

Terms of Reference for Final Evaluation

Making displacement safer: locally led DRR solutions for challenges faced by displaced communities in urban areas

Background for the Assignment

Purpose

GNDR seeks an external consultant to verify the achievements made in the “Making Displacement Safer: locally led DRR solutions for challenges faced by displaced communities in urban areas” (MDS) project that was commissioned by BHA in October 2020, and will reach its conclusion in March 2024.

Project background

The ‘Making Displacement Safer’ programme aims for locally-led DRR solutions for displaced populations in urban areas. The aim of the programme, linked to the key outcome of The Sendai Framework, is *“To contribute to the substantial reduction of disaster risk losses in lives, livelihoods and assets for displaced populations in urban areas”*. Within the programme design it explicitly recognises the need for knowledge to be gathered from the perspective of those most at risk, solutions to be trialled and lessons to be shared around how to build disaster resilience of the urban displaced.

Knowing that the range of disaster loss experienced by displaced populations exceeds others, the programme aimed to address needs of the disaster displaced and the cycle of vulnerability that often characterised their lives. Specific challenges include, but are not limited to:

- **Weak governance systems:** The inability of authorities to include the priorities of displaced people (due to lack of formal identification amongst other factors), means they miss out from development, DRR and emergency response planning and activities.
- **Urbanisation:** Unprecedented growth in urban areas is adding pressure to urban systems already stretched, in which the displaced also have to rebuild their lives. However, they are forced to live in inadequate housing with little or no basic services, and accept compromised living and working conditions in informal settlements.

- **Ongoing disaster risk:** As well as the threat of eviction, these informal settlements are hazard prone due to unplanned infrastructure development, a risk which is exacerbated when displaced people are pushed to the edges of these informal settlements. They literally live on the frontlines of the hazards, the first to be impacted and stand to lose the most. Housing and assets are at risk and, if lost, they are once again displaced to a new location resulting in a loss of livelihoods.
- **Being left behind:** The impact of disasters in urban areas is disproportionately felt by the poorer sections of the community, including the displaced. The impact is the greatest on women, elderly persons, children and persons with disabilities and directly contravenes “Leave no one behind” ambitions.

Programme Outcomes

The intended outcomes of Making Displacement Safer are:

- An increased understanding of the unique disaster risk challenges for displaced populations in urban areas
- An increased number of innovative approaches for reducing the vulnerability of displaced populations in urban areas
- The approaches and stakeholder roles for reducing vulnerabilities of displaced populations in urban areas are institutionalised in national and international systems

Scale of Programme

Making Displacement Safer is currently implemented in 11 countries (Honduras, El Salvador, Iraq, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Indonesia, Rwanda, South Sudan, Niger and Rep. Congo). It also aims to engage global GNDR members and influence international stakeholders for global advocacy.

Previous Evaluations

A midterm review was carried out in October 2022 to measure progress achieved until that point, especially in regards to the fact that implementation in the 11 countries was drawing to a close. It also made further recommendations going forward. These included:

Recommendations on advocacy

- Identify one or two key advocacy messages for the global level to focus efforts, and build products to bring to market around those messages.

- Convene the implementing members in a workshop or series of workshops to reflect on the project.
- Collaborate with global partners like NRC and PDD to take advantage of upcoming opportunities to feed into global policy discussions, and identify additional opportunities for further collaboration.
- Present MDS progress, findings, and key advocacy messages to global partners.
- Consider opportunities to test MDS approaches in reaching a larger number of beneficiaries to assess scope for reaching entire displaced communities.
- Consider establishing additional indicators to measure advocacy achievements beyond the number of documents changed to include DRR considerations.

Recommendations on project management

- Put a dedicated M&E officer in place for the remainder of the MDS project to review project data to date, control for data quality, and more fully measure the impact of each intervention.
- Refine target definitions and areas of work to guide further research and evidence-gathering in the remaining period of the project.

Recommendations on sustainability

- Work with each individual implementing member to develop and monitor bespoke exit strategies in their area.
- Organise a follow-up event with non-implementing GNDR members to present the MDS project's work and disseminate products such as the MDS Cookbook

Recommendations on future evaluations

- More enhanced monitoring systems and feedback mechanisms
- In-country visits

Scope of Evaluation, Key Evaluation Issues, Questions and Criteria

The evaluation is a final project evaluation. It will cover all activities that have taken place since the beginning of the project (October 2020) until the final evaluation (April 2024).

The overall purpose of the final evaluation is to:

- (1) Verify evidence of change already collected by evaluating both qualitative and quantitative data against the project’s indicators over the whole project period; capturing achievements of the programme’s results and indicators; going beyond the recommendations of the annual reviews.
- (2) Collect final evaluation data for outcome measurement
- (3) Discuss overall performance of the project, including details of any discrepancies between expected and actual results and any recommendations for improving the design of the program.
- (4) Draw lessons, success stories and an explanation of successes achieved, constraint encountered and adjustments made, leading to concrete recommendations contributing towards
 - (a) Programme Goal and Outcomes
 - (b) Overall GNDR strategy 2021-2025.
- (5) Showcase examples of change of policies and practices and lessons learnt particularly in the areas of challenges faced by displaced populations in urban areas to strengthen the collaborations across levels for building a coherent approach towards resilience.
- (6) Showcase examples of how the programme has ensured accountability towards the communities most at risk

For the purposes of this evaluation, the key questions identified by the stakeholders were organised in line with OECD DAC criteria under several main evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and (road to) impact. Furthermore, the evaluation will look at capacity development, partnerships, visibility and results-based management (RBM)/ monitoring/ evaluation as cross-cutting themes.

Evaluation questions and rating

Relevance and Coherence	Are the project’s objectives and target groups addressing identified needs at the local and national context?
	Were the conclusions at the global level and national level feeding into the overall global policy frameworks as well as the strategic framework of GNDR (internally)?
Effectiveness	Is the project design articulated in a coherent way? Is the definition of goal, outcomes, and outputs clearly articulated? To what extent were the originally defined objectives of the intervention realistic (achievable)? Was the project planned adequately?

	To what extent have the existing management structures supported the programming and implementation, including monitoring?
	What are the changes produced by the project at the national and global level? What has been the progress made towards achievement of the expected outcomes and expected results? What are the results achieved? What were the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement of objectives?
	To what extent have beneficiaries been satisfied with the results?
	How were lessons learned identified in the annual reviews addressed?
	What is GNDR's comparative advantage in designing and implementing this project?
	How has the project contributed to the global policy dialogue and influence to accelerate the achievement of the Sendai Framework for DRR, Agenda 2030, Paris Agreement, etc.?
	Overall cost effectiveness, with particular attention paid to cost savings and/or cost overruns, and other significant cost impacts such as major exchange rate fluctuations or other types of inflation must be detailed.
Efficiency	Were the project funds managed effectively? Could the activities and outputs be delivered with fewer resources without reducing their quality and quantity? How was the efficiency affected owing to the impacts of COVID 19?
	Have GNDR's organisational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms effectively supported the delivery of the programme?
Sustainability	Is the project supported by national/local civil society organisations (CSOs)? Do they demonstrate ownership of the project results, leadership, commitment and technical capacity to maintain/implement the benefits of the project?
	What is the likelihood that the benefits from the project will be maintained for a reasonably long period of time following the end of the project? How far were the project results institutionalised at the local and national level?
Impact (road to)	What are the intended and unintended, positive and negative, long-term effects of the project?
	What would the development have been like without the project intervention?
Capacity Development	How did the project contribute to capacity development of its stakeholders/beneficiaries? What adaptive or management capacities of national partners have been supported? (Please mention also under all other relevant evaluation criteria, and consider as a general cross cutting theme).
Cross-cutting themes¹	

¹ Use scoring rubric for each of the cross-cutting themes documenting evidence for the score

Gender	To what extent has the project supported women's equal participation with men as decision-makers?
	To what extent are female and male stakeholders satisfied with the results of MDS in their community?
	Did women and girls face any particular constraints or obstacles in their participation with the project and its activities? If so, how successful was the project in addressing these constraints?
	To what extent were the needs and priorities of women, girls, boys and men reflected in the: (i) activities implemented following the design of the local action plans? (ii) overall design of the MDS project?
	Were efforts made to ensure equal representation by men and women at all levels of project delivery?
Partnerships and Coordination	How were relevant regional, national and local actors and stakeholders included in GNDR's programming and implementation, incl. policy advocacy processes?
Visibility	Did the project implement BHA visibility guidelines? Were project partners and beneficiaries aware of these?
Inclusion	How did the project contribute towards addressing the needs of women, children & youth, people with disabilities through the implementation of the project?
Safeguarding and Protection	What mechanisms were in place to safeguard and protect rights of the communities most at risk?
Forward looking insights ²	Should MDS programming continue in the future? Were the approaches and strategies used by GNDR effective, relevant and potentially sustainable?
	What did the stakeholders and beneficiaries consider the most necessary approaches/areas of future MDS interventions in their respective countries? At the regional and global level?
	Based on the information and assessment of project progress and achievements, what other approaches/beneficiaries/donors etc. should be considered for a future iteration? How should a future iteration change?

The final set of evaluation questions will be agreed in the inception report.

² These are not scored but documented for the future iterations

The project performance should be assessed on an agreed sample based on a scoring rubric³ across workstreams, and against local, national level and global levels.

Evaluation Approach & Methods

The evaluation shall mainly be conducted remotely through interviews, group discussions and a desk study. The evaluation will develop and apply a rigorous analytical framework to identify the impact of MDS, particularly in terms of understanding of challenges faced by displaced persons living in urban areas, innovation and/or change in systems to address them at local, national and international levels. Evaluators are expected to detail this framework in the technical offer.

The evaluation will assess the impact of the activities led by the GNDR Secretariat and that of its implementing partners. The evaluation will draw out how this contribution has fared in comparison with factors affecting the engagement of the stakeholders for the type of work highlighted, and a critical analysis of the impact of factors external to the project.

The evaluation will be expected to collect data from a cross-section of representatives of implementing partners and external key stakeholders, including a diversity of respondents and different levels of seniority. Interviews with implementing and external partners, including representatives of donor agencies, national governments and international institutions should be undertaken. The list of interviewees and subjects for any case studies will be determined with GNDR at the inception phase. The evaluation methodology and data collection tools will need approval from GNDR.

Principles underpinning the evaluator's approach are:

³ Suggested scoring rubric (Adapted from "Policy and Guidelines for the Conduct of External Evaluation and Review", New Zealand Qualifications Authority, September 2009 and further drawing on Rich Tobin):

Excellent (Always): Performance is clearly very strong or exemplary in relation to the evaluation question/domain. No gaps or weaknesses were identified.

Very good (almost always): Overall strong, but not exemplary performance on virtually all aspects of the evaluation question/domain. Weaknesses are not significant and are managed effectively.

Good (Mostly, with some exceptions): Performance is reasonably strong on most aspects of the evaluation question/domain. No significant gaps or weaknesses, and less significant gaps or weaknesses are mostly managed effectively.

Adequate (Sometimes, with many exceptions): Performance is inconsistent in relation to the question. There are some serious but non-fatal gaps/weaknesses. Meets minimum expectations/requirements as far as can be determined.

Poor (Never or occasionally with clear weaknesses evident): Performance is unacceptably weak in relation to the evaluation question/domain. Serious and widespread weaknesses on crucial aspects. Does not meet minimum expectations/requirements.

Insufficient evidence: Evidence unavailable or of insufficient quality to determine performance.

- Participatory and culturally sensitive process valuing knowledge and approaches from within the context
- Impartiality and independence of the evaluation process from the programming and implementation functions
- Credibility of the evaluation, through use of appropriately skilled and independent expert
- Transparency of the evaluation process, including wide dissemination of results
- Usefulness of the evaluation findings and recommendations, through timely presentation of relevant, productively critical, clear and concise information, and commitment to building capacity.

The evaluation will have a cross-cutting consideration for inclusion, ensuring that factors related to gender, culture, language and other areas are taken into account.

The evaluation will consist of several phases:

- (1) **Contracting:** Contract is signed, and a discussion of the assignment takes place. First documents are provided to the evaluator.
- (2) **Inception phase:** An inception meeting will be held, along with the submission of an inception report. This should be more detailed in terms of the overall design and process of evaluation. It should also mention the method and approach that will be taken in regard to how data will be obtained and analysed based on the key documents provided. The use of a data collection planning worksheet or a similar tool is required. Data triangulation and quality control are very important and need to be discussed in the inception report. Evaluation questions and evaluation matrix shall be discussed and validated at that stage.
- (3) **Evaluation phase:** The evaluator studies all necessary project documents; re-constructs and analyses the intervention logic and its assumptions. Existing data needs to be analysed and interpreted. It is expected that data and information will be obtained through different methods such as: analysis of documents, structured interviews, semi-structured interviews face-to face (with a limited number of persons) or by phone, group discussions, online-surveys (if applicable), others. Field trips to visit the partners and members as foreseen as necessary and on the availability of the budget.
- (4) **Final draft report:** Submission and presentation of final draft report to GNDR Senior Leadership Team. It should include all the comments from the partners and stakeholders.
- (5) **Final delivery:** Submission of final deliverables.

The evaluators will work closely with the GNDR Secretariat, DKH Head Office and DKH Mozambique Office to ensure regular communications and meetings throughout the evaluation phase. Support for the logistical aspects of the evaluation can be provided by the GNDR Secretariat.

5. Deliverables

The following is required to be delivered during the evaluation period:

- (1) **Inception report**, including a detailed methodology, list of interviewees and tools for the evaluation
- (2) **Draft and final evaluation report** in English addressing the evaluation questions and including:
 - (a) executive summary of key findings and recommendations;
 - (b) evaluation findings, analysis and conclusions with associated evidence and data clearly illustrated. Use of tables, graphs, quotes, anecdotes and stories to illustrate findings and conclusions is encouraged;
 - (c) case studies, which should illustrate stories of the impact of GNDR, DKH and local implementing partners on specific policies, processes and their implementation;
 - (d) recommendations for the next actions, which should be practical and linked directly to conclusions;
 - (e) appendices, including methodology and evaluation tools, list of interviewees/interview dates, questionnaire, and brief biography of evaluator(s)
- (3) Presentations of final findings to GNDR Secretariat, and USAID-BHA

6. Profile and qualifications of the consultant

Applicants may be individuals or a team of consultants; teams of evaluators are encouraged to apply. As a diverse network, GNDR encourages mixed teams, with different backgrounds and genders.

Key qualifications should include:

Essential

- Relevant academic degree
- A minimum of ten years' experience and expertise in the non-profit sector, preferably networks in the field of development and linked to networks.
- At least three evaluations in the last five years, ideally impact evaluations, and experience of focusing on displacement, advocacy and policy and/or themes of risk-informed development or disaster risk reduction. At least one evaluation should have been remotely conducted in the last two years.
- Demonstrated experience of evaluation involving qualitative data and 'soft' outcomes
- Working experience in several countries and continents
- Experience in project cycle management
- Excellent oral and written English skills

Preferred

- Demonstrated experience of evaluating multi-country projects that are funded by BHA
- Capacity to study documentation and conduct interviews in English, French and Spanish.

7. Application procedure

The application documents must be submitted no later than Friday 15 December 2023 in electronic format to the following address: elise.belcher@gndr.org "Final Evaluation: MDS" in the subject line.

The application file should include:

(1) A technical offer including:

- Evaluation methodology: Describe your overall approach and evaluation methodology including, but not limited to, evaluation questions, evaluation design, proposed tools and methodology.
- Understanding of the issues at stake and the Terms of Reference.
- Relevant experience: Provide details of projects of similar scope, complexity and nature you have worked on previously.
- Specific expertise on themes mentioned

- Key personnel and staffing: Describe the key personnel and include CVs (no more than 2 pages each and attached as annex) of key personnel who will be part of the proposed plan
- Timeline: Include a suggested timeline of key activities.
- Three references (including telephone numbers) and any web links to previous work (if available) or annexes.

Applicants should clearly highlight any current or previous working or personal links to GNDR, as well as any risk around conflict of interest.

(2) A detailed financial offer including:

- A line-item budget detailing the cost estimates. The budget should be presented in Euro (including VAT and any other taxes). The tenderer should include his/her proposed daily rate, including all costs.
- A budget narrative.

8. Provisional calendar

Selection process

- Bids should be submitted no later than 15 December 2023
- Interviews of shortlisted candidates will take place during the week of 12 January 2024
- Final contract aims to be signed by 26 January 2024

Evaluation process

A total maximum of 30 working days over three months is currently estimated for this assignment (negotiable depending on methodology). Final payment is dependent on the submission and approval of the final evaluation report.

Contracting of evaluators	January 2024
Inception phase, including kick-off meeting / inception meeting	29 January - 16 February 2024
Evaluation phase	19 February - 29 March 2024
Draft report	5 April 2024

Final delivery	19 April 2024
----------------	---------------