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**Annex A: Terms of Reference of 3rd Party Monitoring Report**

**REF241025MPCATPM**

**HAYATA DESTEK** is a humanitarian aid organization founded with the principle objective of helping communities affected by natural or manmade disasters meet their basic needs and rights. Having its foundations established in 2005, HAYATA DESTEK conducts its work in areas of Emergency Response, Refugee Support, Child Protection in Seasonal Agriculture and Capacity Building in Civil Society. While supporting life under this framework, Hayata Destek upholds principles of impartiality, neutrality, independence and accountability.

Emergency Response: In the aftermath of humanitarian crises, Hayata Destek conducts emergency response operations by means of providing in-kind and cash assistance to disaster-affected communities. In this regard, Hayata Destek aims to address basic food and non-food needs, provide cash assistance, improve shelter conditions as well as respond to water, sanitation and hygiene needs.

Refugee Support: Hayata Destek aims to help Syrian refugees in Turkey access their basic needs and rights. In its community centers, Hayata Destek focuses on contributing to social cohesion through empowerment of individuals. Under the framework of its individual protection activities, Hayata Destek provides refugees personal support when accessing basic rights and services, providing guidance and information services. Hayata Destek’s community-based protection activities are conducted in community centers called Hayata Destek Houses, while individual protection services are provided in 8 provinces (Istanbul, Hatay, Mersin, Adana, Diyarbakır, Batman, Mardin, Şanlıurfa), in offices called Hayata Destek Hubs.

Child Protection in Seasonal Agriculture: Under the framework of activities focusing on combatting the issue of child labor in Turkey, Hayata Destek implements activities targeting children who work, or are at risk of working. Specific focus is given to the children of families working in seasonal agriculture, with primary targets of raising awareness among families and employers regarding hazards of child labor and improving children’s living conditions. Additional priorities in this domain constitute advocating children’s right to live their childhood, contributing to children’s empowerment through access to formal education.

Capacity Building in Civil Society: Hayata Destek’s perspective is that a participatory, inclusive and well-coordinated local civil society landscape is paramount for sustainable humanitarian aid. In this vein, Hayata Destek conducts capacity building activities in order to facilitate effective humanitarian aid delivery and disaster response strategies. These activities are focused primarily on building effective coordination networks that facilitating collective exchange of information, expertise and resources, as well as improving coordination and communication capacities.

**Third Party Monitoring of Support to Life’s (STL) One-off Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance(MPCA) with Winterization Top-up**

**REF241025MPCATPM**

1. **Background**

Türkiye, a key host and transit country on the Eastern Mediterranean route to Europe, currently shelters 3.1 million Syrians under Temporary Protection and approximately 215,000 international protection status holders from other nations, including Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq. The year 2023, marked by significant earthquakes and rising anti-refugee sentiment, has highlighted the heightened vulnerability of refugees.

On February 6, 2023, Türkiye experienced a catastrophic seismic event with two major earthquakes (7.7 and 7.6 magnitude) in Pazarcık and Elbistan, Kahramanmaraş. Over 3,100 aftershocks followed, significantly impacting Hatay, Kahramanmaraş, Malatya and Adıyaman. The situation remains fluid with ongoing needs in housing, education, economy, and basic services.

More than 10,600 buildings have been destroyed by the earthquakes at varying degrees including at least 1,000 primary and secondary schools. Nearly a third of the 601 health facilities are non-functional, 70 of which were damaged by the disaster.

The need for dignified shelters: Shelter/NFI Cluster reported that the homes of at least 855,000 people were damaged to varying degrees by the earthquakes. Out of this figure, 265,000 people who lost their homes are in need of dignified shelters. The Camp Coordination and Camp Management Cluster reported that over 66,000 individuals are living in newly established reception centers. ([OCHA, 21 Jul 2023](https://reliefweb.int/node/3982307/))

Displacement Tracking Matrix’s fourth round of post-earthquake neighborhood and site mapping between 11 March and 5 April 2024 reports on formal and informal sites in six most affected provinces;
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The last ESMAT (August, 2024) factsheet presents the findings of the index updated with the second round of the formal sites assessment that took place from 23 to 31 May 2024 across the four main affected provinces of Adıyaman, Hatay, Kahramanmaraş and Malatya, as well as two other provinces, Gaziantep and Osmaniye.

Since the disaster, DKH and STL partnership has been implementing several cash assistance programmes for earthquake-affected host communities and refugees in the affected region, especially in Adıyaman, Hatay, and Kahramanmaraş. In terms of targeting and beneficiary selection, STL has adopted a vulnerability scoring system to determine the most vulnerable population While winterization-focused programmes provided one-off assistance, STL also provided a 3-month MPCA programme in Hatay and Kahramanmaraş. Cash assistance for all programmes was unconditional and unrestricted, allowing beneficiaries to decide how to use the assistance based on their pressing needs. The winterization-focused MPCA programme in Adıyaman provided TRY 21,040 for a family of five through the financial service provider, with the assistance amount varying based on the size of the family. The program was implemented in partnership with DKH and funded by DG ECHO.

**Objectives of the Third-Party Monitoring**

A winterization-focused MPCA programme has been completed in Adıyaman. Approximately 800,000 EUR in funds were made available for distribution, with a plan to reach approximately 1,407 households. This third-party monitoring aims to assess the achievements, quality, and overall impact of STL's winterization-focused MPCA response on the affected population in Adıyaman. This study and its recommendations will contribute to identifying lessons learned to assist STL in building capacities for future Cash and Voucher Assistance (CVA) programming. The study has five sub-objectives;

1. Assess the experience and satisfaction of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries regarding defining targeting criteria and transfer values, registration, identification of target population and verification of beneficiaries, information provision during registration and during cash distribution, cash assistance distribution, and assistance amount.
2. Measure the extent to which minimum expenses such as food, rent, utilities, non-food items (NFI), health, education, etc., are met vis-à-vis the impact of STL's cash assistance on meeting beneficiaries' needs.
3. Target population’s satisfaction vis-à-vis the form of assistance provided, and their feedback regarding applied and other possible forms of assistance provision.
4. Lay out how income, debt, and expenditure values are critical in understanding households' economic resilience with regard to the socio-economic conditions of beneficiaries.
5. Point out the level of coping strategies applied in case of economic/financial difficulties, with particular focus on their level of expenditure, debt, coping strategies, and food consumption.
6. Compare the above-mentioned outcomes to those experienced by non-beneficiary households.
7. Collect feedback on the assistance and process followed for its provision from partners and service providers involved in the program.

The findings of the TPM will also aim to report against the following outcome and output level indicators of the project, which was set at the proposal stage:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator Level | Indicator | Target Value |
| Outcome | % of beneficiaries reporting that humanitarian assistance is delivered in a safe, accessible, accountable and participatory manner | 80% |
| Outcome | % of households without crisis and emergency Livelihoods Coping Strategies (LCS) | 80% |
| *Outcome* | *% of households who report being able to meet their basic needs as they define and prioritize them* | 80% |
| *Output* | *% of households with total monthly expenditure which exceeds the Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB)* | 80% |

1. **Third Party Monitoring Criteria**

The third party monitoring will use Inter-Agency Summary Guidance Note on PDM in CBIs and adapt five areas of focus, namely programmatic aspects, experience of beneficiaries, intra-household dynamic and household consumption patterns, effectiveness and accountability. Specific questions in relation with the set area of focus include:

**Programmatic Aspects:**

* Did the cash assistance help beneficiaries to address their basic and winter needs with their household and personal priorities?
* How effectively does the current methodology monitor the price and accessibility of markets and basic need items in targeted location?
* How was the selection of location assessed and prioritized?
* What are the existing needs and concerns of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries in accessing their basic needs in the winter season.
* Did the cash ensure access to pressing basic needs of beneficiary households?

**Experience of Beneficiaries:**

* Did assessed households receive good information provision and in a secure manner by STL staff?
* Did beneficiaries experience any challenges (protection risks, security risks, etc.) while collecting and spending the cash assistance?
* Did beneficiaries receive the assistance in a timely manner?
* Was the transfer amount received by beneficiaries the same as the pre-determined amount?
* Were they able to find basic needs items they need in the local market, both in terms of quantity and quality?
* Did the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households need to resort to any negative coping strategy in the period between cash distribution and PDM?
* Do beneficiaries think that there are still vulnerable people they know who were not assisted by this particular action?

**Intra-household dynamic and household consumption patterns:**

* Who received the cash assistance?
* How did the beneficiary households utilize the assistance?
* Who made the decisions on the spending ensuing from the cash assistance?
* Has receiving cash assistance caused conflict or improved relationships within beneficiary households?

**Effectiveness**

* How did the cash assistance contribute to individual households in fulfilling their pressing basic needs considering timeliness, quality and quantity of the support as relevant?
* How much of the basic and winter needs could be covered with the cash assistance?
* How did the market respond, and are there evidences on multiplier effects in targeted markets?
* To what extent has the cash assistance contributed to the socio-economic conditions of beneficiary households?

**Accountability**

* What is the level of knowledge of assessed households regarding Complaint and Feedback Mechanism of STL?
* Did assessed households receive sufficient information on the relevant CFCMs?
* What preferences do people have over the modality of the assistance?
* Did beneficiaries feel need to share any positive or negative feedback and, if so, have they been able to do so?

**4. Third Party Monitoring Methodology**

The proposed TPM will use a learning-oriented approach to establish a more coherent framework to guide STL’s response. The methodology of the TPM will include the following:

* Desk Review of all Relevant documentation of STL’s 2023-2024 Emergency Response Program
* Semi-structured surveys with 20% of cash beneficiaries (approximately 300 households) and non-beneficiaries who applied for support however they were deemed ineligible (approximately 50 households)
* Minimum six focus group discussions with diverse vulnerable groups
* At least ten key informant interviews with volunteers, DKH and STL staff and external key stakeholders (e.g. Cash Based Intervention Technical Working Group, local authorities, DG ECHO).

A kickoff meeting will be held at the inception phase of the third party monitoring. The TPM team will use appreciative inquiry, gender-sensitive and participatory approaches to seek the views of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. Inclusive techniques will be another important approach to the TPM to ensure active participation by STL staff and volunteers and other external stakeholders.

The TPM team will ensure confidentiality of information, in that all documents and data collected from interviews and focus group meetings will be treated as confidential and used solely to facilitate analysis. Interviewees will not be quoted in the reports without their permission. The third part service providers’ responsible staff who will take an access opportunity to STL’s beneficiary data will sign a Confidentiality and Data Protection Agreement with STL.

For the communication of results, an official report of the TPM will be prepared and presented by the service provider. This report, focusing on findings and practical recommendations, will provide lessons to STL and DKH project staff and senior management for improvements in the continuation of STL’s response to disasters.

This report will also be supplemented by a presentation of preliminary findings to key stakeholders including DG ECHO, as the funding agency of the implemented project. Providing immediate feedback to STL’s management and DKH Country Program Team may enhance the opportunity of moving the findings to action.

1. **Components of the TPM report**

The proposed TPM report will include the following headings:

* Overview of the context and Basic & Winterization needs of the Affected Communities
* Post-earthquake Local Economy Analysis of Adıyaman
* Assessment of issues identified in Key Area of Focus Questions
* Achievements against the Logframe indicators
* Lessons Learned & Best Practices
* Key Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

1. **TPM Team Composition**

The proposed TPM might be carried out by a single expert or made up of 2-3 external experts. STL MEAL staff may accompany the TPM expert/team.

**Key qualifications of the expert(s)**

* Extensive knowledge of and working experience with humanitarian actions.
* Solid experience of Cash and Voucher Assistance operations as an expert, designer, consultant, project/program manager.
* Experience with conducting post distribution monitoring and evaluation of CVA programs.
* Experience with participatory monitoring and evaluation and qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis methods.
* Registration or permit to work on the field to conduct the surveys, KIIs, etc.
* Excellent Turkish and Arabic skills – speaking and writing; English and Kurdish language skills would be an asset.
* Knowledge and professional experience of the region.
* Desired level of Familiarity of SPHERE standards, protection mainstreaming, humanitarian principles, Core Humanitarian Standards (CHS) and a conflict-sensitive approach to monitoring.

**Proposed Schedule**

30 days is envisaged for the entire TPM, preparation and report writing included.

The TPM schedule looks as follows: Third Party Monitoring of - Support to Life’s MPCA Response to February 6th earthquakes

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Planned Days** | **Person(s) responsible** | **Total days** | **Proposed dates** |
| **Preparation Phase** | | | | | |
| Finalizing of the TPM ToR | | STL |  | |
| Desk review of key documents and development of data collection tools (Survey, KII, FGD questionnaires) | 1 day | Expert(s) | 1 |  |
| Kick off meeting | 1 day | All | 2 |  |
| **Field Phase** | | | | | |
| Travel - arrival in | ½ day | Expert(s) | 2,5 |  |
| PDM survey and FGDs - Field visit to project sites | 7 days | Full team | 9,5 |  |
| KIIs with volunteers, STL and DKH staff and external key stakeholders | 2 days | Full team | 11,5 |  |
| Preparing for the debrief (presentation of main findings) | 2 days | Full team | 13,5 |  |
| Debrief session at STL and feedback from team | ½ day | Full team | 14 |  |
| **Reporting Phase** | | | | | |
| Drafting the report | 4 days | Expert(s) | 18 |  |
| Final Report (after incorporating feedback on draft) and Presentation | 1 day | Expert(s) | 19 |  |

To participate in the tender process, offers must be submitted to the e-mail-addresses below by **November 17th, 2024** and consist of the following documents:

* A sound CV of the participating experts, as well as company profile;
* A technical proposal detailing the TPM design, methods, data management strategies and instruments/tools to be used to answer the TPM questions (max. 5 pages);
* Example of previous relevant reports/studies;
* A timetable;
* A budget stating precisely the daily fees for the monitoring team and all additional costs;(including with tax)

**e-mail:** [**danisman@hayatadestek.org**](mailto:danisman@hayatadestek.org)

**e-mail subject: REF241025MPCATPM**