



INDIGENOUS RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION (IREMO)

P.O. Box 402-60500 Marsabit, Kenya: Email: iremokenya.org, indresource13@gmail.com,
www.iremokenya.org

Terms of Reference (ToR)

Synopsis of the Request for Proposal (Individual Consultant / Registered firm)

Solicitation Reference No.	K-KEN-2024-4023
Title of Solicitation	Integrated DRR, Gender Inclusion and El Nino Emergency Response in Marsabit County
Issuing Office & Address	Idegeneouse Resource Management Organization (IREMO) Website: https://iremokenya.org/
Point of contact for clarifications, questions and ammendments	iremokenya.org/ indresource13@gmail.com
Email Address for submission of Proposals/ Quotes	iremokenya.org/ indresource13@gmail.com
Solicitation Issue Date	
Initial Deadline for Submission of Proposals	7 th November 2025
Anticipated Award Type	CONSULTANCY AGREEMENT



<p>Submission and Evaluation Criteria</p>	<p>Bidder must provide the below listed information</p> <p>Mandatory Eligibility Requirement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Must be an Individual/ Registered firm consultant● Must submit CV of Key Personnel● Provide certificate of Incorporation/ Business Registration if company● 2 references from pervious similar engagements● 3 latest audit reports● Must submit a certificate of Tax Compliance● Must Submit Business KRA PIN● The firm should not have been sanctioned or blacklisted by any government or institution <p>Technical Evaluation Criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">i. Consultant Academic and Professional Qualification-20%ii. Consultant's Prior Work Experience- 35%iii. Methodology/Approach- 35%iv. Language and analytical skills -10% <p>NB. The minimum technical score shall be 75%. Only the best candidate shall be engaged for financial negotiations.</p>
---	--



1. Background:

Indigenous Resource Management Organization (IREMO) is a registered non-government organization based in Marsabit County. IREMO is a human right and sustainable development organization that has established a solid foundation for community-driven development techniques since its founding in 2013. It firmly believes that communities can recognize and prioritize their needs and, with a bit of assistance, pursue their solutions. Community-driven development has a longer-lasting impact than any other development model, especially where communities have established local and credible grass root structures to leverage on their local resources and influence sustained engagement on human rights.

Kenya's arid and semi-arid lands (ASALs) are increasingly vulnerable to climate-induced shocks, with El Niño events contributing to recurrent flooding, displacement, food insecurity, and disruption of livelihoods. The 2023/2024 El Niño season had particularly devastating effects on communities in Marsabit and surrounding regions, exacerbating existing vulnerabilities and undermining development gains. Women, children, persons with disabilities, and other marginalized groups bore a disproportionate share of the impacts, facing heightened risks of gender-based violence, loss of income sources, and limited access to basic services. In response, the Indigenous Resource Management Organization (IREMO), in partnership with DKH, implemented an Integrated Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), Gender Inclusion, and El Niño Emergency Response Project. The initiative sought to strengthen community resilience through a multi-pronged approach that combined emergency response with long-term risk reduction for 4300 direct beneficiaries (43 groups each serving 100 HH). Interventions included:

- Community awareness and preparedness training on the SCLR approach for 43 community groups through microgrant support.
- Provision of relief and recovery support to 720 households affected by El Niño by provision of relief food aid.
- Strengthening community-based disaster management structures for 60 members of the water management committee through training on water resource management.
- Mainstreaming gender and inclusion to ensure equitable participation and protection of vulnerable groups through dialogue forums targeting 420 people including culture custodians like the Yaa and Nabo.
- Funding 43 community groups using the SCLR funding model as a way of combining response and resilience. Out of the 43 groups, 6 are special interest groups.
- Crop and animal husbandry training for the pastoralist and agro pastoralist communities of Kargi and Maikona wards.
- Hygiene promotion and awareness campaigns targeting 200 people.

As the project comes to an end in November 2025 having started in May 2024, it is critical to conduct an Endline Evaluation to assess the extent to which the interventions achieved their intended outcomes, strengthened community resilience, and promoted inclusive participation. The evaluation will also generate lessons to inform future programming and contribute to evidence-based advocacy for gender-responsive DRR and climate adaptation in Kenya's ASAL context.



2. Objective and Purpose of the Final Evaluation:

a) Purpose:

The overall purpose of the evaluation is learning, accountability, informing new project and to assess the degree to which the project met the objectives as outlined in the project proposal/logframe, with particular emphasis on appropriateness/relevance, timeliness, efficiency, effectiveness, coverage, coherence impact and sustainability of the interventions carried out. For leaning an accountability, we will look at the objective of the project, what has been achieved, achievement vs planned indicators, value placed on methodology and approach and consultant recommendation. The evaluation is also aimed to assess qualitatively as well as quantitatively, the project's achievements. to document the perception of IREMO and the project from relevant stakeholders, including the following: Community members, project beneficiaries, government authorities, and coordination mechanisms.

b. Objective

The project has been running at the community level since May 2024 and the planned activities will be completed in November 2025. The evaluation has been planned on the last month of the project. Being a pilot, the project has a strong interest in understanding if the newly developed SCLR methodology could fulfil its scope, identifying successes and challenges, and determining if it provided value for money.

The main objective of this evaluation is to explore the project's contribution in assessing the following:

- a. Improved capacity of target communities to diversify their livelihoods and improve their food security.
- b. Enhanced safe access to water and improved knowledge on hygiene practices among beneficiaries of the 2 target wards by the end of the project.
- c. Capacity of community is enhanced to develop gender inclusive Community action plans and implement community priority needs to build their resilience to disasters, and
- d. Emergency Humanitarian support for 720HHs in target communities affected by El- Nino rains.

In addition to exploring the project's contribution, the consultant will make sure they consider the following **OECD DAC** criteria:

Relevance:

- Did we plan the right thing? Do we do the right thing? To what extent are our objectives, planned activities and planned outputs consistent with the intended outcome and impact? Are there differences between the time when the project was planned and designed and today?
- To what extent are the objectives of the project / program still valid?

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?



Effectiveness:

- To what extent are the objectives achieved?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- How timely was the assistance?
- To what extent were the selected target groups reached?

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?

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?
- To what extent did the benefits of this or similar other projects/activities persist after donor funding ceased?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?

Coverage

- To what extent have the identified target groups been reached?
- How relevant and appropriate was this outreach as compared to the needs and potential support by other actors (government and NGOs)?
- Were all identified “vulnerable” groups/households reached effectively?
- Were there any complaints about inclusion or exclusion errors from beneficiaries or non-beneficiaries?

Efficiency

- How cost-efficient were the results achieved?
- Were there any delays?
- Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
-



Besides meeting the **OECD DAC** threshold, the consultant should also ensure that the endline report answers the following questions: what worked well? What didn't and why? Lastly, the consultant should have provisions for what should be done differently in the future.

The objective of this final evaluation is to explore what contribution the project made to enabling communities to address the risks of natural/ man-made hazards and fragility. In particular, it will be assessing level of achievement and lessons learnt from the following project objectives and indicators:

DESCRIPTION	INDICATORS ¹
<p>Overall Objective²</p> <p>Contribute to saving lives among flood affected HH, improving inclusive DRR initiatives and women protection in Kargi and Maikona Wards in Marsabit County</p>	
<p>Specific Objective 1:</p> <p>Improved capacity of target communities to diversify their livelihoods and improve their food security</p>	<p>Indicator 1.1:</p> <p>At least 40% of the targeted households (disaggregated by GAD) practice using knowledge learnt to practice livelihood diversification initiatives by the end of the project</p> <p>Indicator 1.2:</p> <p>% of GBV survivors trained and supported on IGA reporting to have improved income by end of project</p>
<p>Result area 1.1:</p> <p>Improved knowledge on how community can maximise on livelihood options within their context to enhance diversification and food security in Kargi and Maikona</p>	<p>Indicator 1.1.1:</p> <p>% of targeted groups reporting improved practical knowledge on how to diversify their livelihood by stating at least 2 ways by the end of the project.</p> <p>Indicator 1.1.2:</p> <p>Number of GBV survivors supported with start-up kits after trainings on local artefacts by the end of the project</p>

¹

²



<p>specific Objective 2:</p> <p>Enhanced safe access to water and improved knowledge on hygiene practices among beneficiaries of the 2 target wards by the end of the project</p>	<p><u>Indicator 2.1:</u></p> <p>Number of people who report to be feeling safe when collecting water from the rehabilitated water structure at the end of the project</p> <p><u>Indicator 2.2:</u></p> <p>% decrease in cases of waterborne diseases in the target areas by end of project.</p>
<p>Result 2.1:</p> <p>Improved capacity for water resource management structures to operate and maintain water structures targeted</p>	<p><u>Indicator 2.1.1:</u></p> <p>At least 50% of Water management committees who are capacity-built reporting at least 3 ways on how they are improving management of water resources under them by the end of the project</p>
<p>Result 2.2:</p> <p>Improved water, sanitation and hygiene for target communities by the end of the project.</p>	<p><u>Indicator 2.2.1:</u></p> <p>Number of earth pans rehabilitated and functioning by the end of the project</p> <p><u>Indicator 2.2.2:</u></p> <p>% decrease in waiting time for water collection by beneficiary communities as compared to baseline at the end of the project.</p> <p><u>Indicator 2.2.3:</u></p>



	<p>Number of people reached by public health promotion and disease prevention campaigns at the end of the project</p>
<p>Specific Objective 3</p> <p>Capacity of community is enhanced to develop gender inclusive Community action plans and implement community priority needs to build their resilience to disasters</p>	<p>Indicator 3.1: % of targeted community members (3300) reporting to have benefited from project implemented by the community groups by end of the project</p> <p>Indicator 3.2: Number of community action plans acted upon by end of the project</p> <p>Indicator 3.3: Number of community members reporting early actions they would undertake when faced by various disasters by the end of the project</p> <p>Indicator 3.4: Number of community members capacity-built advocating for progressive cultural practices</p>
<p>Result area 3.1:</p> <p>Enhanced community awareness on gender rights protection and inclusivity</p>	<p>Indicator 3.1.1: # of individuals within community traditional institutions who exhibit mind-set change at least on 1 retrogressive cultural practice like, early marriage, wife beating, women/girl's ancestral property ownership or FGM at the end of the training</p> <p>Indicator 3.1.2: # of men and women confirming to have been actively involved in developing community anticipatory actions by having their points documented for action</p> <p>Indicator 3.1.3: % of community action plans reviewed/developed at the end of the project</p>
<p>Result area 3.2: Improved capacity of target communities to take lead in community interventions by implementing projects by themselves based on community priority needs</p>	<p>Indicator 3.2.1: # of projects implemented by community groups to address their priority needs at the end of the project</p>



<p>Specific Objective 4: Emergency Humanitarian support for 720HHs in target communities affected by ELNino rains.</p>	<p>Indicator 4.1: At least 80% of targeted HH reporting that the food provided was of good quality at the end of the project</p> <p>Indicator 4.2: Number of HH with improved coping strategy index at the end of the project when compared to base line data</p>
<p>Result area 4.1:</p> <p>Communities of Kargi, Elgade, Forole and Hurri Hills are supported to meet their basic needs due to adverse effects of El Nino Rains.</p>	<p>Indicator 4.1.1:</p> <p># of beneficiaries of food aid confirming to have received 3 cycles of food distribution at the end of the project.</p>

The findings and recommendations from the evaluation will be used to review the methodology, contribute to the learning as well as to improve future resilience programming in the ASALs.

The main audience of this evaluation is, therefore, humanitarian and development practitioners of DKH, IREMO, the project participants and other partners including the Department of Gender, Culture and Social Services.

3. Methodology:

Methods Overview

The consultant is expected to utilize a mixed-methods approach using literature reviews of existing secondary data, quantitative data from the targeted villages, and qualitative data from relevant stakeholders in the project areas. The methods are summarized below:

1. Desk Review of key documents and secondary data from the target areas
2. Households Surveys
3. Focus Group Discussions
4. Key Informant Interviews
5. Observation

The consultant will be required to conduct a thorough and robust review of existing literature relating to food security and livelihood, protection, Gender, WASH, Disaster Risk Reduction among others. The literature review will be presented as a stand-alone section of the final report and will inform the interpretation of the survey findings as well as the development of recommendations.

Quantitative Data Collection



The core of the assessment will consist of a randomized quantitative survey. All data will be disaggregated by sex, age, and disability where appropriate. The endline study will sample community members and other stakeholders from the project locations. The consultant is expected to propose a methodology that is scientific, culturally appropriate, and will leverage both qualitative and quantitative data. The consultant is expected to develop a quantitative survey tool that captures all the indicators and survey questions outlined in the TOR as well as the project documents. The final tool will be approved by IREMO

Sampling Framework

A sample of respondents will be randomly selected from target areas for the quantitative survey. The sample will be statistically representative of the populations living in each target area based on acceptable statistical sampling techniques. This should be in line with various contextual factors and proposed project site.

Sampling Approach

IREMO expects the consultant to employ a sampling framework that utilizes a two-stage cluster sampling with probability proportionate to size (PPS) design.

Survey Administration

The survey will be administered using ODK/Kobo Tool Box. A number of checks will be put in place to ensure the quality and accuracy of the data collected. These will include but are not limited to:

- A thorough testing process for the data collection tool in line with standard operating procedures for tool development and testing, involving multiple layers of testing to ensure that the tool functions properly.
- A pilot phase in the field during which the tool is thoroughly checked and tested prior to final use.
- Daily checks of data collected to ensure that it is comprehensive and does not contain any mistakes.
- Daily debriefs with the data collection team to ensure that any problems encountered during data collection are identified and resolved.
- Regular spot checks on the field during data collection to ensure data collectors are properly administering survey questionnaires.
- A final, thorough, data cleaning process which will include verification of any potentially inaccurate data and revisits to the field if necessary.

Qualitative Data Collection

Qualitative data collection methods will include Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with community members, leaders, IREMO staff, ministry officials, community health workers, and other relevant partners deemed appropriate. In addition, data will be collected through observation checklists. The consultant team is expected to propose KII and FGD participants on the basis of their knowledge and on guidance from IREMO.

Qualitative data collection tools will be determined by IREMO project priorities and guidance from the consultant knowledge and expertise.



The consultancy will be required to come-up with an outline and propose tools to use and plan of action in carrying out the assignment. The consultant will provide an inception report outlining the most appropriate methodology required for the above-mentioned deliverables to be discussed with DKH before the start of the assignment. The methodology must include age, gender, diversity, and environment considerations. The consultant will work closely with the responsible IREMO MEAL officer and Program manager, and project officer in order to capture both the expected and unexpected changes of this resilience building process variety of tools will be used. The consultant is also expected to utilize a mixed-methods approach with both quantitative and qualitative data. The full methodology is as follows:

1. Desk review of project documents, including the Baseline report, case studies, the Logframe, recent progress reports, and the project proposal.
2. Conduct Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with community opinion leaders, government officials and other partners,
3. Conduct individual households' interviews with SGBV and food aid beneficiaries. In each village, a random sample will be selected and the following feedback will be critical for consideration:
 - Who acted differently?
 - What did they do that was different? What were the barriers that prevented them from acting differently?
 - When did this happen?
 - Where did this happen? (location)
 - Why is this change significant? What contribution did this project make/ made towards this changed behavior/relationships? If none, what could the project have done differently?
4. Conduct Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with each village (men and women) in the target villages to validate or not and discuss the changes identified in point. The FGDs will focus on groups that received SCLR microgrants including GBV survivors who received SCLR microgrants for IGA start-ups, the agropastoral communities of Ririma, Boji, Gamura, Borri and El-Gade, trained water management committees as well as the Nabo and Yaa.
5. Conduct interviews with IREMO and other key partners (inc government departments like the department of Gender, Culture and Social Services.) to capture their perspective on the project with focus on prevention of SGBVs and especially a reflection on the practical process of implementation of SCLR.
6. Assess the project SCLR implementation methodology within the framework of Value for Money
7. Develop 2-3 case studies (individual stories representatives of the findings) to back up the study findings.
8. Analysis and collection of all the data collected into a final report.

Key stakeholders to be included in the endline survey include: project participants, community leaders including traditional structures like the Yaa as well as CMDRR champions, relevant departments like the Department of Gender, Culture and Social Services and community health practitioners.

Note: Criteria for selection of communities to be included within the evaluation report.

4. Target Areas:

Kambinye, Murub, Bagasi, Ilkimakini, Dubsai, Ririma, Dakhane, and Kargi in Kargi ward and Maikona, Boji, Gamura, Kalacha, Rage, Kutur, El-Gadhe, Forole, Hurri Hills, Borri, Shankera, Gandile, Yaa Gara in Maikona Ward.



5. Consultancy Outputs:

The evaluators' will be required of the following but not limited to;

- i. Provide inception report, detailing the survey design, sampling methodology and framework, survey
- ii. Tools, and agreed upon budget and work plan.
- iii. Provide inputs regarding evaluation design; bring refinement and specificity to the evaluation objective
- iv. Guide reflection of expected outcome to facilitate a presentation of findings in a workshop setting
- v. Undertake site visits; conduct interviews
- vi. Provide regular progress/briefing report to IREMO
- vii. Analyze and synthesize information; interpreted findings, develop and discuss conclusion and
- viii. Recommendations; draw lessons learnt from similar projects
- ix. Draft end of project evaluation report which should be no more than 35 pages (excluding annexes) and include:

a) Content of the report

- Key data of the evaluation: Project title, Project number, duration of the project evaluated, title of the evaluation, principal of the evaluation (who commissioned the evaluation), contractor of the evaluation, date of the report

b) Executive summary

c) Key recommendations

d) Table of content

e) Abbreviation

f) Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation, scope and key questions. Short description of the project, relevant socio economic and political frame conditions

g) Evaluation design/methodology

h) Key results: observations / findings / conclusions

- Key results/findings: with regard to the questions pointed out in the TOR
- Assessment of the extent to which issues of equity and gender are incorporated in the project
- Assessment in how far humanitarian standards have been met
- Conclusions based on evidence and analysis

i) Recommendations

- Regarding future steps / activities / follow up
- Regarding improvements of project design



- Regarding approaches and methodologies
 - *Recommendations should be based on evidence and analytically sound. They should be targeted to the relevant audience, they should be relevant and feasible.*
- j) Lessons Learnt from the evaluation**
- Generalization of conclusions applicable for a wider use

Annexes

- Annex 1:** Table of Recommendations - overview and link between findings, conclusions, recommendations
- Annex 2:** Lograme with overall achievement Vs indicators
- Annex 3:** Terms of Reference
- Annex 4:** List of Documents for Desk Study, List of Persons/Institutions interviewed
- Annex 6:** 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
- Annex 6:** Tools applied: e.g. Interview Guidelines, Surveys, etc.
- Annex 7:** 2 case studies (individual stories representatives of the findings)
- Annex 8:** Hard and Digital Copies of Signed Consent provided by respondents.

All outputs must be in **English**.

6. Evaluation Timeline:

The Endline Survey is expected to take place over a period of 30 working days. The indicative timeline is as follows:

- Week 1: Inception and tool development.
- Week 2: Data collection.
- Week 3: Data analysis and draft report.
- Week 4: Validation workshop, submission of feedback to the consultant by IREMO and final report submission.

7. Consultant/s Specifications:

Mandatory requirements:

- Significant field experience in humanitarian or development programming (both would be a plus),
- Excellent knowledge of written and spoken English,
- Significant experience in designing and testing research methodologies,
- Good knowledge and practice of participatory research methodologies,
- Good communications skills,



- Ability to manage the available time and resources and to work within tight/ stringent deadlines,
- Ability to write clear and useful reports.

Desirable requirements:

- Fluency in Kiswahili and one of the local languages would be an added advantage,
- Knowledge of Outcome harvesting methodology,

Viii. Obligations of the Consultant

- Give leadership to the technical team throughout the assessment
- Inform the Program Manager, and M&E Officer 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 IREMO team before submitting the final report.
- Cater for his/her transport to the site or within his/her bid can indicate IREMO 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.

Obligations of IREMO

- 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 /IREMO any concerns that may arise
- Provide technical oversight in the review of all deliverables
- Provide timely comments on the draft report.

ix. Proposed cost

The consultant is required to submit a detailed financial proposal including professional fees, enumerator costs, logistics, communication, data analysis, personnel, stationary, report production and applicable taxes. IREMO will provide guidance on allowable costs. All applications to be submitted via iremo@iremokenya.org or indresource13@gmail.com

x. Survey Quality and Ethical Standards

a) Ethical Considerations



The endline survey must be conducted in full compliance with ethical standards to protect the dignity, rights, and safety of participants, as well as to maintain the integrity of the evaluation process. The consultant shall therefore observe the following principles:

1. **Informed Consent**
 - All participants will be briefed on the objectives, scope, and potential risks/benefits of the study.
 - Participation is voluntary, and participants have the right to refuse or withdraw at any time without penalty.
2. **Confidentiality and Anonymity**
 - Personal identifiers will not be included in reporting.
 - Data will be securely stored and accessed only by authorized personnel.
3. **Do No Harm**
 - The evaluation must avoid any physical, emotional, social, or reputational harm to participants.
 - Sensitive topics must be approached with care, particularly in areas relating to GBV, safeguarding, and livelihoods.
4. **Safeguarding and Child Protection**
 - All activities must comply with the organization's safeguarding policies.
 - When working with children or vulnerable groups, appropriate consent/assent protocols must be followed.
 - Enumerators must be trained to handle disclosures of abuse and to apply existing referral mechanisms.
5. **Equity, Inclusion, and Cultural Sensitivity**
 - The survey must ensure participation of women, men, youth, elderly, persons with disabilities, and marginalized groups.
 - Respect must be shown for cultural norms, beliefs, and local languages.
6. **Fraud, Corruption, and Misconduct**
 - The consultant and enumerators must adhere to the highest standards of integrity and accountability.
 - Any form of fraudulent activity, corruption, misrepresentation, or falsification of data is strictly prohibited and will lead to immediate termination of the contract.
 - Consultants are expected to report any observed fraud or unethical practices encountered during the survey.
7. **Data Protection and Ownership**
 - Data collected will remain the property of the contracting organization.
 - The consultant must comply with organizational and national data protection standards.
8. **Referral Pathways for Sensitive Cases**
 - In the event that cases of abuse, GBV, or psychosocial distress are disclosed, the consultant must follow agreed referral mechanisms in coordination with the organization.
9. **Ethical Approval (if required)**
 - Where applicable, the consultant must ensure compliance with national or institutional ethical clearance processes before data collection begins.

b) Future Use of the Data

All data collected will be the sole property of IREMO and DKH. The consultant must not use the data for their own research purposes, nor license the data to be used by others, without the written consent of IREMO.



Submission of the Proposal

- Proposals MUST be submitted **via email** to IREMO Procurement account: iremo@iremokenya.org/ indresource13@gmail.com on or before the deadline indicated on the synopsis of the RFP
- The Technical Proposal **must** conform to the proposed outline provided in Annex 1, 2,3 and 4 below

ANNEX I: TECHNICAL PROPOSAL FORMAT

- 1) Introduction: description of the firm, the firm’s qualifications and statutory compliance (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 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 annex 3)-1 page
- 6) Work plan (Gantt chart of activity and week of implementation)-1 page

ANNEX II: BUDGET TEMPLATE

The consultant shall only quote for the items below and other costs deemed necessary:

Item	Unit	# of Units	Unit Cost (Ksh)	Total Cost (Ksh)
Consultancy Fee	Per Day			
Office Expenses (Printing, photocopy, binding, communications costs, etc.)	Per Item			
Logistics Breakdown				
Enumerator data collection cost				
Enumerator training Cost				
Grand Total, inclusive of KRA Tax				

ANNEX III: PROPOSED TEAM COMPOSITION

Name of Team Member	Qualifications	Years of Experience Related to Consultancy	# of Days to be engaged	Role(s) Under This Assignment

Annex IV - Tasks & Timeframe



A detailed evaluation schedule is to be submitted by the selected consultant.

Tasks (to be amended as required)	Number of work days	Proposed dates including deadlines (to be revised by evaluation consultant, as required)
Development of evaluation inception report, including details evaluation methodology, tools (i.e., evaluation questions for stakeholders), and proposed evaluation schedule – <i>to be submitted for review and approval by the local partner and DKH</i>		
Desk review of project key documents		
Meeting with local partner and DKH		
Primary data collection		
Presentation and participatory analysis of findings (with participation of the local partner and DKH, and other actors as relevant)		
Submission of the draft evaluation report (and other outputs) for feedback from the local partner and DKH		
Submission of the final report (and other outputs) based on the feedback received		
TOTAL DAYS		