TERMS OF REFERENCE
Programme Review of the Strategic Partnership Agreement with Danida

Introduction

CARE Denmark (henceforth CARE) seeks to undertake a mid-term review of its current Strategic Partnership Agreement (SPA) with Danish MFA (2022-2025) with an outlook to harvest learning and generate practical lessons for late state implementation as well as future SPA's. Under the current SPA, CARE Denmark is for the first time implementing climate innovation programmes that have a radically different design compared to conventional development interventions (see CARE strategy and SPA application), including working with human-centred design, user engagement, localisation and a strong market orientation.

Purpose & objectives of the Programme Review

The overall purpose of the programme review is to assess and analyse CARE's climate innovation approach by capturing best practices and sustainable business models emerging within the SPA framework (2022-2025). The objectives of the programme review is as follows:

a) To assess the relevance of the underlying programme design for CARE DK's climate innovation portfolio and identify potential opportunities for strengthening/adapting the framework
b) To undertake a mapping and detailed description of best practices, business models and/or climate solutions that are assessed to be sustainable and scalable
c) To analyse how the climate innovation approach plays into a nexus context and how this could be strengthened throughout the project cycle
d) To synthesise learning and provide operational recommendations for a future SPA together with a strategic refinement of the climate innovation portfolio as well as for late-state implementation

CARE wishes an honest and critical review of its engagement under the current SPA with a focus on solutions and business models that have a potential for scaling and/or replication – but also on failures and innovations that were not taken forward. To create value for CARE, the final report of this review should aim to clearly showcase financially viable business models for climate-smart solutions that at the same time make an impact (or have the potential to) for the climate-vulnerable people CARE works with.

Further, the review should take into consideration the nature of climate innovation programmes, in which results and achievements follow a less straightforward pattern than conventional development programming. This means that CARE does not seek a typical review based on OECD-DAC criteria, but a review that takes into consideration the innovation cycle in which programme deliverables are tested, iterated and adapted on an ongoing basis.

Intended use and users:

The primary intended users of the review are CARE management and programming staff seeking to understand the effects of climate innovation programming and extract learning for future programming. *Findings* from the programme review will thus be used for adaptive management (adjusting programmes for maximum impact) as well as knowledge generation for the development of the upcoming Strategic Partnership with Danish MFA (2026-2029/30). Findings and learning will be directly used to inform the development of a new ToC and associated refinement of the current climate innovation framework, with a particular focus on how to effectively scale solutions and create viable business models.

Secondary intended users are CARE country offices and local partners but also Danish MFA (and other donors) financing climate innovation programmes. This is to ensure an equal focus on upwards and downward accountability while disseminating information on climate innovation to a broader audience for inspiration, improved coordination and ultimately the likelihood of effective scaling.

Scope of Work

Work covered under this review entails a desk review of existing data and reporting to identify and map potential climate-smart solutions and/or practices developed during the first two years of the SPA. This will also serve to inform the selection of country deep dives.

The consultancy is expected to carry out 2 x deep dives, comprising physical visits to two different country programmes. The consultants will identify which countries to visit together with CARE's programme + MEAL staff during the inception phase. Data collection during field visits should encompass:

> a) Key Informant (KI) interviews with staff at country offices (CO)
> b) interviews with local partners directly in touch with programme deliverables, and
> c) focus groups with local communities (end-users) who have been directly engaged in defining and developing climate-smart solutions.

Other social actors that the programme has sought to influence/collaborate with could also be included.

In addition to the two deep dives, the consultant(s) are expected to carry out limited online data collection in countries *not* visited. As a minimum COs and local partners should be engaged to compare findings from field visits and qualify learning and recommendations. Conclusions will be based on a representative sample of the country programmes involved in the programme.

Review questions

CARE is keen to understand how its climate innovation approach is a relevant and effective model for responding to local climate challenges with local communities. Based on this, the consultancy will help CARE capture and refine successful business models for locally-led climate innovation that are emerging within programmes. In doing so, the consultancy will answer the following themes and questions:

1. Assessing the extent to which climate innovation is a **relevant approach** for adaptation programming, resilience and local leadership:

    a. To what extent is the design of the programmes conducive for strengthening local climate resilience?
    b. In which ways do the programmes foster innovation (if any)? What is actually new?
    c. Where can programmes be strengthened from a Human-centred design perspective?
    d. To what extent are promoted solutions perceived as relevant and/or preferable to existing practices by end users?
    e. To what extent do programmes facilitate local ownership of promoted solutions? How can this be strengthened?
    f. What is the added value of a climate innovation approach compared to more conventional climate adaptation?
    g. To what extent is climate innovation a suitable approach for fragile contexts and nexus settings?

2. Assessing the **effectiveness** and **sustainability** of promoted climate-smart solutions and associated practices

   a. How well are sustainability considerations built into the programme framework and the different programmes?
   b. Is CARE approaching the right type of partners for scaling and replication of solutions?
   c. How can CARE's role in multi-stakeholder innovation be characterised? What are the challenges?
   d. To what extent have CARE had success with engaging the private sector in developing, testing and scaling the solutions? What were the challenges and what are different views on how we can improve?
   e. To what extent were market-based approaches used to sustain and scale the solutions?
   f. Is there evidence of external uptake or scaling of solutions by non-project (external) stakeholders?
   g. What were the challenges and what are different views on how we can improve?

3. Capturing and synthesising **learning** with a focus on viable business models and operational recommendations for future programming:

   a. To what extent are the solutions embedded in viable business models? What are the concrete examples?
   b. What characterises scalable solutions? What type of criteria should be used when scaling tested models?
   c. What are the opportunities to strengthen sustainability? What is missing in CARE's scaling strategy?
   d. What are the examples of return on investment (if any)?
   e. What other factors (external) have contributed to achieving results and/or successful business models?
   f. What type of unintended outcomes /changes can be observed? (when compared with programme design and ToC)
   g. How can CARE improve its ability to capture and document results from climate innovations? What tools or methods could support programme M&E?

In addition, the consultancy is expected to answer the following **cross-cutting thematic questions**:

- *Gender transformation* – How well are gender considerations integrated into programmes, and to what extent do observed outcomes involve positive changes for women and gender dynamics? How can CARE DK strengthen gender perspectives in its work?
- *Local leadership* –does the climate innovation approach contribute to local leadership? How could CARE advance local leadership within the climate innovation approach?
- *Nexus* – is the climate innovation approach sufficiently catered to fragile context(s) or rapidly changing environments? To what extent has CARE been successful in adapting the strategy to humanitarian settings?

The consultancy team may propose alternative or additional key questions to be addressed as part of the review as a result of the inception phase.

The **final section** of the review report should lay out **recommendations** and ways forward in response to the above themes and questions. However, CARE welcomes any other recommendation not captured in the report but related to the purpose of the review. The recommendation section is first and foremost meant for recommendations by the consultant(s) but CARE strongly encourages for this section to also reflect views and recommendations by others but related to the purpose of the review (made with a clear

distinction when applicable). Each recommendation made should be tailored and actionable, and include estimates for resource use to implement these, responsible persons/units, and priority.

Methodology

It is expected that the consultancy team will develop a review framework based on a collaborative inception phase, which includes an inception workshop with key CARE staff members, where the framing and scope of the review will be discussed in further detail.

It is expected that the review will primarily rely on qualitative data collection but other approaches that can shed light on the climate innovation approach are welcome. In addition to the main report, **two main outputs** should be delivered and annexed in the final review report. These are:

   I. Promising business models that have a local impact (or potential for) should be presented as independent cases (2-4 individual cases). The cases should clearly showcase how and why a certain model is financially viable, relevant to its local context and scalable in the wider sector. The cases should be done in a clear and communicable language, that allows CARE to demonstrate business models to an external audience. Format for cases will be developed by the consultant(s) and with inputs from CARE in the inception phase.
   II. A catalogue of criteria for successful scaling and/or best practices – this should serve as an overview and include concise descriptions of methodology, inputs on how to overcome "scaling barriers" and references for further information.

In general, the consultant(s) are expected to triangulate findings using multiple data sources to qaulify and substantiate findings, incl. research of recent trends and analysis within humanitarian innovation. Finally, the review should be participatory and involve the different views of CARE staff and partners, culminating in a reflection workshop to discuss review findings, learning and recommendations.

Timing & Deliverables

The review will be considered completed once an edited and approved review report has been handed over to CARE DK – exceeding no more than 20 pages, excl. executive summary and annexes. Key deliverables are outlined in the table below:

Tentative deadlines for deliverables

Deliverables	Timeline
Signing of contract	October 7th 2024
Kick-off with CARE DK	October 10th 2024
Draft Inception note, incl. workplan, field programme and case format	October 28th 2024
Final and approved inception note	November 6th 2024
Data collection and information collection completed, incl. deep dives	January 6th 2025
Reflection workshop with Country Offices and partners online to discuss review findings, learning and recommendations	January 8th 2025
Draft review report incl. annexes	January 14th 2025
Final review report incl. annexes	January 24th 2025

CARE Denmark will provide access to all relevant information and provide contact details for data and information collection. It is the responsibility of the consultancy to deliver the outputs as described above. Logistical support (scheduling of interviews, local and international travels, arrangement of field accommodation during data collection, access to internet, documentation—printing, photocopying of tools etc.) will be borne by the consultant.

Final Report Requirements

The consultant(s) is accountable to maintain the requirements for the content, format, or length of the final report, overall quality and approved timelines. They will produce a comprehensive report that assesses the achievements, observed changes and best practices so far and provide prioritised recommendations to strengthen programmatic approaches and late stage implementation.

The contract will be a deliverable-based contract, and final payment will be contingent on receiving the agreed deliverables in their final versions at acceptable quality standards.

The report must include:

- **A Title:** A title that conveys the name of the project, location, implementation period, as well as the main impact or key finding of the report.
- An **executive summary that focuses both on the process as well as best practices or outcomes** that is no more than 2 pages in length and is formatted so that it can be printed as a stand-alone 2-pager.
- **A display of the most important programmatic practices early in the report, including 3-5 key findings:** Which models have proven effective and relevant? What happened in the world, and why did it matter? These are the most significant accomplishments, supported by solid evidence. Each best practice should be written as one or two sentences. **Talk about changes and concrete practices early on in the report** so that the audience does not have to read the entire report before seeing evidence of change.
- **A clear methodology section:** the methodology should explain the review questions, and how the methodology chosen appropriately answers those questions. It should also contain key ethical considerations and a description of how reviewers protected participants and personally identifiable information.
- **3-5 key lessons learned:** These should be short, actionable, and the most important aspects of what the analysis found. They need to be relevant and new for people outside of the direct program. They should also include highlights of what to improve in the future
- **3-5 bullets describing how the project has leveraged innovation** to foster local climate resilience and/or enhanced adaptive capacities. It is important to have non-jargon descriptions of what a project did to achieve results. These can also be highlights of the most effective, relevant, and scalable approaches and tools.
- **5-7 recommendations**: As described under the 'Review Questions' section, these should be tangible and actionable recommendations focused on strengthening future programme design as well as late state implementation of the current SPA.
- **Shareable Evidence:** Evidence collected by the Review Team from the conclusions and recommendations must be submitted along with the final report. All datasets, qualitative interviews, and underlying data are owned by CARE and are included in final deliverables. Sources of all evidence must be identified and conclusions must be based only on evidence presented in the report, and recommendations must directly correspond to the conclusions.

Review team composition and required competencies

- Demonstrated experience (min. 10 years) of leading and conducting evaluations/reviews (leading at least 2, conducting at least 5 assignments) related to climate adaptation and humanitarian innovation
- Extensive experience with design of multi-stakeholder development cooperation and with a strong focus on private sector engagement to achieve desired results

- Solid knowledge of human-centred design or similar innovative approaches to the sector. The consultancy must demonstrate the ability to step outside a conventional OECD-DAC related review, and focus on both intended and unintended outcomes
- Proven knowledge of contribution analysis Outcome Harvesting and/or similar outcome related data collection methodologies (in particular qualitative)
- Knowledge and experience with qualitative approaches such as interviews, focus groups, observation, surveys etc.
- Recent experience with remote online data collection and workshops with the participation of multiple stakeholders.
- Ability to engage with, listen to, and learn from a broad range of stakeholders
- Commitment to protecting confidential information.
- Ability to write concise reports underpinned by rigorous critical analysis of collected as well as available data.

Budget

CARE DK expects the review to be carried out within **40-60 work days** and in accordance with the timetable provided above. The financial proposal should provide a detailed budget for the review including budget lines for the consultant/assistance travelling, accommodation, allowances, local transport, translation and other related costs. If local consultants are used for data collection, this should also be included in the budget.

Required External Response to Terms of Reference

A technical and cost proposal based on this Terms of Reference (ToR) is requested from the consultant or consulting firm. The proposal should contain:

1. The technical proposal (max. 3 pages) should present the proposed review methodology, including how the consultant(s) proposes to examine the specific nature of the project and the requested issues highlighted under the scope of the review. Specific roles and responsibilities of the team leader and other potential core members of the review team, including motivation for consultancy should also be included here.
2. Suggested work plan for the review in accordance with defined deliverables (see 'timing and expected deliverables) and activities indicating staff days required - preferably in a format such as a Gantt chart
3. Detailed budget with justification. The external proposal should include a reasonably detailed budget to cover all costs associated with the review. This includes a break-down of the cost to contract potential external team members, international and local travel, and in-country lodging and per diem. Other related costs that might be in the budget include expenditures for hiring local personnel (drivers, translators, enumerators and other local technical experts), translating reports, and renting meeting rooms for presentations/workshops.
4. Updated CV of Team Leader and other core members of the Review Team
5. A profile of the consulting firm, if relevant (including a sample report if possible)

Due date: October 1st 2024
Based on these submissions, shortlisted applicants will be invited to an interview before final selection is made. **Please submit the proposal and CV to: tender@care.dk**

Any questions related to the Terms of References should be directed to MEAL Manager, Mikkel Otto Hansen @ mhansen@care.dk