

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

TUR 1012-21

END-LINE EVALUATION



Country:	Turkiye
Project title:	Urgent support for vulnerable Syrian refugees in Southeast Turkiye through protection, winterization and Covid-19 support in the form of multi-purpose cash
Project no.:	TUR1012
Project holder:	Deutsche Welthungerhilfe
Donor:	AA
Project period:	01/04/2021 - 31/12/2022 (21 Months)

1. INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

About Welthungerhilfe

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 on development-related topics and to mobilize funds from currently more than 57,000 **permanent private donors**.

Welthungerhilfe (WHH) has been officially registered in Turkiye since 2013. It provided emergency aid by distributing food and other relief items to the most vulnerable Syrian refugees in provinces in South-Eastern Turkiye 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 Turkiye 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

The project is aimed at addressing the most urgent protection needs of the most vulnerable Syrian refugees in Turkiye and furthermore, targets the vulnerable Turkish host community as well as refugees from other countries residing in Turkiye (Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan), using the “one refugee approach”. 70% of the target population are Syrian refugees, 20% (Host community) and 10% (others). All activities are closely coordinated within the respective working groups inside Turkiye as well as with local authorities.

The project works with Government Actors and Local Authorities such as Social Assistance and Solidarity Foundations (SASF) (Gaziantep and Hatay), Association Directorate (Gaziantep and Hatay), Social Service Center (Gaziantep and Hatay), Metropolitan Municipality (Gaziantep) for case referrals and coordination. The UN agencies in Gaziantep/ Hatay include IOM (Gaziantep) for Protection, Basic needs, Shelter; UNHCR for Protection; UNICEF for Protection, Basic needs, and WFP for Basic needs. Other (I)NGO actors in Gaziantep/ Hatay are AAR Japan, ASAM, CARE, DRC, GOAL, SCI, STL, TRC, MSYD and UOSSM.

The first component of the project is the **provision of multi-purpose cash assistance**. Through this activity, the project aims to cover the most urgent needs of the identified target households by providing cash transfers. Cash is chosen as a modality to give the beneficiaries as much freedom as possible. In this case, WHH has a standing agreement with Ziraat Bank to process the money to beneficiaries, even if they don't have a bank account. The current unstable economic situation in Turkiye has created more burdens especially for the refugee communities, and the devaluation of the TRY has significantly increased the food prices-therby increasing the vulnerability and needs of the refugees. Moreover, the significant increase in the electricity and heating services creates additional challenges for those unable to access those facilities without support. Lack of access to basic services exacerbates the adoption of negative coping mechanisms and increased protection risks. To provide a more flexible cash support for eligible beneficiaries, a multi-purpose cash support of 1,500 TRY was paid to each household.

In terms of **Nutrition**, WHH provides nutrition training and nutritional counselling to Syrian and Turkish beneficiaries, in form of group seminars and individual phone counselling and using a developed nutrition training app for remote sessions. At the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic, these activities were shifted entirely to phone-based counselling sessions. The counselling component provides individualized face-to-face or tele-based nutrition consultations on topics such as chronic diseases, infant and young children feeding, and pregnancy based on the beneficiaries' dietary needs. On the other hand, training will provide individualized nutrition training for topics such as chronic diseases; infant and young children feeding; nutrition for school-aged children, pregnant and breastfeeding women; healthy nutrition and food hygiene.

The project provides **case management** in the form of referrals and using Special Needs Funds (SNF) as cash/in-kind support for protection. Since this is rather rare for NGOs in Turkiye to provide, WHH receives referrals for SNF assistance also from other organizations. The modalities used here highly depend on the individual case and include cash (rent support, medical support including surgery cost), in-kind (food kits, hygiene kits, kitchen utensils, medical items and NFIs), and shelter rehabilitation assistance. WHH will always choose the most appropriate modality to serve the BNFs best. For all activities, WHH has an upper ceiling of 10.000 TL per individual case, no matter the modality. In case of special hardship cases, the ceiling can be adjusted.

The last component of the project is **Legal counselling**. Through in-house legal counselors in Gaziantep and Hatay, Syrian refugees and other vulnerable persons will be provided with specialized legal services

and counselling. Based on their needs, they benefit from legal cash support including certificate translation service or legal documents cost.

Table 1: Project summary

Impact	The humanitarian situation of the most vulnerable refugees and host community members is improved, and urgent protection needs are met.
Outcome(s)	The living conditions of Syrian & non-Syrian refugees and host communities in south-eastern Turkiye are improved through integrated and multi-sectoral protection support (case management and SNF including nutrition counselling, emergency shelter repair, and legal aid) and seasonal and COVID-19-related financial assistance complementary to ESSN and nutrition awareness raising.
Outputs	<p>Output 1: The resilience and capacity to cope with winter and Covid-19-related challenges is strengthened within the targeted households in Gaziantep and Hatay, through one-off seasonal financial support.</p> <p>Output 2: Vulnerable Syrian & non-Syrian refugees and host community Households improve their nutritional diet and eating practices through the provision of nutrition training and counselling sessions.</p> <p>Output 3: Vulnerable Syrian & non-Syrian refugees and host community Households are protected through the provision of high-quality case management, including the Special Needs Fund (SNF), emergency shelter repair and legal counselling services.</p>
Project Target	Direct project participants: 49538 (24291-male, 25247-female) Indirect project participants: 21528
Project Locations	South-East Turkiye (provinces of Gaziantep and Hatay). Additional regions in Turkiye will be reached via SNF and case referrals, e.g Adana, Istanbul, Ankara, Mardin, Osmaniye, Kahramanmaraş). In the case of cities out of Gaziantep and Hatay, cash-based support is provided for exceptional cases that do not require distribution due to procurement challenges in the remote locations.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE

The main purpose of the end-line evaluation is to document and inform stakeholders (the donor, partners, and beneficiaries) of the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and potential impact of the project interventions. The evaluation will help to provide practical recommendations and document the lessons learnt for adoption in other WHH projects. Specifically, three key evaluation themes will be covered during the evaluation process: project logic, participation, and sustainability. The Consultant will also assess the cross-cutting themes, including protection, accountability to the affected population, access to rights and services, gender, and environment during the evaluation process. The pre-and-post project performance analysis with the baseline values compared against the end-of-project targets, significance of the change in the indicator performance will also be determined during the end-line evaluation.

The specific objectives of the evaluation will be:

1. To establish whether and to what extent the project design and interventions have been relevant to the needs of the target population?
2. To measure the extent to which other interventions (particularly other projects within Turkiye) supported or undermined the intervention.
3. To assess the extent the project has achieved the planned results.
4. To assess the extent to which the components of cash transfer, nutrition and protection interventions have been efficient.
5. To establish the indications of the impact of the project interventions on the target population/beneficiaries.
6. To assess if the benefits of the project are likely to continue beyond the project life span.
7. To document lessons learnt and good practices that can be replicated in future projects.

3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The scope of this end-line evaluation will be on a single project (TUR1012-21) and will cover the area where WHH implements its project activities in the Gaziantep and Hatay provinces of Turkiye. The evaluation shall broadly assess the accomplishment of all the expected results as outlined in the project proposal. It should also assess all the different project activities as in the logical framework matrix, with a strong emphasis on the following:

- Determining to what degree the project outcomes and outputs have been achieved and whether there were unexpected outcomes
- Determining the project relevance, effectiveness, coherence/complementarity, efficiency, sustainability, and impact.
- Documenting the challenges, lessons learnt and key recommendations for improvement.

The end-line evaluation will take place between the months of November and December 2022, prior to the closure of the project.

4. USERS OF THE EVALUATION

The primary users of this evaluation will be the Head of Project together with the project team, the Head of Programs, and the donor AA. The findings will inform the appropriate measures and recommendations for adoption in future projects. The project participants will also be informed about the evaluation findings.

5. EVALUATION QUESTIONS (AND CRITERIA)

With reference to the specific objectives, the end-line evaluation will respond to the following questions. This will also be guided by the widely used and agreed OECD/DAC criteria for evaluating development assistance.

Table 2: Criteria and evaluation questions

Criteria	Evaluation Questions
Relevance: The relevance of the project will be assessed by looking into whether the funding and support are consistent with	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the project articulate the objectives related to changes in children's well-being and lives, and that of their family and community? 2. Were clear needs defined with respect to required 'levels' of psychosocial support?

<p>local needs, priorities, and possibilities, including the needs, and priorities.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Were potential beneficiaries involved in developing the project? 4. Is the project response relevant to identified needs of the target groups, locations, and the context? 5. To what extent did the project build the local capacity, especially the local market vendors, bar associations/legal clinics and the people affected by the crisis? 6. How relevant was the project to the priorities, strategies, and policies of the relevant government units?
<p>Coherence/complementarity: The extent to which other projects supported or undermined the interventions.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent were context factors (political stability/instability, population movements, etc.) considered in the design and delivery of the project? 2. To what extent was the project coherent with the policies and programmes of other partners operating in the same area? 3. What have been the synergies between the project and other WHH projects?
<p>Effectiveness: To what extent did the intervention achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differences across groups thus far. This can be done, for instance, by emphasizing tangible improvements for the target population</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent has the project achieved its planned results-inputs, outputs, and outcomes? 2. Have inputs resulted in the outputs targeted? 3. What indications are there that the achieved outcomes can be attributed to the interventions of the project? 4. How did external factors positively or negatively influence the achievement of the outcomes?
<p>Efficiency: The extent the components of cash transfer, nutrition and protection interventions have been efficient.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent were the project components of cash transfer, nutrition, and protection interventions efficient? 2. Did the project leverage on other projects in the same area? 3. To what extent were the project interventions of cash transfer, nutrition and protection interventions implemented in the most efficient way as compared to other alternatives? 4. How did the costs compare to other projects targeting similar outputs?
<p>Sustainability: The project sustainability will be assessed by establishing to what extent the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What new capacities within services or communities have been established or restored? 2. Are these capacities being actively used in the psychosocial support and development of children and community? 3. What is the probability of the continuation of positive project outcomes beyond the end of the project (both by project participants and possibly others)? 4. Are there any factors threatening the sustainability of project outcomes? How does the project seek to mitigate these risks? 5. Are there any factors that might strengthen sustainability? Is there any action the project should take to promote these factors?
<p>Impact: The project impact will be assessed by establishing to which extent the intervention has generated or is expected</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What lasting changes attributable to the project can be identified in the lives of individuals, families, communities, and the broader environment?

to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Is the project contributing to systemic changes, e.g. to improved rights, and better service provision? 3. What are the unintended positive and negative impacts of the implementation of the project? 4. What measures have been and can be taken to eliminate or reduce the negative impacts
Lessons Learnt: The evaluator will document challenges, programmatic lessons learnt and key recommendations for TUR1012-21 project improvement.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the key recommendations for improving the project or for other similar programs elsewhere in Turkiye? 2. What lessons and best practices can be replicated in future similar projects? 3. What mistakes should be avoided if the project were to be replicated?

6. EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

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, project documents, and data review. A range of existing documents 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 key project staff and local stakeholders; Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with beneficiaries; a Most Significant Change tool (MSC); a beneficiary survey; and substantiating photos. The evaluator will provide a detailed plan of the proposed methodologies in an inception report. WHH will review the planned methodologies proposed by the evaluator and provide feedback before the evaluation process begins.

It is a requirement that the evaluation should be conducted in compliance with the KVKK and GDPR data protection regulations. The consultant is expected to sign an understanding to ensure the protection of personal data collected during this assignment. The consultant in the (inception report) needs to elaborate on how beneficiary data will be collected and protected; what tools/ IT equipment will be used to store the data, and how long this data will be stored. Depending on the developments with COVID-19 in Turkiye, 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 practices for mitigating 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, if 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 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.

The methodology used and the final report must adhere to the minimum standards of evidence quality outlined in the BOND evidence principles, including voice and inclusion, appropriateness, triangulation, contribution, and transparency.

To demonstrate the impact of the project, the consultant will make use of three approaches as follows.

- Comparing the performance of outcome and impact level indicators at Baseline and Evaluation. The difference in the two (positive or negative) provides an indication of the change that has transpired as a result of the interventions of the project
- Determining if the change proposed is significant with a 95% confidence that indeed there has been an impact of the interventions of the project when the baseline is compared with evaluation findings
- Documentation of impact or most significant change stories to qualitatively complement the quantitative data collected.

7. MANAGERIAL ARRANGEMENTS / ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Head of MEAL and the Head of Project (or designates) will be the main contact points for the evaluation process.

WHH Hatay 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. The summary of roles and responsibilities is outlined in the table below.

Role	Responsibility	Name/Title
Evaluation Commissioner	Commissions/authorizes the evaluation study, the main user of the evaluation results	Head of Project
Evaluation Manager	Overall management of evaluation and technical support if needed. In particular, the Head of MEAL will provide technical support during the end-line evaluation process to ensure that the evaluation is of the required quality and standard.	Head of MEAL
Evaluator	Responsible for carrying out the evaluation as agreed upon in the ToR (and the inception report).	External Evaluator
Logistical support	Make sure that the evaluation administration with regard to the finances and procurement is compliant with the existing donor/organization's regulations.	Logistic Country Office
Other field support	Day-to-day coordination and communication with the evaluator during field data collection	Senior MEL Officer and MEL Officer

8. DELIVERABLES AND REPORTING DEADLINES

The following deliverables are expected to be produced by the evaluator(s). All the Deliverables will be submitted to WHH soft copy (unless otherwise noted below).

	Expected Deliverable	Description
1	Inception Report	<p>The inception report should set out the planned design and methodology to meet the above-mentioned objectives and to answer the evaluation questions. Furthermore, the overarching evaluation questions should be specified further in the inception report</p> <p>It should also reflect the limits of the suggested design and methodology and could explore the feasibility for answering the evaluation questions and reflect on the ToR, describe the overall approach of the evaluation and how data will be collected by providing an evaluation matrix, drafts of suggested data collection tools such as questionnaires and interview guidelines as well as a tentative evaluation schedule.</p> <p>The inception report follows a standard outline which will be provided to the evaluator(s) after contracting and needs the approval of the contracting party.</p> <p>Deadline: 6 days after the briefing meeting</p>
2	Approved data collection tools:	<p>The evaluator shall develop the data collection tools and have them approved by WHH before data collection, analysis, and interpretation. This should be shared together with the Inception report.</p> <p>Deadline: 6 days after the briefing meeting</p>
3	Validation meeting:	<p>A meeting, either online or face to face, discussing the main findings of the draft report, including project and program staff, and WHH MEAL staff, once data collection has ended.</p> <p>Deadline: 3 days after the field data collection</p>
4	Draft End-line Evaluation Report:	<p>The evaluator will prepare a draft evaluation report with details of findings, recommendations and lessons learnt for review by WHH and partners</p> <p>Deadline: 6 days after the field data collection</p>
	Final Dissemination workshop	<p>A workshop/meeting to present and discuss the main findings of the draft report, incl. project staff and WHH MEAL staff</p>
5	Final End-line Evaluation Report:	<p>The evaluator will share a final evaluation report after incorporating the comments from WHH and project partners.</p> <p>Deadline: Latest 6 days after feedback on the draft report</p>
6	Evaluation Management Response Matrix	<p>The evaluator, as part of their assignment, will elaborate a management response matrix, listing the recommendations and the addressee for each recommendation. They will further determine a priority level, stating how important and urgent they consider the recommendation. A standard Evaluation Management Response Matrix template will be provided by WHH</p> <p>Deadline: To be submitted together with the final evaluation</p>

9. TIME FRAME / SCHEDULE

The duration of the assignment will be 30 working days. This evaluation will begin on 15 November 2022. Below is a tentative schedule prepared to guide the evaluator in developing the evaluation workplan.

	Activity	Duration
1	Contract signing and inception meeting between WHH and the Consultant	1 WD
2	Planning, review of project documents, development of study tools and preparation of Inception Report by the Consultant	2 WDs
3	Review of the draft inception report and the data collection tools by WHH	2 WDs
4	Finalize inception report and detailed work plan, including sampling methodology and final submission by the Consultant	2 WDs
5	Mobilisation and training of Enumerators	2 WDs
6	Conduct data collection	8 WDs
7	Data analysis and draft reporting	6
8	Presentation of the preliminary findings for validation	0.5 WD
9	Review of the draft evaluation report by WHH	3 WDs
10	Final Dissemination workshop	0.5 WD
11	Finalizing Final Report	3WDs

10. CONFIDENTIALITY

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

11. 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 Turkiye
- 4) Strong experience and training in relevant evaluation methods (participatory methods, qualitative methods, and surveys).
- 5) Minimum of 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/ Turkiye 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.

12. TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL OFFER

Applicants shall provide:

- 1) A technical and financial offer
- 2) The technical part of the offer should include a reference to the Consultant’s understanding of the Terms of Reference with specific attention to the objectives of the assignment and how the objectives will be measured
- 3) Clear description of the overall design and methodology of the evaluation

- 4) It should also include a brief description of the overall design and methodology of the evaluation and a work plan/adaptation to the workplan at hand (maximum of four pages).
- 5) 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 the level of effort for each member, and any other costs.
- 6) Proof of professional registration and taxation is also required (e.g., by providing the evaluator(s) tax number).
- 7) CV with references
- 8) A sample evaluation report for assessing the quality of work of the Consultant. *(Please anonymize the sample report by deleting (if any) personal and confidential data due to confidentiality issues before submitting it.)*

13. SELECTION CRITERIA

The following ranking criteria will be considered for the contract granting:

Evaluation Criteria	Expectations of the technical and financial proposals	Max scores
General understanding of the Terms of Reference (ToR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the purpose and objectives of the assignment • Clear interpretation of the objectives i.e. understanding of the objectives and how they will be measured • General strategy and approach indicate knowledge of the subject matter under consideration. 	15%
Technical feasibility of the proposed methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed methodology appropriate to achieve survey objectives: Scientific sampling approach • Study methodology is presented in a logical way (clear statistical theory) • A clear data management approach that addresses both quantitative and qualitative data needs • A clear and credible quality assurance plan proposed for the assignment • Clear detailed implementation plan or timeline. Organization of work indicates the ability to comply with the required timeframe for the assignment and there is a clear indication of the level of effort of each team member • Ability to propose technological advancements in conducting the assignment. 	40%
Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience in conducting and managing assignments of a similar nature • Demonstrates great knowledge of the field to be evaluated • The Lead Consultant should have participated as the lead Consultant in at least three assignments of this nature • Evidence of at least 2 sample reports of a similar evaluation conducted in the last 2 years. 	20%
Consultant's competence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience, qualifications and proven track record of proposed team leader and team 	15%

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversity of team, complementary skills, relevant expertise, and experience of members of the consultancy team in relation to the specific topics of this evaluation. • Valid references with their contacts and evidence of previous similar work done 	
Financial proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and realistic budget • Budget clearly aligned with the detailed implementation plan for the assignment 	10%
<p>Additional information</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The total minimum score to be considered technically competent is 70%. If a bid does not meet this minimum, it will be deemed technically non-compliant and will not proceed to the next level. 2. After the initial technical review of the proposals, the best 3 Consultants shall be invited to make a presentation of their technical and financial proposals as part of the selection process. 		