field. (CV and certificates must be attached)	4
Technical Knowledge of other team members	Demonstrable qualifications and hands-on knowledge in; Nutrition, Food Security (CVA), WASH, Protection, Psychosocial support, DRR, Agriculture and Livelihoods (CV’s and certificates must be attached)	4
<b>Experience (25%)</b>		
Relevant Work Experience	Minimum 5+ years proven experience of undertaking endline evaluations and assessments in the sectors of Agriculture-Livestock, Food Security, Nutrition, WASH, Agriculture and Livelihoods/CVA.	8

Similar Assignments	Demonstrated experience in conducting baseline/ MTE/ endline assessment on WASH/Food security-CVA/Agriculture/livestock Health/ Nutrition Post-Distribution Monitoring or related projects in the past 5-years (sample reports to be provided).	7
Sector Experience	Experience in humanitarian, emergency response, ASAL/Somalia context (Knowledge and experience of emergency response and humanitarian response in East Africa is preferred).	5
Geographic Experience	Experience working in Kenya/East Africa (Understanding of political, social and cultural context in ASAL counties in Kenya is essential). Demonstrable working experience in Mandera triangle will be an added advantage	5
<b>Methodology (30%)</b>		
Understanding of TOR	Demonstrates clear understanding of assignment objectives	7
Proposed Methodology	Clarity, appropriateness, and robustness of methodological approach.	10
Sampling & Tools	Quality of sampling design, tools to be used, and indicators	8
Work Plan	Realistic timeline, Gantt chart, deliverables alignment, data analysis plan.	5
<b>Language &amp; Analytical Skills (10%)</b>		
Language Proficiency	Proposal is clear, well-structured, error-free, professional tone throughout all sections	3
Report Writing Skills	Sample reports provided, high-quality structure (exec summary, methodology, findings, recommendations), strong clarity	4
Analytical Capacity	Strong evidence of quantitative & qualitative analysis (tools, frameworks, data interpretation clearly explained)	3
<b>Total Score</b>		<b>80</b>
<b>Note:</b>		
➤ Only technical proposals that score a minimum of 60% will proceed to financial proposal review and negotiations where applicable. The financial proposal has a total score of 20%.		

### 6.1 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL FORMAT

1. Introduction: description of the firm, and the firm's qualifications. (1 page)
2. Background: Understanding of the project, context and requirements for services, Key questions (2 pages)
3. Proposed methodology - Indicate methods to be used for each indicator with sample questionnaires and highlight any areas where indicators may need adjustment. The targeted respondents should be indicated for each indicator. Proposed detailed questions should be indicated. Detailed sampling procedure needs to be indicated. (5 pages)

4. Firms experience in undertaking assignments of similar nature and experience from the geographical area for other major clients (Table with: Name of organization, name of assignment, duration of assignment (Dates)) reference person contacts. (2 pages)
5. Proposed team composition (As per 6.2). (1 page)
6. Work plan (Gantt chart of activity and week of implementation). (1 page)

## 6.2 PROPOSED TEAM COMPOSITION FORMAT

- Name of Team Member
- Qualifications
- Years of Experience Related to Consultancy
- # of Days to be Engaged
- Roles(s) under this assignment

## 6.3 SUBMISSION OF THE PROPOSAL

1. Interested and eligible firms/individuals are requested to submit their proposals/applications *via Email* to “[procurement@racida.org](mailto:procurement@racida.org)” and “[info@napad-int.org](mailto:info@napad-int.org)” *on or before 21<sup>st</sup> May 2026, by 1700hrs*. Late submissions will be disqualified.
2. The Technical Proposal *must* conform to the proposed outline provided in 6.1. The proposed Team Composition should conform to 6.2.
3. Bidders’ submissions of technical and financial proposals should be submitted *via email* with the subject line “**PROPOSAL NO: NAPAD/RACIDA/K-AFM-2024-4027/01**”
4. All bidders *must* use the RFP reference number in the subject line of their email submission. Failure to use the reference code might lead to missing out on your proposal.
5. Technical proposal and the financial proposal shall be submitted as separate attachments. The financial proposal should have terms of payment.
6. Neither technical nor financial proposals should exceed 10MB. The proposal with any subsequent modifications and counterproposals, if applicable, shall become an integral part of any resulting contract.
7. Proposal must be written and submitted in English.

## 6.4 Terms of Engagement

Payment schedule shall be agreed upon at contracting stage with the successful bidder.

### *Note:*

- This endline evaluation service will be jointly/equally funded by NAPAD and RACIDA
- Payments will be done subject to the consulting entity meeting quality and timely delivery of stated task.

***END OF RFP***