

Terms of Reference for a Feasibility Study

Consultancy to conduct a feasibility study for the project proposal “Pathways to Protection (P2P)” in Kenya and Zimbabwe to be financed jointly by Terre des Hommes Germany and the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)

1. About Terre des Hommes Germany

Terre des Hommes (TdH) Germany is an international children's rights organisation that promotes equitable development without racial, religious, political, cultural, or gender-based discrimination, since 1967. TdH empowers children and young people and protects them from violence and exploitation through various projects implemented by its implementing partners. TdH provides humanitarian assistance and improves the living conditions of children worldwide. What is particularly important to us is that we work with local partner organizations and enforce their rights together with children. Together with its local partner organisations, TdH Germany supports 416 projects in 47 countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America, Europe, and the Middle East.

TDH is an independent non-governmental organisation that promotes civic engagement and the participation of children and youths in all aspects of its work. TDH sees its mission in strengthening children and realising children's rights for all children because every child has the right to live and to develop in the best possible way. At TDH, we are convinced that sustainable development is possible for all people if the interests of children and future generations are respected and realised.

2. About the project

The proposed *Pathways to Protection (P2P)* project seeks to strengthen Protection Systems and Transforming Communities to Prevent Child and Youth Sexual Exploitation and Gender Based Rights Violations in Kenya and Zimbabwe. As its overall goal, the project envisages that by 2030, the incidence of Sexual Exploitation of Children and Youth (SEC&Y), and Gender-based Rights Violations (GBRV), including Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV), are significantly reduced along transport corridor in Kenya and vulnerable rural communities of Mazowe and Mt Darwin Districts in Zimbabwe. The project overall goal is hinged on three outcome areas namely: **Outcome 1:** By 2030, strengthened multi-county and district governance, coordination, and enforcement systems in Kenya and Zimbabwe effectively prevent and respond to SEC&Y and GBRV; **Outcome 2:** By 2030, Transport and local business operators within the corridor and communities demonstrate increased safeguarding accountability and responsible practices to prevent SEC&Y and GBRV and; **Outcome 3:** By 2030, children, youth, and communities in targeted locations demonstrate increased resilience to prevent and respond to sexual exploitation and gender-based violence and actively influence positive social norms.

P2P adopts an integrated, rights-based and gender-responsive approach that combines strengthened child-protection governance and referral systems; safeguarding and accountability within transport and other high-risk business sectors; meaningful participation and agency of children and youth; community-based prevention and social-norms change; and economic empowerment of vulnerable youth and households. The project seeks to address both immediate protection risks and the structural and social factors that contribute to vulnerability.

Major outputs include strengthened child-protection coordination mechanisms; improved capacity of frontline government, law-enforcement and other duty bearers; strengthened referral and safeguarding systems; adoption and application of a Transport Corridor Safeguarding Code of Conduct; increased engagement of transport and business actors; safe spaces and community-based protection mechanisms; youth skills, enterprise and financial-inclusion support; child- and youth-led advocacy; and gender-transformative community engagement involving men, boys, traditional and religious leaders and other community actors.

The proposed implementation period is **1 April 2027 to 30 March 2030 (36 months)**, with a total project budget of **€ 1,260,000**, with expected direct project costs of approx. **€ 1,086,000**. The funding is from the **German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)**, through TDH serving as the German executing organisation and coordinating partner.

Geographical location

In **Kenya**, the project will be implemented in selected high-risk communities along the Northern Corridor, specifically **Salgaa, Gilgil, Naivasha and Mai Mahiu in Nakuru County, and Malaba and Matayos in Busia County**. These locations reflect transport-corridor and community-level protection risks associated with high mobility, informal and precarious economic activity, and the presence of transport, hospitality and other businesses.

In **Zimbabwe**, implementation will focus on vulnerable rural communities in **Mazowe and Mt Darwin Districts in Mashonaland Central Province**. The geographical focus reflects identified vulnerabilities relating to GBV, child marriage, adolescent pregnancy, harmful gender norms, limited access to services and socio-economic vulnerability.

Target groups

The project will directly reach approximately **2,500 children and young people aged 10-24 years**, comprising **1,300 in Kenya and 1,200 in Zimbabwe**. Approximately 80% will be female and 20% male, with approximately 10% being persons with disabilities. Priority groups include out-of-school adolescents, young people engaged in informal or precarious work, girls at risk of or experiencing child marriage, children and youth with disabilities, and other children and young people experiencing heightened protection and socio-economic vulnerability. In Zimbabwe, **720 female survivors of GBV aged 10-24** form part of the overall direct beneficiary population and will receive post-GBV support and related services.

The project will also engage a wider group of government duty bearers, law-enforcement and frontline personnel, transport and business-sector actors, community leaders, youth peer educators, civil-society actors, men and boys, and other stakeholders who influence child protection and safeguarding.

2.1 Problem statement

The proposed *Pathways to Protection (P2P)* project responds to persistent risks of Sexual Exploitation of Children and Youth (SEC&Y) and Gender-Based Rights Violations (GBRV), including sexual and gender-based violence, affecting children, adolescents, and young people in selected high-risk communities in Kenya and Zimbabwe. These risks are influenced by intersecting economic, social, gender, institutional and environmental vulnerabilities, including poverty and insecure livelihoods, harmful gender norms, limited access to protection and referral services, weak accountability mechanisms, mobility along transport corridors, and exposure to unsafe work and business environments.

Kenya: Sexual exploitation of children and youth remains a significant protection concern along the Northern Corridor (Mombasa-Malaba), where high population mobility, transport hubs, informal settlements and roadside economies create environments conducive to exploitation and trafficking. Vulnerability is driven by poverty, unemployment, limited livelihood opportunities, weak social protection, unregulated informal sectors and high demand for commercial sex associated with mobile populations. Children and youth, particularly those who are out of school, economically vulnerable or experiencing family instability, face risks including sexual violence, exploitation, trafficking, early pregnancy, STIs, school dropout, and psychosocial harm. Weak coordination among duty bearers, limited reporting and referral systems, inconsistent enforcement of child protection laws, harmful social norms and inadequate survivor-centred services further constrain prevention and response.

Zimbabwe: In Mazowe and Mt Darwin, child marriage, teenage pregnancy and GBV remain critical protection concerns, particularly among girls and young women. Poverty, limited livelihood opportunities, harmful gender and social norms, and economic vulnerability contribute to risky coping strategies and exploitation. GBV and child marriage remain widespread, while low levels of reporting and limited access to protection and survivor-centred services weaken response. Early marriage and childbearing disrupt education, increase exposure to violence and restrict future economic opportunities. Weak community protection mechanisms, gaps in referral systems, limited psychosocial and legal support, and entrenched harmful norms perpetuate cycles of vulnerability.

Overall: In both Kenya and Zimbabwe, poverty and limited economic opportunities interact with harmful social norms, weak protection systems, inadequate referral and survivor-support services, and gaps in enforcement to heighten the vulnerability of children, adolescents, and young women to sexual exploitation, GBV, child marriage and related harms. This underscores the need for integrated, community-led approaches that strengthen prevention and protection systems, expand survivor-centered services, improve referral and reporting mechanisms, address harmful norms, and enhance livelihood opportunities for vulnerable groups.

Partner organizations

The project will be implemented by **terre des hommes Deutschland e.V. (tdh)** in partnership with **K-NOTE (Kenya National Outreach, Counseling and Training Program)** in Kenya and **Musasa Project** in Zimbabwe. K-NOTE is a Kenyan grassroots organization with experience in child protection, prevention of sexual exploitation, youth empowerment, safeguarding, livelihoods and engagement with government, communities and private-sector actors, including within transport-corridor settings. K-NOTE has partnered with TDH since 2019 and has implemented several youth protection and empowerment initiatives, including EMPROTECT and Emprotect+

Musasa Project is a Zimbabwean organization with established experience in GBV prevention and response, child protection, survivor-centered services, safe spaces, child-marriage prevention, women's empowerment, gender-transformative programming and policy advocacy. Musasa has partnered with TDH since 2020.

3. Objective and Use of the Feasibility Study

The overall objective of the feasibility study is to assess whether the proposed Pathways to Protection (P2P) project is feasible, appropriate, and sufficiently robust for implementation in the proposed intervention areas in Kenya and Zimbabwe, and to identify the adjustments and conditions required to strengthen the project design before implementation.

The study shall critically examine the proposed problem analysis, intervention logic, target groups, implementation approaches, institutional arrangements, stakeholder engagement, resource requirements, safeguarding arrangements, risks and sustainability prospects. It shall assess whether the proposed results can realistically be achieved within the planned implementation period and with the resources and capacities available.

Particular attention shall be given to the feasibility of the proposed approaches to preventing and responding to Sexual Exploitation of Children and Youth (SEC&Y) and Gender-Based Rights Violations (GBRV), strengthening protection and referral systems, engaging transport and other high-risk business sectors, strengthening child, youth and community agency, and supporting vulnerable children, youth and survivors.

The feasibility study shall generate evidence-based findings and practical recommendations to inform the finalisation of the project proposal, including recommendations on the geographical focus, target groups and scale, intervention strategies, sequencing of activities, stakeholder roles, institutional arrangements, safeguarding measures, indicators, resource requirements, risk mitigation and sustainability mechanisms.

The study shall not merely assess whether P2P is relevant; it shall determine what is feasible, under what conditions, at what scale, and with what adaptations. Where the

proposed design is not considered feasible, the consultant shall clearly identify the elements requiring modification and propose realistic alternatives.

The findings shall provide a basis for tdh, K-NOTE, Musasa and other relevant stakeholders to make informed decisions on the final project design and, where appropriate, incorporate the recommendations into the proposal submitted to BMZ

4. Research Questions

The feasibility study must cover four fields of analysis:

1. A context and problem analysis,
2. An analysis of the local partner organization(s) and its (their) capacities **to implement the proposed P2P project.**
3. An analysis of the target group(s) and other stakeholders involved in the project
4. An analysis of the project proposal regarding the OECD-DAC criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability).
5. An analysis of to what extent the project is feasible under the current context in Kenya and Zimbabwe

In the final report of the feasibility study, the consultant(s) must provide answers to the research questions listed for each field of analysis in the following subchapters; presenting a separate section for each of the four fields. However, the lists of research questions can be extended by the consultant(s). In order to avoid overlapping and repetition of questions from sections one, two, and three with section four, questions that may cause such repetition are highlighted respectively in the lists. **It is the consultant(s)'s critical task to attribute the findings to the matching section in the final report during analysis.**

In general, the analysis sections on context and problem, local partner organization(s), and target group(s) and stakeholders function as basis for better understanding the background and idea of the proposed project. On the other hand, the analysis section that sheds light on the project proposal from the OECD-DAC criteria perspective will investigate, evaluate, and assess the potential chances and risks of reaching the project's aims by applying the proposed measures and activities. I.e. **the findings from section one, two, and three function as basis for the findings from section four.**

Accordingly, findings should be presented in detail in section four rather than in previous sections. However, cross-references between the sections are permissible; repetitions should be kept to a minimum.

The feasibility study should focus on the following key questions for the proposed project

- What are the key protection, social and economic needs of children and young people particularly in relation to GBV, child marriage, sexual exploitation and harmful social norms?

- What are the main gaps in existing prevention, protection, referral and support systems that the project should address?
- Are the proposed target groups, geographic focus and beneficiary numbers appropriate and realistic for the identified needs?
- How feasible and appropriate are the proposed approaches for engaging young people, survivors, communities, men and boys, traditional/religious leaders and government actors?
- Is the proposed combination of prevention, youth participation, safe spaces, survivor support, referral systems and economic empowerment appropriate and feasible in the target context?
- To what extent can existing government and community structures be strengthened and linked to deliver the proposed interventions without creating parallel systems?
- To what extent is the proposed project relevant, coherent, effective, efficient and sustainable in addressing the identified needs?

4.1 Context and problem analysis

If a situational analysis, baseline study, gender analysis, and/or an evaluation of a prior project phase was carried out not long before the feasibility study, reference should be made to these studies regarding the questions listed below. If reference is made, respective studies and results must be made available to the consultant(s).

Potential research questions	Relation to OECD-DAC (if applicable)
1. To what extent does the available evidence demonstrate that SEC&Y and GBRV constitute significant and addressable protection concerns in the proposed intervention areas in Kenya and Zimbabwe?	Relevance; Impact
2. Are the proposed target groups sufficiently aligned with the identified risks and vulnerabilities? Are any particularly vulnerable groups insufficiently represented or inappropriately included?	Relevance; Effectiveness; Equity/Inclusion
3. Are the proposed geographical areas appropriate for the intervention? What location-specific factors justify their selection, and are any locations better prioritized, added or removed?	Relevance; Effectiveness
4. What are the principal drivers, risk factors and protective factors associated with SEC&Y and GBRV in the proposed intervention areas, and to what extent do the proposed intervention strategies address these?	Relevance; Effectiveness; Impact
5. How do gender and power inequalities shape exposure to SEC&Y and GBRV, access to protection and services, reporting	Relevance; Effectiveness;

behavior, participation and the likely effectiveness of the proposed intervention?	Impact; Gender equality
6. What contextual, socio-economic, cultural, institutional, political, environmental or mobility-related factors could materially influence implementation feasibility or results?	Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability
7. Are gender inequalities a matter of concern in the project locations? What are the main gender inequalities identified? What (gender specific) needs have been identified based on the problem analysis? How were these needs identified (or how will they be identified)?	Relevance
8. Does the proposed intervention logic adequately respond to the identified problems and their underlying causes, or are important assumptions or causal links insufficiently supported?	Relevance; Effectiveness; Impact
9. Are there alternative intervention approaches or combinations of approaches that would be more feasible, effective or appropriate in the proposed context?	Effectiveness; Efficiency; Relevance

4.2 Analysis of the local partner organization(s) and its (their) capacities

Potential Research Questions	Relation to OECD-DAC criteria (if applicable)
1. To what extent do K-NOTE and Musasa have the organisational, technical, human-resource and programme-management capacity required to implement P2P at the proposed scale, geographical coverage and level of complexity?	Effectiveness; Efficiency
2. Are the partners' financial-management, procurement, internal-control and reporting systems adequate to manage the proposed project resources and comply with tdh/BMZ requirements? What capacity gaps, if any, could affect implementation?	Efficiency; Effectiveness

3. Are the partners' safeguarding, PSEAH, gender equality, disability inclusion, child participation, data protection and accountability systems sufficiently robust for the proposed work with children, youth, survivors and other vulnerable groups?	Relevance; Effectiveness; Sustainability
4. What specific organisational or technical capacity gaps could constrain delivery of the proposed results, and which of these require capacity strengthening, additional technical support, changes in project scope or adjustments to implementation arrangements?	Effectiveness; Efficiency
5. Are the proposed roles, responsibilities and decision-making arrangements between TDH, K-NOTE and Musasa appropriate and sufficiently clear to support effective implementation, coordination, oversight and accountability across the two countries?	Coherence; Effectiveness; Efficiency
6. To what extent do K-NOTE and Musasa have the relationships, legitimacy and operational access required to work effectively with the proposed target groups, government authorities, communities, transport-sector actors, businesses and other key stakeholders?	Relevance; Effectiveness; Coherence
7. What level of strategic alignment, ownership and commitment do the local partners have towards the proposed P2P approach, and are they sufficiently positioned to influence and sustain the institutional and community-level changes envisaged by the project?	Relevance; Sustainability; Effectiveness
8. Are the proposed implementation arrangements appropriately matched to the respective strengths and comparative advantages of tdh, K-NOTE and Musasa, or are additional partners, expertise or implementation mechanisms required?	Coherence; Effectiveness; Efficiency
9. What institutional, staffing, financial or operational dependencies could create implementation bottlenecks, and what measures should be put in place to mitigate them?	Efficiency; Effectiveness; Sustainability
10. Based on the partners' existing capacities and identified gaps, what minimum organisational and operational conditions should be in place before project commencement, and what capacity-strengthening measures should be incorporated into the project?	Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability

4.3 Analysis of the target group(s) and involved stakeholders

Besides considering the analysis of the target group(s) and other relevant stakeholders in the overall analysis of the feasibility study, the consultant(s) is (are) expected to produce a respective stakeholder matrix, including sub-groups based on gender, age, etc. The matrix shall be added as annex to the final report of the feasibility study.

4.3.1 Assessment of the Target Group(s)

Potential research questions	Relation to OECD-DAC criteria (if applicable)
1. Are the proposed target groups, beneficiary numbers and selection criteria realistic, appropriately prioritized and achievable within the proposed geographical scope, project duration and implementation capacity?	Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency
2. To what extent do the proposed target groups adequately reflect the different levels and forms of vulnerability to SEC&Y and GBRV, including differences related to sex, age, disability, survivor status and socio-economic circumstances?	Relevance; Effectiveness; Gender equality; Inclusion
3. What barriers are likely to prevent children, youth, survivors and other vulnerable groups from accessing, participating in or benefiting from the proposed interventions, and are the proposed approaches sufficient to address these barriers?	Relevance; Effectiveness; Inclusion
4. Are the proposed mechanisms for meaningful participation of children and youth safe, appropriate and feasible within the project context, and what safeguards and practical arrangements are required to ensure participation is meaningful rather than tokenistic?	Relevance; Effectiveness; Sustainability; Safeguarding
5. What mechanisms are required to enable children, youth, survivors and other vulnerable groups to safely influence project design, implementation, monitoring, and adaptation, and are these mechanisms feasible within the proposed project structure?	Relevance; Effectiveness; Sustainability; Safeguarding
6. What are the needs of the target group(s) and how can these ideally be addressed?	Relevance
7. What is the target group(s)'s role in the broader social context? What conflicts of interest could arise between the target group(s)	Coherence

and other, non-target groups because of the support provided by the proposed project?

4.3.2 Assessment of involved Stakeholders

Potential research questions	Relation to OECD-DAC criteria
1. Which government, private-sector, community, and civil-society stakeholders are critical to P2P at national, county/district, and community levels? What are their mandates, roles, capacities, and existing contributions to SEC&Y, GBRV, child protection, GBV, youth livelihoods and safeguarding?	Relevance; Coherence; Effectiveness
2. What are the key interests, incentives, levels of influence, and potential conflicts among P2P stakeholders, and how might these dynamics facilitate or constrain collaboration, implementation and achievement of results?	Coherence; Effectiveness; Sustainability
3. What existing programs, services, referral systems and coordination mechanisms address issues relevant to P2P, and where are the main opportunities for complementarity, integration and coordination, or risks of duplication and inefficiency?	Coherence; Efficiency; Effectiveness
4. To what extent do key stakeholders share a common understanding of the protection problems addressed by P2P and its proposed pathways to change? Are the proposed stakeholder roles, engagement mechanisms, and commitments realistic given existing mandates, capacities, incentives and institutional constraints?	Relevance; Coherence; Effectiveness; Efficiency
5. What formal or informal agreements, commitments, referral arrangements, and coordination structures are required to support P2P implementation? Which stakeholders are essential to secure, and what engagement arrangements would strengthen institutional ownership, accountability and continuation of project-supported mechanisms beyond the project period?	Effectiveness; Coherence; Sustainability
6. Which government, private-sector, community and civil-society stakeholders are critical to achieving the proposed results, and do they have the necessary mandate, capacity, influence and willingness to fulfil the roles envisaged?	Relevance; Coherence; Effectiveness

7. Are the proposed stakeholder roles, responsibilities and coordination arrangements realistic, and what commitments, agreements or institutional arrangements are required to make them operational?	Coherence; Effectiveness; Sustainability
8. What stakeholder interests, incentives, power dynamics and potential conflicts could enable or obstruct implementation, particularly in engaging transport operators, hospitality and informal businesses, law-enforcement actors and community structures?	Relevance; Coherence; Effectiveness; Risk

4.4 Assessment of the Project Proposal regarding the OECD-DAC Criteria

4.4.1 Relevance

1. To what extent does the proposed P2P design respond to the most significant protection needs, risks and priorities of the intended target groups in the proposed locations? Is the number and composition of direct and indirect beneficiaries realistic?
2. Are the focus, priorities and objectives (approach) of the planned project clearly defined and aligned with the beneficiaries?
3. Is the choice of geographical areas, target groups and intervention pathways justified by available evidence and stakeholder perspectives?
4. Is the proposed intervention logic sufficiently aligned with the underlying drivers and protective factors identified through the feasibility study?
5. Is the project appropriately aligned with relevant national, local and international child-rights, gender, safeguarding and development priorities?
6. What changes to the project focus, targeting or intervention logic are required to improve relevance

4.4.2 Coherence

a) Internal coherence

1. Strategic Alignment: To what extent does the P2P project contribute to TDH's strategic goals while aligning with the Africa Regional Strategy. How effectively does it demonstrate compliance with TDH's principles and guidelines on Child Safeguarding, inclusivity, Gender Justice and Mainstreaming as well as Child and Youth Participation?
2. Partnership Integration: How well does the project design align with partners' (KNOTE & Musasa) organizational objectives, capabilities and other projects. To what extent does it leverage the partner's local knowledge and networks to enhance project effectiveness?
3. What existing interventions by TDH,, K-NOTE, Musasa and other actors provide opportunities for complementarity, learning or joint action, and where are there risks of duplication?
4. What steps, measures, or activities does the project foresee to safeguard children and youth and allow for meaningful participation? How can this be improved?

5. What steps, measures, or activities does the project foresee to ensure equal and inclusive protection and participation of girls, boys, other, children with disabilities, etc.? How can this be improved?

b) External coherence

1. How well does the proposed project complement existing government systems, policies, plans, programs and services relevant to child protection, GBV, youth livelihoods and safeguarding?
2. Does the proposed design make effective use of existing structures, referral pathways and institutional mandates, or does it risk creating parallel systems?
3. What coordination and partnership arrangements are required to maximise the project's added value within the existing protection and development landscape?
4. Which interventions of other actors (both state and non-state) exist in the same locality and/or area of intervention? Which opportunities and challenges for coordination and cooperation with other stakeholders can be identified?

4.4.3 Effectiveness

1. Can the proposed activities, approaches, and scale realistically deliver the intended outputs and outcomes within 36 months, considering available staffing, capacity, and resources in Kenya and Zimbabwe?
2. Are the proposed SEC&Y/GBRV prevention and response approaches, referral and survivor-support pathways, and engagement with transport operators, businesses, and other high-risk sectors technically appropriate, accessible, and feasible?
3. Are the proposed youth livelihoods, enterprise development, and financial-inclusion interventions technically and economically viable, with realistic market opportunities for the intended beneficiaries?
4. Are the proposed indicators and monitoring arrangements adequate to measure meaningful changes without excessive reporting burdens, and what design adaptations would strengthen the likelihood of achieving results?

4.4.4 Efficiency

1. Is the relationship between the proposed resources, staffing, implementation scale, beneficiary numbers, and expected results realistic and proportionate?
2. Are the proposed activities and delivery approaches appropriately resourced and cost-effective, and are there feasible alternatives that could achieve the same results without compromising quality, safeguarding, or inclusion?
3. Is the proposed sequencing and implementation timeline realistic, from start-up and baseline through implementation, consolidation, institutionalization, and exit?
4. Are project management, coordination, monitoring, and learning arrangements adequately resourced and feasible for a two-country intervention?
5. What minimum operational, human resources, and financial conditions must be in place for successful implementation to begin and be sustained?

4.4.5 Impact

1. To what extent can the proposed intervention plausibly contribute to higher-level changes in protection, accountability, gender norms, child and youth agency, and access to services?
2. Which proposed results have realistic potential to contribute to wider structural or systems-level changes beyond direct project-level results?
3. What changes could reasonably occur without the intervention, and what does this imply about the intervention's likely significance and contribution?
4. What unintended changes may the project contribute to? What negative consequences and impacts may result from implementing the proposed project? To what extent will it be possible to consider and address these risks in the project concept, e. g. Do-No-Harm, conflict-sensitive planning, etc.?

4.4.6 Sustainability

1. Which proposed results are realistically sustainable beyond the project period, and which are likely to remain dependent on project funding or external support?
2. To what extent can proposed protection, referral, coordination and safeguarding mechanisms be embedded within existing government, community and private-sector systems?
3. Are the proposed institutional ownership, capacity-building and transition arrangements sufficient to maintain key project functions after March 2030?
4. Are the proposed youth livelihood and enterprise pathways capable of generating sustained economic benefits beyond direct project support?
5. What financial, institutional, social, policy and socio-cultural conditions are necessary for sustainability, and who is realistically positioned to provide them?
6. What should the project deliberately avoid creating in terms of parallel structures, dependency or systems that cannot be maintained after project funding ends?

5. Methodology

The feasibility study should apply a **mixed-method, participatory, and evidence-based approach** combining desk review, quantitative and qualitative data collection, stakeholder analysis, and validation. The methodology should be designed to answer the research questions outlined in Section 4 and assess the feasibility of the proposed P2P intervention in **Kenya and Zimbabwe**.

The approach must be **participatory, child and youth-friendly, gender-sensitive, inclusive and culturally appropriate**, with meaningful consideration of the perspectives and experiences of children, adolescents, youth, and other intended beneficiaries. Attention should be given to safeguarding, confidentiality, informed

consent/assent, do-no-harm principles, and appropriate referral procedures when engaging children, survivors, and other potentially vulnerable participants.

The consultant(s) should propose a methodology that enables triangulation of evidence across different sources and stakeholder groups and identifies differences between the Kenyan and Zimbabwean contexts. The methodology should also assess the feasibility of the proposed intervention at **individual, household/community, institutional and systems levels**, as relevant to the project design.

5.1 Methods

The consultant(s) are expected to use a combination of the following methods, with the final selection and design justified in the inception report:

- **Desk study:** Review of the project proposal, Theory of Change, relevant previous project reports and evaluations, baseline and assessment findings, gender and safeguarding analyses, TdH internal assessments, relevant policies, legislation, strategies, research, and other contextual evidence.
- **Key informant interviews (KIIs):** Interviews with relevant government authorities, TDH staff, local partner organizations (K-NOTE and MUSASA), civil-society organizations, service providers, private-sector actors, researchers and other key stakeholders.
- **Focus group discussions (FGDs):** Separate and appropriately designed discussions with relevant groups, including children, adolescents, youth, caregivers and community stakeholders, ensuring age, gender and safeguarding considerations.
- **Participatory and child-sensitive methods:** Appropriate approaches such as storytelling, participatory mapping, problem/solution mapping, visual methods or other child-friendly techniques to capture the perspectives, priorities and experiences of children and youth.
- **Quantitative data collection:** Where appropriate, surveys or structured data collection to establish evidence on target-group needs, access to services, livelihood opportunities, stakeholder capacities and other dimensions relevant to assessing feasibility.
- **Stakeholder and institutional analysis:** Mapping key stakeholders, mandates, capacities, influence, existing interventions, coordination mechanisms, and potential contributions to implementation and sustainability.
- **Validation and triangulation:** Comparison of findings across documentary evidence, quantitative data, qualitative consultations and stakeholder perspectives, followed by validation of key findings through the follow-up workshop.

The final methodology should clearly explain **how the selected methods will generate evidence to answer each research question**, including the proposed sampling approach, respondent categories, data-analysis methods, quality assurance measures and ethical safeguards.

The consultant(s) should also identify any methodological limitations and explain how these will be mitigated. The proposed approach should be proportionate to the available timeframe and resources and should avoid unnecessary data collection where reliable existing evidence is already available.

6. Key deliverables

The services to be carried out as part of the feasibility study shall comprise the following assignments:

- **Preparatory and Inception Meeting with TDH, K-NOTE and MUSASA**
 - Jointly confirm the scope, research questions, methodology, data-collection methods, ethical and safeguarding procedures, work plan and reporting arrangements.
 - Clarify roles, responsibilities, access to documentation, and stakeholder engagement arrangements.
 - Incorporate agreed adjustments into the inception report and research tools.
- **Desk Study**
- Review relevant explicit knowledge and existing evidence relevant to the assignment, including, but not limited to:
 - Project proposal and Theory of Change
 - Relevant reports, assessments, and baseline studies
 - Government policies, strategies, and legal frameworks
 - Relevant sector and program strategies
 - Research and academic literature
 - Existing data and studies on SEC&Y, GBRV/GBV, child protection, safeguarding, youth livelihoods, and related issues in Kenya and Zimbabwe
 - Relevant BMZ and TdH guidance and standards.
- **Fieldwork**
 - Conduct fieldwork in **Kenya and Zimbabwe** in accordance with the approved methodology and tools.
 - Undertake appropriate consultations with children and youth, local communities, government institutions, civil society organizations, private sector actors and other relevant stakeholders.
 - Apply participatory, child-sensitive, gender-responsive, and ethically appropriate research methods.
 - Assess the feasibility of the proposed intervention against the agreed research questions and OECD-DAC criteria.
 - Document and analyze evidence from both countries and identify contextual similarities, differences, and implications for project design.
- **Follow-up/Validation Workshop**
 - Present and validate key findings, conclusions, and recommendations and jointly discuss their implications for the proposed project design and implementation.
- **Tasks for the consultant(s):**
 - Prepare the workshop agenda, presentation, and validation materials.
 - Present preliminary findings and facilitate discussion with TdH and local project partners.
 - Moderate the workshop and facilitate prioritization of key recommendations.
 - Document the discussions, decisions, and agreed adaptations.
 - Incorporate validated findings into the final feasibility study report.
- **Draft Report**

- **Background:** Provide a first complete draft for review and substantive feedback by TdH and the local partner organizations.
- The draft report shall present the evidence, analysis, conclusion and preliminary recommendations in accordance with the structure specified below.
- **Final Report of the Feasibility Study**
 - The final report shall be submitted **in English**, should not exceed **30 pages excluding annexes**, and shall include:
 - **Executive Summary** of no more than 5 pages.
 - **Project description and rationale.**
 - **Study methodology**, including limitations and ethical and safeguarding considerations.
 - **Context and problem analysis**, including relevant country-specific and cross-border considerations.
 - **Analysis of the local partner organizations**, including institutional capacity and comparative strengths.
 - **Analysis of target groups and key stakeholders**, including stakeholder roles, influence, and existing systems and services.
 - **Assessment of the project proposal against the OECD-DAC criteria**, covering:
 - Relevance and coherence
 - Effectiveness and technical feasibility
 - Efficiency and operational/financial feasibility
 - Impact
 - Sustainability
- **Key risks, assumptions, and critical conditions for successful implementation.**
- **Recommendations for improving the project proposal**, including practical and prioritized design adaptations.
- **Concluding assessment** of the overall feasibility and readiness of the proposed intervention.
- **Annexes** may include, as appropriate: a stakeholder analysis matrix; list of persons/institutions consulted; data-collection tools; key documents reviewed; workshop documentation; relevant analytical matrices; summary data tables; and other supporting documentation. Sensitive personal information, interview transcripts and raw datasets should only be included where ethically justified and in compliance with applicable data protection and safeguarding requirements.

7. Tasks, Responsibilities, and Timeline

Terre des Hommes (TdH) will manage the feasibility study in close collaboration with the local partner organizations, **K-NOTE in Kenya and MUSASA in Zimbabwe**, and the selected consultant/team. The consultant/team will have overall responsibility for the technical execution of the study, while TdH and the partner organizations will facilitate access, provide relevant documentation, support stakeholder engagement, and provide technical feedback.

The **TdH Head Office** will oversee the assignment, including contracting and coordinating the consultant/team, providing relevant program and donor guidance,

reviewing and approving key deliverables, and facilitating communication among stakeholders.

The **TdH regional/country structures**, will support coordination, contextual guidance, stakeholder access, and quality assurance. The **local partner organizations** will facilitate access to project documents, government and other relevant stakeholders, support arrangements for field consultations, provide contextual information and participate in the review and validation of findings and recommendations.

The **consultant/team** will be responsible for developing the detailed methodology and work plan, reviewing relevant documentation, conducting stakeholder consultations and fieldwork in Kenya and Zimbabwe, analyzing quantitative and qualitative evidence, assessing the feasibility of the proposed intervention against the agreed OECD-DAC criteria, identifying key risks and assumptions, and producing the required deliverables and recommendations for project design

Task(s)		Deliverables/Output	Responsible Stakeholders	Deadline/ Timeline
Preparation				
Tender		---	TDH	16th September 2026
Selection of shortlisted candidate(s) & awarding of contract(s)		Contract(s)	TDH	23rd September 2026
Line-up of research team		Confirmed research team and allocation of roles	Consultant(s)	Not specified
Preparatory meeting /inception		Minutes of the meeting, agreed methodology, scope, research questions, work plan, logistical arrangements	Consultant(s)	28th September 2026
			TDH and partners	
Submission of inception report and tools		Inception report, data collection tools and detailed work plan	Consultant(s)	2nd October 2026
Feedback on inception report		Written statement/consolidated feedback	TDH Head Office, TDH AFCCO and partners	6th October 2026
Empirical Research				
Desk study	Review of project proposal, theory of change, contextual and baseline information, relevant policies, studies, program documents and other available evidence	---	Consultant(s)	By 7th October
	Provision of necessary project documents, including InA & other relevant study results if available	Files & documents	Project partners and TDH	tbd by consultant(s)
Field work	Arrangements for travel, including tickets, visa, vaccination etc.	Proof for reimbursement of travel expenses	Consultant(s) and TDH	By 5 th October

	Arrangements for local travel	Local transport and field logistics arranged	Local project partner(s) and consultants	By 5 th October
	Arrangements for accessing the target group(s) if applicable	Access to children, youth, communities and other relevant respondents, with required safeguarding and ethical procedures in place	Local project partner(s) and consultants	By 7 th October
	Conduct investigation according to specifications in chapters 4 & 5	Completed data collection and field work Documentation	Consultant(s) and partners	By 13 th october
	Assist investigation & be available for inquiries by consultant(s)	Technical and contextual support; access to relevant information and stakeholders	Local project partner(s)	tbd by consultant(s)
	Be available as interviewee	Participation in interviews/consultations as relevant	Local project partner(s) Country office Regional office Head office	tbd by consultant(s)

Follow-up Workshop				
Preparation (Validation) of workshop	Invitation to all potential participants	Consultant(s)		By 20 th october, 2026
	One pager presenting major aim			
Moderation of workshop	facilitated validation and prioritization of findings, conclusions and recommendations	Consultant(s)		tbd jointly by all stakeholders
Participation in workshop	Review and validation of findings, assumptions and recommendations	Local project partner(s)		
		Country office		
		Regional office		
		Head office		
Systematization of findings and outcome of workshop	Documentation of validated findings, stakeholder inputs, and agreed recommendations	Consultant(s)		By 26 th october, 2026

Report Writing			
Submission of draft report	Draft report according to specifications in chapter 6	Consultant(s)	30 October 2026
Feedback on draft report	Consolidated Written feedback/ statement (1 to 2 pages)	Local project partner(s)	6 November 2026
		Country office	
		Regional office	
		Head office	
Submission of final report	Final report according to specifications in chapter 6 and incorporating agreed feedback and validated findings	Consultant(s)	13 November 2026
Approval of final report	Formal review and approval of final feasibility study report	Local project partner(s)	18 November 2026
		Country office	
		Regional office	
		Head office	

8. Requirements for bidders

The consultant(s) engaged to undertake the assignment must fulfil the following minimum qualifications and experience requirements:

- **At least Five (5) years of proven experience** in conducting feasibility studies, assessments, evaluations, or research related to **child protection, prevention of SEC&Y, GBV/GBRV, safeguarding, youth empowerment, and/or livelihoods**, preferably in development or humanitarian contexts.
- **Demonstrated experience with mixed-method research**, including qualitative and quantitative methods, participatory approaches, and **child-sensitive and ethically appropriate research methods** involving children, adolescents, and other vulnerable groups.
- **Relevant academic qualifications**, preferably a university degree or postgraduate qualification in social sciences, development studies, child protection, gender studies, economics, public policy, research, or another relevant discipline.
- **Strong knowledge of the socio-economic, institutional, policy, and child-rights context** of Kenya and Zimbabwe, including relevant government systems, protection and referral structures, youth livelihoods, and private-sector engagement.
- **Demonstrated understanding of institutional and systems approaches** to child protection, safeguarding, GBV/GBRV prevention and response, youth economic empowerment, and sustainability.
- **Experience with BMZ-funded development cooperation projects** and knowledge of relevant BMZ requirements, quality standards, and principles governing feasibility studies is an advantage.
- **Strong analytical, report-writing, and communication skills in English**, including the ability to produce clear, evidence-based, and actionable recommendations for program design.
- **Commitment to ethical research, safeguarding, and data protection**, including full compliance with Terre des Hommes' Child Protection Policy and applicable data protection requirements, including the **EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)**, where applicable.
- **Availability and capacity to undertake a two-country feasibility study**, including fieldwork and stakeholder consultations in Kenya and Zimbabwe, within the timeframe specified in the Terms of Reference

9. Specification for offers

Qualified and interested applicants to submit Technical and Financial proposals electronically in PDF formats, addressed to "The Selection Committee", with subject line clearly marked **Feasibility Study for Pathways to Protection (P2P) Project** via email on or before **23/09/2026 at 1700 hrs (EAT)** to: tdhsaco@gmail.com and cc w.jenje@tdh.de and d.ratemo@tdh.de. The aim is to select the Consultant/s by **24/09/2026** to start the assignment by **28/09/2026**.

Offers should include:

Technical Proposal (maximum 8 pages): Detailed description of relevant experience, suggested methodology and methodological approaches that demonstrate understanding of feasibility studies, participatory approaches, realistic timeline that accommodates community schedules and logistics challenges, and staffing structure including qualifications of team members and their specific roles.

Financial Proposal: A detailed financial proposal in KES/dollar currency, detailing the evaluators' itemised professional and logistical fees, broken down per phases of the study, transparent pricing structure that demonstrates value for money.

Portfolio Evidence: At least a sample of a feasibility study (published or unpublished report approved by respective clients), demonstrating quality of analysis and report writing.

Team Composition: CVs of all proposed team members, including lead consultant and any local consultants or specialists, with clear indication of their roles and time allocation to the assignment.

Professional Reference: At least two (2) professional references.

Contextual Experience: Demonstration of experience working in both Kenya and Zimbabwe.

Attachments:

- 1) TdH feasibility Report template
- 2) TdH Child Safeguarding Policy
- 3) EU- data protection declaration GDPR

Only shortlisted applicants will be informed and evaluated against their experience (20%), technical proposal (50%), and financial proposal (30%). All inquiries regarding the TOR should be directed to the emails provided above.