



## **INVITATION TO TENDER (ITT) AND TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) EVALUATION OF LAST MILE MOBILE MONEY IN KENYA SOCIAL IMPACT LAB (SIMLAB)**

### **1.1 Background information**

Social Impact Lab (SIMLab) helps people and organizations to use inclusive technologies to build systems and services that are accessible, responsive, and resilient. They support implementation, the sharing of learning and synthesis of best practice, and advocate to decision-makers and donors for policy-level change.

SIMLab defines inclusive technologies as those which embody values critical to truly scalable, locally-owned impact; accessibility, ease of use, interoperability, and sustainability. Mobile is a key example - SMS and voice telephony reach all of the world's 3.6 billion mobile subscribers - as is radio, a critical technology for broad reach at relatively low cost. They also embrace both ends of the spectrum of inclusive tech - the increasing availability and affordability of cheap web-enabled phones and mobile data make them more accessible for relatively disconnected communities, and more analogue communications technologies, such as public criers, noticeboards and human networks, like religious structures and community leadership, reach into even the most remote and disconnected communities.

This project is funded by the UK Government's Department for International Development (DFID) under their Global Poverty Action Fund (GPAF), through the Innovation Stream. The current political climate and results-based agenda demand a rigorous assessment of the effectiveness of funds disbursed to ensure that they are managed to provide value for money.

TripleLine is currently the Fund Manager for the GPAF, but will be handing over to MannionDaniels during towards the end of the 2015, so the final report and evaluation of our project is likely to be affected. The Fund Manager is responsible for assessing performance of grantees at the project level. This evaluation will need to meet both DFID's requirements and SIMLab's needs as it seeks to learn from its first-ever directly implemented project.

### **1.2 Project description**

SIMLab's Last Mile Mobile Money Project helps small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and under-resourced organizations explore available tools to realize the latent potential in mobile value transfer technologies for social change. SIMLab helped partners to break down barriers to innovation; both internally, through change management and business process consulting, and externally, through trainings on how to engage with and educate end-users to begin using accessible mobile money technologies. Through this project, SIMLab has been able to help organizations realize the uses and limitations of inclusive technologies and mobile money, while better understanding the types of organizational characteristics necessary in the implementation of digitization and cashless systems.

Since January 2014, SIMLab has been developing and testing Payments (a simple mobile money management technology based on FrontlineSMS technology), with 40 financial institutions, organizations, schools, and small to medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in rural Kenya. Until December



2014, SIMLab was the institutional home of the FrontlineSMS project, which provided a suite of software that helps organizations build services with text messages. FrontlineSMS has now spun out as a separate, for-profit social enterprise and continues to own and operate the Payments platform, now in private beta. SIMLab's intervention in this project sought to enable participating organizations to use Safaricom's M-Pesa mobile money service at an enterprise scale, empowering them to provide critical services more efficiently and effectively to remote, rural and low-income populations.

M-PESA users last year sent 11 billion Kenya Shillings per month through the service, which has been transformative for peer-to-peer (P2P) transactions such as urban to rural remittances. For the majority of businesses in Kenya, however, M-PESA seems still to be out of reach, although during the period of SIMLab's project, Safaricom has launched numerous products trying to gain traction in this market. SIMLab set out to explore whether providing a new type of platform to organizations like this could help them to implement mobile money, and in so doing, could improve economic livelihoods in rural Kenya. Our theory of change, essentially, was that mobile money could be a transformative tool for rural schools, NGOs, SMEs and Savings and Cooperative Credit Organizations (SACCOs), but that the lack of affordable offline management platforms was having a chilling effect. With a better platform and hands-on support to get started, organizations would be able to begin using mobile money and their end-users — parents and children, beneficiaries, customers and borrowers — would gain all the benefits of mobile money. An example might be a school or rural health clinic that wants to provide installment payment plans, or a rural MFI that wants to broker a microinsurance product to individuals alongside their group lending.

By far the largest challenge was to develop a recipe for transitioning different types of partners from cash to mobile payments. This required us to understand an organization's operational and programmatic processes, and how existing processes could be adapted to encourage beneficiaries and clients to transition to using mobile payments. Trainings with partner organizations initially consisted of one- to two-day on-site sessions with critical members of staff, usually from finance, project and senior management. Trainings aimed to dive deeply into the organization's programs and operations, come to a consensus about where mobile money should be piloted, set out roles and responsibilities in the roll-out of mobile money and provide an orientation to the Payments or PaymentView software. The evaluation will need to cover not just the technology implemented, but the important role played by this analysis and support.

### **1.3 Purpose of the independent final evaluation**

For SIMLab, the evaluation should provide an independent statement on the quality and outcomes of the project and help to identify and codify learning from the project and lessons that can be taken forward in the future. The evaluation will be shared under an open license on SIMLab's website, in hopes that it can inform donors, developers and implementers working in the wider field of ICT for Development. It will form the basis of a revision to the SIMLab case study on this project (Church, September 2015).

According to the agreement with DFID, the evaluation must be undertaken by an external evaluator, and must be submitted within 3 months of the project end-date of December 31, 2015. Thus the evaluation will take place in December 2015, with the final evaluation report submitted by March 31, 2016. For the Fund Manager, the independent final evaluation report will inform their understanding of



the grantee's performance at the project level and will also be used to inform the Evaluation Manager's assessment of performance at the GPAF fund level.

The independent final evaluation report needs to be a substantial document that (a) answers all the elements of the Terms of Reference (ToR); (b) provides findings and conclusions that are based on robust and transparent evidence; and (c) where necessary supplements SIMLab's own data with independent research.

#### **1.4 Key objectives of the evaluation**

DFID requires the evaluation to cover two explicit objectives that are explained below:

1. To independently verify (and supplement where necessary), SIMLab's record of achievement as reported through its Annual Reports and defined in the project logframe;
2. To assess the extent to which the project was good value for money, which includes considering:
  - How well the project met its objectives;
  - How well the project applied value for money principles of effectiveness, economy, efficiency in relation to delivery of its outcome;
  - What has happened because of DFID funding that wouldn't have otherwise happened; and
  - How well the project aligns with DFID's goals of supporting the delivery of the MDGs.

In addition to the DFID requirements, SIMLab is developing a Monitoring and Evaluation framework that will further inform the evaluation. See below under 1.4.3, Evaluation Questions.

##### **1.4.1 Verification of reporting**

Under DFID requirements, the final evaluation must verify DFID grantee achievement. The record of achievement will be presented in past Annual Reports and progress against the project logframe. This exercise could include verifying information that was collected by SIMLab for reporting purposes and possibly supplementing this data with additional information collected through primary and secondary research.

Verifying the results from the project log frame will begin to capture what the project has achieved. SIMLab has identified other activities and results that occur outside of the logframe that require examination in order to respond to the different evaluation questions. Verifying reporting will also necessarily include a review of the data and systems that were used to populate results, including SIMLab's existing baseline and monitoring data collected over the course of the project.

##### **1.4.2 Assessment of value for money**

Each final evaluation should assess the extent to which the delivery and results of the project are good value for money. Value for money can be defined in different ways, but at minimum the evaluation report should include an assessment against:

- How well the project applied value for money principles of effectiveness, economy, efficiency in relation to delivery of its outcome;
- What has happened because of DFID funding that wouldn't have otherwise happened;



### 1.4.3 Evaluation questions

To ensure comparability across the final evaluation reports, the evaluator(s) should respond to the questions below, which are structured according to the OECD-DAC criteria. As part of its M&E Framework, SIMLab is developing a set of evaluation criteria which integrate its principles of good implementation with inclusive technology into the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria - this will expand the criteria and add some additional learning questions, and will be supplied following the appointment of the evaluator for discussion and improvement.

#### *Relevance*

- To what extent did the grantee support achievement towards the MDGs, specifically off-track MDGs?
- To what extent did the project target and reach the poor and marginalised?
- To what extent did the project mainstream gender equality in the design and delivery of activities (and or other relevant excluded groups)?
- How well did the project respond to the needs of target beneficiaries, including how these needs evolved over time?

#### *Effectiveness*

- To what extent are the reported results a fair and accurate record of achievement?
- To what extent has the project delivered results that are value for money? To include but not limited to:
  - How well the project applied value for money principles of effectiveness, economy, efficiency in relation to delivery of its outcome;
  - What has happened because of DFID funding that wouldn't have otherwise happened; and
- To what extent has the project used learning to improve delivery?
- What are the key drivers and barriers affecting the delivery of results for the project?

#### *Efficiency*

- To what extent did the grantee deliver results on time and on budget against agreed plans?
- To what extent did the project understand cost drivers and manage these in relation to performance requirements?

#### *Sustainability*

- To what extent has the project leveraged additional resources (financial and in-kind) from other sources? What effect has this had on the scale, delivery or sustainability of activities?
- To what extent is there evidence that the benefits delivered by the project will be sustained after the project ends?

#### *Impact*

- To what extent and how has the project built the capacity of civil society?



- How many people are receiving support from the project that otherwise would not have received support?
- To what extent and how has the project affected people in ways that were not originally intended?

## **2. Evaluation methods**

Working together and supported by the SIMLab Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, the consultants(s) (or consulting firm) commissioned to conduct the final evaluation and SIMLab will select the methods that are the most appropriate for demonstrating impact. Evaluation methods should be rigorous yet at all times proportionate and appropriate to the context of the project intervention. Where possible, the evaluator(s) are encouraged to triangulate data sources so that findings are as robust as possible.

### **2.1 Different approaches to assessing impact**

Evaluator(s) should apply a mixed-methods approach for assessing impact. This would combine qualitative data to provide an explanation of ‘why’ and ‘how’ the project has achieved the type and scale of results that are quantitatively observed. DFID also suggest contribution-based approaches, which help to overcome the attribution issue of proving cause and effect. A contribution-based approach should result in a ‘plausible’ account of the difference that DFID’s funding has made to the impact of SIMLab’s impact.<sup>1</sup>

### **2.2 Indicative materials to review**

Relevant to review may include review of SIMLab’s original application for funding; MOU with DFID for funding; updated versions of organisational project logframes; monitoring data; monitoring systems, annual reports and comments provided by the Fund Manager; organisational monitoring & evaluation strategy; studies undertaken by SIMLab; financial information / information on resources spent; the case study published in September 2015; the ranking exercise and accompanying criteria carried out in planning the exit strategy at the conclusion of the project information on synergies / collaboration with DFID country programmes and other actors; published material (e.g. to demonstrate sharing of learning with others); and additional relevant documents, to be confirmed by the SIMLab Project Director and Manager.

### **2.3 Indicative methods for conducting primary and secondary research**

Relevant primary and secondary research may include: interviews with SIMLab staff involved in the management and delivery of work; interviews with selected partners; if possible, at least one focus group discussion with ultimate beneficiaries; surveys with project partners and other relevant stakeholders where (possible and proportionate); systematic reviews of secondary studies and sources, measuring impact where possible and proportionate through comparison groups and other

---

<sup>1</sup> Additional guidance concerning the fundamental principles and techniques of impact and contribution research is presented in ‘Broadening And Annex 8.1 of the Evaluation Manager’s Evaluation Strategy for the GPAF and PPA which is also publically available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-strategy-programme-partnership-arrangements-ppa-and-global-poverty-action-fund-gpaf>



quantitative methods; and verifying reported data through back checking and quality control assessments.

### **3. Contractual and reporting arrangements**

#### **3.1 Profile of the Independent Evaluation provider**

The Independent Evaluator should be a suitably-qualified and experienced consultant or consulting firm. The consultant profile should include:

- A minimum of seven years experience in programme/ project evaluation in an international development context.
- Experience of working with technology in Development, ideally in East Africa,
- Experience of results-based monitoring and evaluation;
- Ability to design and plan the evaluation approaches and research methodologies, including quantitative and qualitative research methods. Where feasible and proportionate, the person or team should include skills and expertise required to design, plan and conduct impact evaluation, potentially using experimental or quasi-experimental techniques;

Desirable qualifications:

- Experience of undertaking evaluations for DFID-funded projects
- Experience and knowledge of mobile money or mobile technology more broadly

#### **3.2 Management arrangements**

Recruitment and management of the evaluator(s) will be undertaken by Kelly Church, Project Director, with the support of Laura Walker McDonald, SIMLab CEO. SIMLab staff in Kenya will support the logistics and organization of meetings and interviews, and travel and accommodation while in Kenya. Travel, visa and accommodation expenses are covered and the quote which accompanies the proposal should exclude those costs. SIMLab staff will provide translation, should this be required.

SIMLab review of the draft report will be undertaken by the Project Director, Project Manager and CEO.

#### **3.3 Deliverables and timeframe**

The final evaluation consultant will submit the final report to SIMLab who, in turn, will submit it to DFID's then Fund Manager within three months of the project's completion. DFID limits the length of the main body of the report (draft and final version) must be limited to 40 pages (this can include or exclude annexes). One of the annexes should consist of a table, which summarizes the findings according to the OECD-DAC criteria.

The evaluation will take place in early December 2015 with the draft report submitted to SIMLab by December 15, 2015 for discussion and any additions/input. The final evaluation report will be submitted to SIMLab by December 22nd, 2015 or a date thereafter to be agreed with SIMLab following the evaluation visit, but no later than 15th January 2016.



Based on the available budget, it is assumed that the evaluators will spend no more than 2 days developing the evaluation approach and plan, 5 days conducting research on the ground, 3 days analyzing results and 3 days developing the draft report and 2 days to complete the final version of the evaluation report.

To ensure consistency across evaluation reports, the following structure should be used for reporting:

### **Executive Summary Introduction**

Purpose of the evaluation  
Organization context  
Logic and assumptions of the evaluation  
Overview of GPAF funded activities

### **Evaluation Methodology**

Evaluation plan  
Strengths and weaknesses of selected design and research methods  
Summary of problems and issues encountered

### **Findings**

Overall Results  
Assessment of accuracy of reported results  
Relevance  
Effectiveness  
Efficiency  
Sustainability  
Impact

### **Conclusions**

Summary of achievements against evaluation questions  
Summary of achievements against rationale for GPAF funding  
Overall impact and value for money of GPAF funded activities

### **Lessons learnt (where relevant)**

Project level - management, design, implementation  
Policy level  
Sector level  
GPAF management

### **Recommendations Annexes (such as)**

Independent final evaluation terms of reference  
Evaluation research schedule  
Evaluation framework



Data collection tools  
List of people consulted  
List of supporting documentary information  
Details of the evaluation team  
Grantee management response to report findings and recommendations

### **3.4 The following award criteria will be used to judge proposal submissions**

Criteria	Weighting
Quality of the tender, including the following sub-criteria	<b>75%</b>
• Method statement to deliver requested services	25%
• Evaluator's relevant experience and expertise	20%
• Project plan and approach to the evaluation	20%
• Quality assurance and risk	10%
Price	25%

**Interested candidates are invited to send their CV and a motivation letter to [kelly@simlab.org](mailto:kelly@simlab.org) no later than November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2015. We will be reviewing applications as they are received.**