

Final Project Evaluation TOR

- **Organization:** DKH - Diakonie-Katastrophenhilfe
- **Location:** Aden, Yemen
- **Grade:** Consultancy Agreement
- **Occupational Groups:** DKH Quality Team
- **Project:** WASH and humanitarian food assistance for IDPs, host communities, returnees and marginalized groups in six districts of Shabwah Governorate, Yemen.
- **DKH Project Nr.:** K-YEM-2020-9005
- **GFFO Project Nr.:** S09-20 321.50 YEM 02/20
- **Closing Date:** 31st March, 2023

Organizational and Program Background

Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe (DKH) is part of the Evangelisches Werk für Diakonie und Entwicklung e.V. (EWDE), one of the biggest welfare institutions in Germany. The organisation supports people affected by natural disasters, war and displacement in 36 countries across the world. This is delivered through a global network of partner organisations.

DKH provides technical and other backstopping support to all partner organisations by building their capacities and strengthening relations.

DKH has been supporting partnerships in the delivery of emergency responses and resilience building initiatives in Yemen since June 2019. It current operates from its office in Aden.

Project Background

Project Title:	WASH and humanitarian food assistance for IDPs, host communities, returnees, and marginalized groups in six districts of Shabwah and two districts of Marib Governorates, Yemen.
Partner Organization:	Yemen Family Care Association (YFCA) www.yfca.org Build Foundation for Development (BFD) www.bfdyemen.org
Project Location:	Six districts in Shabwah Governorate (Bayhan, Jardan, Ataq, Nisab, Markha Al-Sufla, Ursaylan) Two districts in Marib Governorate, (Marib Al Wadi and Marib City)
Project implementation Period:	From 1st August 2020 to 31st March 2023

Target Group:	IDPs, host communities, returnees, marginalized groups
----------------------	--

Brief description of the interventions to be evaluated

DKH Yemen received a grant from German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO) to support YFCA and BFD to deliver humanitarian assistance to vulnerable communities in Marib and Shabwa governorates. The intervention started in August 2020 and is due to end in March 2023. The project went through a revision in 2021, scaling up the number of beneficiaries and expanding the geographical coverage to Shabwa and Marib Governorates. The project was to reach 23,201 households with access to safe drinking water, 4,142 households with sanitation services, 2,335 cash voucher assistance, 3,360 household with Rapid Response Mechanism and 50,497 beneficiaries through free basic health services.

Project Objectives and Outcomes

Overall Objective:

Contribute to improved food security and well-being of targeted vulnerable populations, improved functioning of public water facilities, access to primary health care services, and capacity of the local partner to rapidly respond to future emergencies.

Specific Objective:

Targeted vulnerable communities can meet their basic food needs and have improved access to basic communal assets, safe drinking water, sanitation, and primary health care services.

Outcome Indicator 1: 90% of targeted HH with access to safe drinking water.

Outcome Indicator 2: 90% improvement of average reduced coping Strategy Index (rCSI);

Outcome Indicator 3: 60% of targeted households with a Food Consumption Score of >42;

Outcome Indicator 4: 100% of the targeted HHs their SMEB gap is fully covered to meet their life-saving emergency assistance needs for at least one month.

Outcome Indicator 5: 100% of the people are not making any direct payment when accessing or using improved and functional health facilities and outreach/mobile care in targeted districts (including consultations, treatment, investigations, and provision of medicines)

Purpose and Objective of the Evaluation

The evaluation is intended principally for learning and accountability purposes. It is expected to generate relevant findings, lessons, and recommendations that will be shared with key stakeholders of DKH and used to guide future programming, according to its 2021-2022 strategic plans.

Objectives

The objectives of the evaluation include, but are not limited to, the following:

The main objective of this evaluation is to provide DKH and the GFFO with an assessment of the project, its design, implementation, and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of the project. The evaluation should provide evidence-based,

credible, and useful information, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the future decision-making processes of DKH and its partners.

The evaluation will specifically:

- 1) Assess the extent to which the project met its planned outcomes.
- 2) Assess the extent to which the partners met key CHS commitments during the implementation of the project.
- 3) Highlight lessons learned, best practices, and recommendations for improvements to feed back into the current and future DKH programming in the same sectoral areas and use similar approaches to meet their objectives.

Research Criteria and Questions

The evaluation shall use all six of the following OECD¹ DAC² criteria and corresponding questions (Relevance, Coherence, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact, and Sustainability). The consultant will be able to review and revise the questions (not the criteria) in consultation with the DKH country office quality team, as part of the inception phase of the evaluation, and as relevant.

1) RELEVANCE

The appropriateness of project objectives to the problems that it was supposed to address, and to the physical and policy environment within which it operated. It should include an assessment of the quality of project preparation and design – i.e., the logic and completeness of the project planning process, and the internal logic and coherence of the project design.

The following questions should be answered:

- 1.1 Was the action adequately designed to respond to the needs of the direct beneficiaries?
- 1.2 Were the project methodologies and activities relevant to achieve the project objectives?
- 1.3 To what extent have the gender, special needs and vulnerability considerations been mainstreamed into activities?

2) COHERENCE

The compatibility of the partners' intervention with other interventions in a country, sector, or institution. The extent to which other interventions (particularly policies) support or undermine the intervention and vice versa. This includes internal coherence and external coherence. Internal coherence addresses the synergies and interlinkages between the intervention and other interventions carried out by the same institution/government, as well as the consistency of the intervention with the relevant international norms and standards to which that institution/government adheres. External coherence considers the consistency of the intervention with other actors' interventions in the same context. This includes complementarity, harmonization, and coordination with others and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort.

The following questions should be answered:

- 2.1 To what extent is this intervention coherent with other interventions which have similar objectives?
- 2.2 To what extent is the intervention coherent internally?
- 2.3 To what extent is the intervention coherent with wider GFFO policy?
- 2.4 To what extent is the intervention coherent with international obligations?

3) EFFICIENCY

The fact that the project results have been achieved at a reasonable cost, i.e. how well inputs/means have been converted into activities, in terms of quality, quantity, and time, and the quality of the results achieved. This

¹ Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

² Development Assistance Committee

requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same results, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted.

The following questions should be answered:

- 3.1 Was the project managed in a cost-efficient manner (in terms of human, financial, and other resources versus the results)?
- 3.2 Were synergies capitalized on with other actors (local and international) involved in similar projects?
- 3.3 Were the objectives appropriately operationalized by the local partners in terms of capacity and capability?

The consultant shall analyze the efficiency of project management arrangements and duly justify any issue. Factual statements on the quality and quantity of inputs shall be provided, delays should be measured by means of comparison with the latest update of the planning. Any significant deviations shall be analyzed. Conclusions on the cost efficiency of outputs shall be drawn.

4) **EFFECTIVENESS**

An assessment of the contribution made by results to the achievement of the project purpose, and how assumptions have affected project achievements. This should include a specific assessment of the benefits accruing to target groups.

- 4.1 Were the expected results realized?
- 4.2 Did the achievement of the results conduct to the achievement of the project-specific objectives?
- 4.3 What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the set objectives?
- 4.4 If there is a gap between the benefits brought by the activities and the objective of the project, how can it be explained?
- 4.5 During the project, how well did the partners provide information to communities and people affected by the crisis about the organization, the principles it adheres to, how it expects its staff to behave, the project, and what they intend to deliver?
- 4.6 Was the implemented monitoring appropriate to address political or contextual changes as well as arising risks and was it effective in adjusting the program-activities in a timely manner?

The consultant's focus should be on outputs and outcomes' delivery and quality (not activities); he/she is expected to explain any causes of deviations and the implications thereof. The level of achievement of results should be assessed as reflected by indicators covering the specific objective (outcome), providing a transparent chain of arguments.

5) **IMPACT**

The effect of the project on its wider environment, and its contribution to the wider policy or sector objectives (as summarized in the project's overall objective).

The following questions should be answered:

- 5.1 What evidence is there that the project contributed to the achievement of its overall objective?
- 5.2 What, if any, were the unintended impacts of the project intervention, both positive and negative?
- 5.3 Was the project able to monitor, mitigate and respond to any unintended negative effects?
- 5.4 What recommendations for future programs can be made based on the "lessons learnt" and "good practices?"

6) **SUSTAINABILITY**

An assessment of the likelihood of benefits produced by the project to continue to flow after external funding has ended (probability of continued long-term benefits).

The following questions should be answered:

6.1 What evidence is there to suggest the project’s interventions and/or results will be sustained after the project ends?

6.2 What are the possibilities for replication and extension of the project’s outcomes?

Human, organizational (including policies and institutions), and financial factors, as well as environmental and gender viability, are the main sustainability factors.

Evaluation Methodology

While DKH suggests consideration of the following mixed-methods methodology in order to collect the relevant data, the consultant is expected to determine the final methodological approach for presentation and approval during the inception phase. Final approval will be made by the DKH quality team. The evaluation is expected to be based on the findings and factual statements identified from a review of relevant documents including the project document, ad-hoc, monthly, quarterly and interim reports to the donor.

DKH will provide the external evaluator with all available project documentation at the beginning of the consultancy. Project-specific context shall also be taken into account. The consultant will also undertake field visits and interview the stakeholders including the target beneficiaries, government officials, respective Clusters, etc. Participation of stakeholders in the evaluation should be maintained at all times, reflecting opinions, expectations, and vision about the contribution of the project towards the achievement of its objectives.

The methodology must consider participants’ safety throughout the evaluation (including data collection/analysis and report writing) as well as research ethics (confidentiality of data and information collected) and quality assurance (tools piloting, data cleaning). The above-described methodology is indicative, the consultant is expected to provide a detailed methodology and work plan. He/she will also be free to collect additional data in order to reply to all the research questions.

Schedule

This assignment is expected to be completed in five weeks during the period from 1st February to 15th March, 2023z. Bidders should provide an evaluation workplan detailing the number of working days required per evaluation activity (see below table).

Review of program activities, implementation policies, and reporting mechanisms, based on available documentation	To be filled by bidders
Development of an Inception Report, outlining the methodology for data collection and analysis	To be filled by bidders
Data collection	To be filled by bidders
Analysis of program performance based on the Six DAC criteria and the corresponding research questions listed above	To be filled by bidders
Drafting of the Final Evaluation Report	To be filled by bidders
Finalization of the Final Evaluation Report, taking into account DKH comments on its quality and accuracy.	10 days

The consultant will be expected to meet weekly with DKH management staff to provide updates on the evaluation timeframe. This can be done either by phone, email, or in person.

Deliverables

The following deliverables should be provided to the DKH Country office in Aden Yemen which will then circulate them to the Head Office for feedback.

All deliverables should be in electronic version, Word/Windows compatible format, and in English.

Deliverables	Deadline
Inception Report	First week
Draft Final Evaluation Report	Fourth week
The final version of the Final Evaluation Report	Fifth week

For all deliverables, the external evaluator is expected to underline factual statements using evidence, and to comment on any deviation.

Inception Report

The inception report shall include the following elements:

- Detailed description of the methodology for the evaluation
 - o Data collection methods
 - o Data collection tools
 - o Sampling of the FGDs and KIIs
 - o Approach to quality control
- Data analysis methods
- Justification for revising the Evaluation Questions (if relevant)
- Detailed workplan
- Analysis of anticipated limitations and mitigation measures

Final Evaluation Report

The final evaluation report should be including the following elements:

The project synopsis serves as an introduction and provides background information. It, therefore, includes a short text on the objectives of the project and issues to be addressed by it, a description of the target groups, and a summary of its intervention logic, including the indicators at the three levels of the intervention logic: overall objective/impact, specific.

<p>Executive summary</p> <p><i>(2 pages max)</i></p>	<p>Should be tightly drafted, and usable as a free-standing document. It should be short, not more than two pages. It should focus on the main analytical points, and indicate the main conclusions, lessons learned, and specific recommendations.</p>
---	---

<p>Project synopsis</p> <p><i>(This section should not exceed 1 page in length)</i></p>	<p>The project synopsis serves as an introduction and provides background information. It, therefore, includes a short text on the objectives of the project and issues to be addressed by it, a description of the target groups, and a summary of its intervention logic, including the indicators at the three levels of the intervention logic: overall objective/impact, specific objective/outcome, outputs. The synopsis does not include an appreciation and observations on issues related to the project implementation.</p>
<p>Methodology</p> <p><i>(This section should not exceed 1 page in length)</i></p>	<p>The methodology section should detail the tools used in the evaluation; locations, sample sizes, sampling methodology, tools used, dates, limitations faced, and other pertinent facts.</p>
<p>Findings</p> <p><i>(max. 2 pages per DAC criteria)</i></p>	<p>The findings section should present the results of the evaluation in an objective and non-judgmental way that gives an honest portrayal of the project. Included in the findings should be a discussion of how well the project achieved each of the six DAC criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability), and the Core Humanitarian Standards commitments. The consultant shall highlight the most important findings relating to the performance of the project and elaborate on them in detail while also pointing out any critical issues and/or serious deficiencies. Findings shall be accurate, concise, and direct. They must be based on and coherent with their answers to the evaluation questions.</p> <p>The consultant is expected to provide a self-sustaining explanation of their assessment which must be understandable by any person unfamiliar with the project while at the same time providing useful elements of information to the stakeholders. The consultant should avoid the following weaknesses: not evidence-based, lack of technical content (e.g. experts provide an analysis that does not take into account the state of the art of knowledge in a given sector or topic).</p> <p>Full source details (including file name, and page numbers...) are always to be included.</p>

<p>Conclusions, Lessons Learned, Best Practices, and Recommendations</p> <p><i>(max.3 pages)</i></p>	<p>These should be presented as a separate final chapter. Wherever possible and relevant, for each key conclusion there should be a corresponding recommendation. The consultant shall set out the main conclusions and recommendations based on the answers given to the evaluation questions and which are summarized in the findings section.</p> <p>Recommendations should be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible and drafted in a way that the stakeholders to whom they relate are clearly identified. Recommendations are derived from the conclusions and address issues of major importance to the performance of the project. They must take in consideration applicable rules and other constraints, related for example to the context in which the project is implemented. They must not be phrased in general terms but constitute clear proposals for solutions and they target the most important issues rather than minor or less relevant aspects of a project.</p> <p>Through conclusions, lessons learned, best practices, and recommendations, the evaluation will generate knowledge and support accountability to beneficiaries, the DKH, Partners, and the overall humanitarian community. It will provide information on the processes or activities that partners implemented to develop insights, knowledge, and lessons from past experiences so as to improve current and future performance.</p>
<p>Annexes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of Reference of the evaluation • Assessment tools used (questionnaires, checklists, scoring grids, etc.) • List of persons (job titles only, no names)/organizations consulted • List of literature and documentation consulted <p>Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses and other pertinent elements, graphs, etc.)</p>

Experience Requirement

The consultant should have the following background:

- Post-graduate qualifications in development/humanitarian studies or relevant areas.
- At least 7 years of experience in Monitoring and evaluation, including all relevant humanitarian sectors.
- Strong knowledge and/or demonstrated experience in conducting similar evaluation activities in insecure contexts is required.
- Strong knowledge of Core Humanitarian Standards.
- Strong analytical skills and ability to clearly synthesize and present findings.
- Excellent written and oral English essential.

[Please direct the application to procurement.yem@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.org](mailto:procurement.yem@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.org) and [CC godfrey.rotich@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.org](mailto:godfrey.rotich@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.org)