

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) TUR 1011 PIPS IV FINAL EVALUATION



Providing Integrated Protection Services in Mardin, Diyarbakir, and Istanbul

INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

Deutsche Welthungerhilfe e. V. is one of the largest non-governmental organizations in Germany operating in the humanitarian assistance and development fields. It was established in 1962 like the German section of the “Freedom from Hunger Campaign,” one of the world’s first initiatives to eradicate hunger. Welthungerhilfe’s work is still dedicated to the following vision: All people have a right to a self-determined life in dignity and justice, free from hunger and poverty. By **2018**, Welthungerhilfe and its partner organizations ran **404** international projects in **37** countries with an overall financing volume of EUR 184 million, comprised of private donations, public national and international funds. In addition, Welthungerhilfe operates a marketing and fundraising department in Germany to engage and educate a wider public in development-related topics and to mobilize funds from currently more than **57,000 permanent private donors**.

Welthungerhilfe (WHH) has been officially registered in Türkiye since 2013. s provided emergency aid by distributing food and other relief items to the most vulnerable Syrian refugees in provinces in north-eastern Türkiye and internally displaced persons in north-western Syria. As the conflict in Syria continued and the humanitarian crisis worsened, WHH expanded its work in the region and adopted a more comprehensive approach to strengthening people’s resilience. Through its regional programme, WHH supports Syrians living in Türkiye and Lebanon, internally displaced persons (IDPs), and host communities in Northwest Syria with project activities focused on increasing food security and reducing poverty. WHH’s interventions include live-saving humanitarian assistance, shelter, protection financial support), small-scale agricultural activities, and the rehabilitation of water, sanitation, and hygiene infrastructure (WASH). WHH also plays a supporting role in providing access to existing protection and social care services through its case management activities.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

Project Overview

The main purpose of this action is to facilitate access to qualified protection services for people in need, following the one refugee approach, whether provided by public institutions by facilitating access or making necessary referrals, or by providing services directly through project partners, where the state does or not sufficiently provide such services. Additionally, the project will focus on capacity building for partners and duty bearers alike and engage with targeted communities in identifying protection risks through protection monitoring reports that can further inform the implementation of the project and its advocacy efforts.

The Action targets Syrians under Temporary Protection (SuTP) and other refugees under IP. Through integrated quality protection activities, i.e., psychoeducation, individual counseling (IPA&CM), child protection, and awareness-raising activities, the most vulnerable people will become aware of their rights and responsibilities and acquire knowledge to access existing services. The most vulnerable beneficiaries will be identified and provided with required services through internal and external referral pathway mechanisms through the psychoeducation approach. This will improve refugees’ well-being, knowledge, confidence, and resilience.

The Action will be implemented by Welthungerhilfe (WHH), Human Resource Development Foundation (HRDF), Refugee Support Centre (RSC-MUDEM), Refugees and Asylum Seekers Assistance, and Solidarity Association (RASAS), and Leader Women Association (LWA). WHH will be responsible for the overall coordination of the action and organizing capacity-building activities towards both the employees of public institutions and NGOs to increase the quality and sustainability of the services provided. The action will be implemented in Mardin and Diyarbakir's provinces and various districts and European sides.

Project summary

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Principal objective | Most vulnerable refugees in Türkiye receive Protection services until lasting solutions are modeled and integrated into government |
| Specific objective | Vulnerable adults and children are identified with their specific needs and are supported through a comprehensive Protection approach and receive services to improve their well-being and build up their resilience; public institutions will be capacitated to take over the responsibilities in providing social services. |
| Project expected results | <p>The project has three specific results, in brief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Result 1: Most vulnerable refugees have access to quality Protection services including case management, referral, PSS, legal support, etc. • Result 2: Service providers' and community leaders' capacity regarding refugee protection is increased through community-based protection approaches and capacity building of duty bearers • Result 3: Refugee community is engaged in action to identify risks trends and unaddressed gaps in protection through protection information management |
| Project Target | 6428 Individuals: |
| Project Locations | The project will be implemented in 4 locations in Istanbul which are WHH office in Şişli, HRDF office in Esenler, MUDEM community center in Fatih, and RASAS project office in Umraniye. In the South-East, the action will be implemented through WHH and LWA in Mardin and Diyarbakir provinces. |
| Project Duration | 1-Jan-22 to 15-Sep-22 |
| Project Partners | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Human Resource Development Foundation (HRDF) is a non-profit organization that has worked in the area of migration since its foundation in 1988. It has an experienced focus on gender equality, reproductive health services, women's empowerment, and humanitarian protection. 2) Refugee Support Centre (RSC-MUDEM) was established in Ankara in 2014. Their primary goal is to create solutions for the problems that asylum seekers, refugees, migrants, victims of human trafficking, applicants for international protection, and stateless people face in Türkiye. MUDEM's current operation in Istanbul continues with four centers in different locations with projects funded by different donors. 3) Leader Women Association (LWA) was established in 2010 and offered empowerment, livelihood, and social development services mainly to women in Kiziltepe. The organization has experience conducting a needs assessment, providing information seminars and outreach services to the surrounding rural and hard-to-reach areas. 4) Asylum Seekers Assistance, and Solidarity Association (RASAS) Refugees and Asylum Seekers Assistance and Solidarity Association was established in 2014 in order to seek solutions to the problems of people who have left their country and need international protection. RASAS supports refugees in need with its staff consisting of different nationalities. Within the scope of RASAS, as Refugees Association, they provide service in the areas of physical therapy, mental health, protection, legal counseling, vocational training, career counseling, Turkish language education, psychological counseling, guidance for students, and mentoring activities. |

EVALUATION PURPOSE

The overall purpose of the final evaluation is to analyze and assess the effectiveness of the project in terms of its stated objectives (principal objective, specific objectives, results, and impact). The evaluation will look at how far the services provided have had a positive impact on beneficiaries and their families, whether they support provided has been sustainable beyond the end of the project and measure the project's outcome level indicators. There is also a learning function to identify and list best practices, challenges, and opportunities based on the implementation methods and steps taken during the project duration and the initial design and setup to gain insights and draw lessons for the future.

SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The final evaluation will look at the project in terms of the strengths and limitations of the support it provides to improve the living standards of refugees and host communities through cross-sectoral measures. The evaluation will be conducted in all the project locations as per the project proposal document: Mardin-City, Kiziltepe, Midyat, Nusaybin, Diyarbakir-City, Istanbul-City,

More specifically, the evaluation will look at:

- 1) Assessing the project relevance by looking into whether the funding and support are consistent with local needs, priorities, and possibilities, including local partners' needs, priorities, and possibilities.
- 2) Assessing achievement of PIPS IV project outcomes and results as defined in the project logic of interventions
- 3) Assessing the sustainability of the interventions beyond the life cycle of the project *with specific focus on Solidarity Group (SG) members, community leaders and Capacity Building (CB) activities.*
- 4) Documenting challenges, programmatic lessons learned, and key recommendations for project improvement and corrective actions.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS (AND CRITERIA)

The evaluation will address the following basic evaluation questions based on the agreed criteria: **Relevance, Effectiveness, Sustainability, Coherence and Impact.**

Relevance: The relevance will be assessed by looking into whether the volume of resources and project activities are consistent with local needs, priorities, and possibilities, including the needs, priorities, and possibilities of local partners.

This should include:

- To what extent was the project set up and adapted in line with actual needs and gaps of the target groups, the target locations, and the context?
- To what extent have the defined results and the respective indicators been adequate and realistic in a dynamic environment where needs and priorities are changing?
- To what extent are primary stakeholders (target group/beneficiaries), duty bearers (government authorities) and key stakeholders (UN agencies, inter-agency coordination fora, donors) adequately engaged during the project development and implementation process?
- In how far were beneficiaries involved in the identification and design of the intervention? Are there any feedback mechanism, and if so, has the feedback provided led to corrective actions? Were beneficiaries feel safe using feedback mechanism?
- How fit for the purpose was the choice of partners and implementing modalities of the project?

Effectiveness: To what extent did the intervention achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differences across groups. This can be done, for instance, by emphasizing tangible improvements for the target population. This will include:

- Determining to what extent the intended objectives (outcomes and use of output) have been met by the end of the project and what the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives.
- Identifying the feasibility of planned objectives considering the operational and contextual realities
- Assessing the communication and coordination between WHH and the implementing partners, (Were the interventions of WHH and local actors compatible with each other) and determining to what extent it has contributed to overcome programmatic challenges and revamp the programmatic strategy to accomplish the project outcomes
- Scrutinizing whether there were any unintended outcomes (positive or negative)?

- Assessing whether the response was timely from the beneficiaries' point of view.
- Determining how age and gender are mainstreamed and whether the project considered different needs and vulnerabilities of women, men, girls and boys during design and implementation of the intervention?
- Determining indications are there that the achieved outcomes can be attributed to the interventions of the project?
- Determining the contribution of project's MEAL and protection information management system in adjusting/adapting activities and strategies.

Efficiency: This will assess the project outputs, both qualitative and quantitative, in relation to the inputs i.e were inputs, staff, time, funding, equipment used in the best possible way to achieve outputs; Thus, the evaluator will assess the following;

- To what extent was the volume of funding and human resources allocated commensurate to the project's formulated objectives and expected outcomes?
- To what extent has the project achieved cost effectiveness?
- What factors have affected efficiency and cost effectiveness and to what extent?
- How successful is the project in coordinating with similar interventions as to ensure most appropriate division of labor, and to avoid gaps and duplications?
- What efficiency gains could be made/have been made?
- How efficient were the management and accountability structures of the project?
- How did the project financial management processes and procedures affect project implementation?
- What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of the project implementation process?

Sustainability: The project sustainability will be assessed by establishing to what extent the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue?

- To what extent was the project able to connect short terms interventions to medium-term strategies and longer-term perspectives?
- Environment: To what extent the project adapting different approaches toward environment-sensitive protection programming? What are the concrete adjustments applied both operationally and programs side?
- Exit Strategy: To what extent the capacity building recipients and local structures would be capacitated in contributing to an exit strategy? How feasible is the exit strategy considering the context and capacities?
- What is the likelihood of the continuation of positive project outcomes beyond the end of the project (both by primary stakeholders and duty bearers)?
- How does the project seek to safeguard sustainability?
- Are there any factors threatening the sustainability of project outcomes? How does the project seek to mitigate these risks?
- To what extent was the target group became more aware and resilient and their aid-dependence is considered less than before?
- Are there any factors that might strengthen sustainability? Is there any action the project should take to promote these factors?
- To what extent have local capacities (e.g., community-based organizations, statutory service providers and implementing partners) been strengthened to contribute protective environment building?

Coherence/Complementarity: The project's coherence will be assessed by looking at project's adherence to core humanitarian principles and alignment with broader goals and strategies

- To what extent does the project complement the UN-led 3RP? Did the project interventions take account of other actors and efforts (connectedness)?
- To what extent did the theory of change and monitoring/reporting approach contribute to a coordinated and coherent intervention across project locations and implementing partners?
- To what extend does the project complement the ECHO HIP 2021 and its Technical Annexes?
- Did the intervention adhere to core humanitarian principles?

Impact: The project impact will be assessed by establishing to which extent the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects?

- Is the project contributing to systemic changes, e.g., to improved access to rights and services, mitigated protection risks, better service provision, etc. (contribution analysis)?
- What evidence is there that the expected outcomes have been realized by the project?

- What have the achievements of the project been in relation to these outcomes and, to what extent have other contextual and operational factors played an influential role.
- What are the unintended positive and negative impacts of the implementation of the project?
- If it has, what measures have been and can be taken to eliminate or reduce the negative impacts?

EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The evaluation's assessment of effectiveness will focus on the project's "contribution" to refugee protection. The evaluation will use both qualitative and quantitative methods, using both primary and secondary data sources. This should involve interviews with project beneficiaries, partners, stakeholders, field visits, desk review of project documents, and data review. A range of existing information will be made available to the evaluator upon notification of the award. This would include (but is not limited to): The original proposal, M&E plan, Indicator performance tracking table (IPTT) or similar tool, work plans, monitoring data, monthly/quarterly reports, and any other relevant documents. As part of this assignment, the successful evaluator will apply different methodologies, including primary data collection and a review of existing resources. The primary data collection will include Key Informant Interviews (KII) with implementing partners (IP) - duty-bearers and key stakeholders; a Most Significant Change tool (MSC); a beneficiary survey; and substantiating photos and videos. The evaluator will provide a detailed plan of the proposed methodologies in an inception report. The proposed methodology should include an evaluation matrix to reflect evaluation questions, judgement criteria, indicators linked to the judgement criteria, data sources and data collection methods. WHH will review the planned methodologies proposed by the evaluator and provide feedback before the evaluation process begins. The evaluator will have access to the project team of both WHH and partners.

It is a requirement that the evaluation should be conducted in compliance with the Turkish Data Protection Regulation and EU's GDPR. The consultant is expected to sign an understanding to ensure protection of personal data collected during this assignment. The consultant (in the inception report phase) need to elaborate on how beneficiary data will be collected and protected; what tools/ IT equipment will be used to store the data, how long this data will be stored.

Depending on the developments with Covid-19 in Türkiye, training and briefings with staff may be moved to phone-based or online using video-conferencing technology. It is the evaluator's responsibility to ensure that all staff involved are clear on the evaluation's aim and purpose, as well as all project details. In person interviews should be conducted in accordance with best practice for mitigating against the spread of Covid-19, with appropriate social distancing and hygiene measures including mask wearing and no physical contact including handshaking. It is strongly preferred that the evaluation team is fully vaccinated.

Translation staff, (Arabic, Kurdish and Farsi) is needed, must be organized by the evaluator and should strictly comply with the above measures. It is the role of the evaluator to ensure that interviewers are trained in confidentiality procedures. Interviewers need to be trained in obtaining verbal consent for interview participation. Staff should have experience in program monitoring, surveying, and data collection and effectively use technology-based analysis software to collect and analyze data. The evaluator will be responsible for preparing all manuals, guides, and training material used to train data collectors.

All tools will be designed in English and approved in collaboration with WHH. The evaluator will be expected to translate all tools into relevant languages in case needed. The main language of reports and tools will be English. Since the project includes three partners, the report should clearly distinguish the results across each partner and WHH.

MANAGERIAL ARRANGEMENTS / ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Head of MEAL and the Head of Programs/Projects (or designates) will be the main contact points for the evaluation process. For day-to-day coordination and communication with partners and managing data collection in the field, the MEAL Officer (in Istanbul office) will be the Focal Point.

WHH Gaziantep Office will manage the contract and provide funding directly to the evaluator(s) according to the terms specified in the contract.

The evaluator should make the necessary arrangements and coordinate with WHH staff before fieldwork to ensure no issues arise during field data collection. Relevant contacts will be shared with the evaluator.

DELIVERABLES AND REPORTING DEADLINES

All the Deliverables will be submitted to WHH soft copy (unless otherwise noted below).

- 1) **An inception report:** The consultant will share the inception report that details the evaluation design (rationale, methodology), evaluation matrix data collection tools, and a detailed work plan within 1-3 days of engagement, to be approved by WHH (Head of MEAL & Head of Project).
- 2) **Data collection tools:** Develop the data collection tools and have them approved by WHH before data collection, analysis, interpretation
- 3) **Validation meeting:** A meeting, online, discussing the main findings of the draft report, including project staff, partner staff, WHH MEAL staff, once data collection has ended.
- 4) **Raw Datasets**
- 5) **Draft Evaluation Report:** The evaluator will prepare a draft evaluation report with details of findings, recommendations and lessons learnt for review by WHH and partners
- 6) **Final Evaluation Report:** The evaluator will share a final evaluation report after incorporating the comments from WHH and project partners.

TIME FRAME / SCHEDULE

The duration of the assignment will be 50 working days. This evaluation will begin in XXX 2022; preliminary works may begin earlier, such as developing the tools and reviewing; the final study design. Below is a tentative schedule prepared to guide the evaluator in developing the evaluation workplan;

| | Activity | Duration |
|----|--|----------|
| 1 | Review documents and draft inception report by the evaluator(s) | 4 WDs |
| 2 | WHH meeting to discuss the inception report, project details and answer any questions the evaluator(s) have | 0.5 WD |
| 3 | Finalize inception report and detailed work plan, including sampling methodology | 3 WDs |
| 4 | Development of tools | 5 WDs |
| 5 | Setting up and training of enumerators on the tools using mobile data collection | 2.5 WDs |
| 6 | Data collection/interviews | 16 WDs |
| 7 | Validation workshop/meeting to discuss the draft final report | 1 WD |
| 8 | Draft Final Report Note: WHH will be responsible for reviewing the first draft report within 3 WDs of receipt and will provide feedback to the evaluator(s). | 5 WDs |
| 9 | ECHO to review the draft final report. | 10 WDs |
| 10 | Finalizing Final Report | 3WDs |

CONFIDENTIALITY

All documents and data acquired from documents during interviews and meetings are confidential and used solely for the evaluation. The deliverables and all material linked to the evaluation (produced by the evaluators or the organization itself) are all material linked to the evaluation (produced by the evaluators or the organization itself) are confidential and remain at all times the property of the contracting party.

EXPERTISE OF THE EVALUATORS

This evaluation assignment is open to evaluators with sound experience in the services outlined above. To be considered for the services described herein, the consultants must meet the following criteria:

- 1) Post-graduate qualifications in Sociology, Development/Humanitarian studies or relevant area
- 2) Proven experience of carrying out baseline, end-line, and project implementation of SGBV/Protection intervention in refugees/IDP setting or the MENA region.
- 3) Experience in project Monitoring and Evaluation in Türkiye
- 4) Strong experience and training in relevant evaluation methods (participatory methods, qualitative methods, and surveys).

- 5) Minimum of 3 to 5 years of experience evaluating development and/or humanitarian programs implemented by international aid organizations; experience of evaluating European union and German-funded programs is an advantage.
- 6) Knowledge of the Syria/ Türkiye political and cultural contexts
- 7) Proven experience in organizational learning and development of international NGOs.
- 8) Knowledge of the KVKK and GDPR regulatory requirements as regards personal data protection.

TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL OFFER

Applicants have to provide:

- A technical and financial offer
- The technical part of the offer should include a reference to the perceived feasibility of the ToR. (If required, including suggestions for specific evaluation questions.)
- It should also include a brief description of the overall design and methodology of the evaluation and a workplan/adaptations to the workplan at hand (maximum four pages).
- The financial part includes a proposed budget for the complete evaluation. It should state the fees per working day (plus the respective VAT, if applicable), the number of working days proposed, and other costs (e.g., visa costs). Proof of professional registration and taxation is also required (e.g., by providing the evaluator(s) tax number).
- CV with references.
- Evaluation Report sample