

Terms of Reference

Evaluation of the Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe (DKH) Humanitarian Response Programme in the context of the Syria Crisis (Syria, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey)

1. Introduction

In 2012, the Diakonisches Werk der EKD merged with the Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst to form the Evangelisches Werk für Diakonie und Entwicklung e.V. (in the following called EWDE). The new agency was founded in order to meet the demands of a globalised world. Internationally, EWDE works through its aid programmes, Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe (in the following called DKH) and Brot für die Welt.

DKH renders humanitarian aid worldwide. In its activities, DKH is committed to the Humanitarian Principles of the Code of Conduct of the Red Cross and Red Crescent movement and of non-governmental aid organizations. In all its actions, DKH is guided by the four humanitarian principles: humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence. These principles provide the foundations for DKH's humanitarian action, and are regarded as essential in order to establish and maintain access to affected people, whether in a natural disaster or a complex emergency, such as armed conflict. DKH is also committed to the Core Humanitarian Standards (CHS) in order to adhere to enhanced accountability protocols.

DKH supports people who are affected by natural disasters, war and displacement and who are not able to cope on their own in the emergency situation they find themselves in. It is an effort to help people in great need – worldwide, regardless of their colour, religion and nationality.

DKH's assistance is designed to suit the local conditions and is integrated in the economic, social and political context of a specific country or region. It is adjusted to respond to the needs and the situation of the affected population, respect the dignity of the people, and protect valid laws and traditions. Assistance is provided according to needs, corresponds to local standards and is based on a thorough response analysis. It is DKH's approach to work through a global network of partner organizations. Wherever possible and required, DKH is accompanying the partners from project design through implementation until final project documentation.

DKH is an active member of the ACT Alliance - a coalition of more than 140 churches and church-related organisations working together in over 100 countries to create positive and sustainable change in the lives of poor and marginalised people regardless of their religion, politics, gender, colour or nationality in keeping with the highest international codes and standards. ACT Alliance endeavours to respond to emergencies around the world – local or global, large or small – with an ecumenical commitment to meet the needs of communities when they are at their most vulnerable.

Scope of the evaluation

During the period from 2012 until 2017, DKH has supported relief, early recovery and rehabilitation projects with a funding volume of about € 54 Mio. in Syria and its neighboring countries (Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey). More than 950,000 people have been assisted within over 50 projects. While to some extent DKH was able to operate with private donations, until today over € 40 Mio. were raised from backdonors such as the German Federal Foreign Office (AA), the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and the European Commission's Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Department (ECHO). Partner organizations have been supported by DKH through the headquarter in Berlin and were accompanied to a very large extent through the DKH Regional Office which was located until end of 2017 in Istanbul/Turkey (today the Regional Office is based in Amman/Jordan). Since November 2017, DKH has started to establish a Project Office Syria which still remains under the umbrella of the Regional Office in Amman until moving it to Syria will become feasible. The Regional Office is also directly responsible for the "Capacity Building Initiative Asia", a

project for tailor-made capacity building for the partner organizations in the region. While DKH could count on a strong network of partner organizations in Syria's neighboring countries, for Syria itself a partner structure needed to be developed – a process which is still ongoing.

2. Purpose and objective of the evaluation

DKH's response to the Syria-crisis since 2012 in the region initially focussed on emergency relief. Over the years, it started to include more and more projects in early recovery and rehabilitation. The initial geographical focus on Syria's neighbouring countries was actively shifted to programs in Syria since 2016. For the response in Syria itself, DKH is following the "Whole Of Syria Approach". This is also ensured through cross-border activities. The Terms of Reference were developed against this background. The purpose of the evaluation is to provide an independent review and assessment of the program and projects within the regional response from 2012 until 2018 and to contribute to the overall learning of DKH, especially regarding future similar large-scale programs in armed conflicts and crises. If the timing of the evaluation allows, the findings and recommendations shall be utilized in order to shape the DKH Syria Program Strategy 2018-2023.

This is the first regional program evaluation of a DKH response in **the context of armed conflict and crises**, as previous regional program evaluations have focused on DKH responses in the context of natural disasters. Thus, the evaluation is primarily intended for the use of DKH (headquarter and regional office) as well as partner organizations. Results of this evaluation will also be presented to DKH's backdonors which include the German Federal Foreign Office (AA), the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) as well as the European Commission's Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Department (ECHO). While this is not a project evaluation, it needs to take both perspectives into consideration: The DKH's response to the Syria-crisis in general as well as the individual projects. The specific objectives of the evaluation are:

- To evaluate the adequacy of the response, taking into account the specific (changing) needs and social and political context in the region, as well as to evaluate the effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and coordination of the program;
- To identify lessons learned for DKH and its partner organisations for the future conceptualisation and implementation of projects with focus on Syria and Iraq as well as in the context of armed conflicts in general;
- To identify lessons learned from the transition from acute emergency relief to early recovery (linking relief to recovery) as well as on DKH's reaction to funding constraints leading to phasing out country programs;
- To analyse the systematic use of a response analysis and consequently the appropriateness of the used modalities (cash, vouchers or in kind) and identify gaps within this.

3. Key questions

It is expected that the evaluation report offers a complete and detailed description of the DKH response to the Syria-crisis since 2012, the different stakeholders involved and the relations between them. Cross-cutting issues such as **Do No Harm, Protection and Gender** shall be considered in all of the questions where possible and reasonable.

Relevance

1. To what extent were the projects suited to the particular needs and priorities of the target groups in a given context?
2. Did the projects address and reach the most vulnerable and severely affected people?
3. Was DKH's response timely? Was the targeting (of project countries and regions) appropriate for the context and (changing) needs (e.g. sudden influx of refugees or transition from acute emergency relief to early recovery)?

4. Were the SPHERE standards (especially in regards of the humanitarian principles and quality aspects), and the Core Humanitarian Standards (CHS) taken into account throughout the entire program and individual projects? Did DKH and its partner organizations adapt to the technical recommendations of the relevant clusters and working groups?
5. To what extent did DKH support the partner organizations and was the support suited to the particular needs and priorities of partner organizations? In which ways was DKH's capacity building program relevant for the partner organizations?

Coverage

6. Was the targeting appropriate for the context and needs? Which groups of people were supported and which not, and why (inclusion/exclusion bias)?
7. How were ethnic and religious minorities included in DKH's assistance?
8. Have those in need of protection received protection in the DKH-supported projects? Was protection sufficiently mainstreamed in the planning, implementation and monitoring of the projects?
9. What do the beneficiaries think of the response - its relevance, appropriateness and outcomes (including conditions and restrictions applied and cash versus voucher options)? Do they find the vulnerability criteria fair and transparent (do they know why they were selected)?
10. Were the framework and principles of DKH to find new partners who are working in Syria appropriate? Did the selection of new partners in Syria meet the needs on the ground, and supported DKH's objective of a "Whole Of Syria Approach"?

Effectiveness

11. To what extent did the projects achieve their objectives?
12. What were the major factors that influenced the (non-) achievement of objectives?
13. Did the partner organizations carry out a response analysis to enable them to identify the most suitable delivery modality (cash, vouchers or in-kind) for each context? Which gaps exist here in this regard?
14. Were applied conditions or restrictions (in cash and voucher programmes) appropriate?
15. How robust was the monitoring of projects by DKH taking into account methods, frequency and analysis of the monitoring? Special consideration should be given to remote monitoring to identify any gaps that may exist.
16. Were risks analysis carried out before and during projects to identify (internal and external) risks (e.g. fraud) and possible mitigation/ control measures, particularly for cash and voucher projects?
17. Were lessons learned from previous projects adequately incorporated into follow-up projects?

Efficiency

18. Did DKH's capacity building program have any immediate effect on the work of partner organizations?
19. Which added value did DKH (headquarter, regional office) provide to the partner organizations and projects?
20. Did the partner organizations carry out a response analysis, and to which extent the most cost-efficient delivery mechanisms have been selected? Were there examples during project implementation where the selected delivery mechanism proved not to be the most cost-efficient?
21. Were there appropriate systems of beneficiary accountability (participation, information sharing and complaint/feedback) that beneficiaries were aware of and used? Were complaints welcomed and addressed?

Impact

22. What difference did the projects bring about for the beneficiaries and communities? Have local capacities been strengthened? Are there any wider (positive or negative) unintended impacts?
23. For cash transfer programs specifically, what psychological effects has the response had (e.g. do beneficiaries feel dignified, empowered, trusted and respected due to cash)? Does the review

team observe any unintended changes, positive or negative, that have stemmed from the response (e.g. explore household or community tensions due to receiving/not receiving cash as well as decision making authority in the household), please also explore whether there were unintended results around security to do with cash for beneficiaries)?

24. How did the projects contribute to or hinder the adoption of coping strategies of the targeted beneficiaries and communities?

Sustainability

25. To what extent did the results of projects with a focus on early recovery and rehabilitation continue or are likely to continue after the projects ceased?

26. What do the partner organizations consider to be the critical issues for future support and moving from emergency response to recovery and rehabilitation?

27. How did DKH's capacity building programme contribute to sustainable project results as well as to increased capacities of partner organizations?

Complementarity, Coordination and Coherence

28. How did DKH and its partner organizations coordinate with other (inter-) national organizations, the ACT Alliance and within relevant working groups (UN clusters, etc.)?

29. How was DKH's and its partner organizations involvement in the ACT Forums?

30. Which was the added value of DKH's response through ACT-partners and ACT Appeals?

31. Were official national regulations in the different countries respected?

32. How did the different projects fit into the DKH response strategy (or, vice versa, affect the strategy)? Did DKH provide sufficient strategic and programmatic guidance to the partner organizations?

4. Evaluation design/methods

The evaluation is to be conducted in line with the **OECD/DAC standards**. DKH is not committed to any specific evaluation design. It should be carefully discussed how to achieve the objectives of the evaluation, when it is not possible, due to security reasons and time/ resource constraints, to visit all partners and countries. The evaluators are expected to use a diverse set of methodologies, including, but not limited to: analysis of documents, online-survey, interviews and observation.

The evaluation is divided into **four parts**:

- **Inception phase:** The inception phase will include a kick-off meeting in Berlin, a desk review of key program documents and explorative interviews (personal or telephone).
- **Desk study:** This includes an analysis of key project documents (proposals and logframes, final reports etc.) of all projects. Due to the fact, that not all projects and partners can be visited during the evaluation, a **survey** should ensure that all partner organizations can participate and contribute with their experiences and opinions. Documents and contact details will be made available by DKH.
- **Field visits:** The field phase includes visits to project sites in Turkey, Iraq and Syria, consisting of interviews with project staff, partner organisations, beneficiaries and external actors. Participatory approaches in data collection and analysis should be employed throughout the evaluation. It is expected that project visits are always concluded with a short debriefing with representatives of the partner organization and, if possible, with representatives of the target group.
- **Synthesis:** It is critical that information is triangulated in order to increase the validity of findings. The evaluation concludes with writing the evaluation report. Some questions should be answered by a profound evaluation of selected projects; it is expected that best practice found are documented and used to illustrate certain findings.

It should be evident that the evaluation, which takes place in conflict affected countries, should be **conflict-sensitive**. As conducting an evaluation in a conflict setting may put evaluators, partners and beneficiaries at risk, safety concerns need to be included in all stages of the evaluation.

5. Process of the evaluation/ time frame

No.	Deadline	Issue
1	6 th of Mai 2018	Deadline for submitting proposals
2	18 th of May 2018	Selection of evaluation team and signing of contract
3	May/ June 2018	Kick-off meeting
4	June 2018	Inception report
5	June/July/August 2018	Desk study and online survey
6	August 2018	Presentation and discussion of the report of the desk study as well as the amended inception report
7	September/October 2018	Field trips to Turkey, Syria and Iraq + telephone interviews with Jordan and Lebanon
8	November 2018	Draft evaluation report
9	November/December 2018	Presentation in Berlin
10	December 2018	Final version of the report

The schedule is roughly fixed as stated above due to external conditions and other commitments; however, small deviations are possible.

6. Deliverables

Inception Report

The inception report should be prepared after the kick-off meeting, initial interviews and a study of key documents. The inception report shall include at least:

- if the objectives of the evaluation can be reached, possible restrictions and additional issues and questions;
- which evaluation design will be used;
- which methods and instruments will be used;
- which stakeholders and how many representatives of them will be included;
- which kind of support will be needed;
- a detailed schedule.

The inception report shall be written in English, should not exceed 10 pages and must be accepted by DKH. Suggestions can be made to supplement or restrict the ToR.

After the desk study and online survey, the inception report **should be adapted accordingly** to specify selection criteria, all methods and approaches to be used for the field phase, including a detailed field schedule.

Report of the desk study and online survey

The report of the desk study and online survey focuses on the whole program. It shall be written in English and should not exceed 40 pages plus annexes. It is expected that the evaluators present a comprehensible and detailed overview over the projects to be evaluated, the preliminary findings based on the analysis of documents and survey results with partner organizations and interviews with stakeholders, and explain possible implications for the field phase.

Final Report and Presentation

The final report shall be written in English and should not exceed 50 pages plus annexes. After presenting the draft report the evaluation results and recommendations shall be presented and discussed with representatives of DKH in Berlin.

Creating a summary of the evaluation report

The evaluators should also, on an anonymous basis, provide a summary of the evaluation report as an extra Word document in German (or in the language of the report). This summary should be between 7,000 and 10,000 characters (with spaces) in length and include the following: (1) A short description of the organisation carrying out the project and of the evaluated project, (2) the goals of the evaluation and methodological approach, (3) key findings according to the OECD/DAC criteria and (4) recommendations. Ten photos related to the evaluation process should also be submitted.

7. Key qualifications of the evaluators

The team of evaluators should consist of at least **three evaluators**. At least one evaluator should be a local evaluator and at least one evaluator should be female.

The evaluation team must demonstrate:

- extensive knowledge of and working experience with emergency and rehabilitation projects, especially in the context of armed conflicts;
- experience with conducting similar kind of evaluations;
- experience with participatory evaluation and qualitative and quantitative methods;
- excellent English and Arabic skills; – speaking and writing; Turkish and/or Kurdish skills would be an asset, if not, interviews must be conducted with the support of an interpreter;
- Knowledge and professional experience of the region
- Familiarity with and clear comprehension of SPHERE standards, humanitarian principles, Core Humanitarian Standards (CHS) and a conflict-sensitive approach to evaluations
- Previous experience with cash and voucher programming (including conditionality and restrictions), ideally in the region, and thus best practice globally and regionally of designing and implementing Cash Transfer Programs

8. Content of the evaluator's offer

Interested consultants, who intend to hand in a proposal, can manifest their intention and ask questions until the 11th of April 2018 using the e-mail-addresses below. The answers to all of the questions communicated until the 13th of April 2018 will be sent to all of the consultants having announced their interest. After the 11th of April 2018 consultants can still participate and hand in an offer and ask for the answers given, but no further questions will be admitted.

To participate in the tender process, offers must be submitted to the e-mail-addresses below by the **6th of Mai 2018** and consist of the following documents:

- a sound CV of all of the participating evaluators;
- an offer detailing the evaluation design, methods and instruments to be used to answer the evaluation questions (max. 8 pages);
- a timetable;
- a budget stating precisely the daily fees for the evaluators (disclosing taxes), costs for transport and all additional costs;
- firm profile, if applicable

Please hand the offer via e-mail in to:

Evangelisches Werk für Diakonie und
Entwicklung e.V.
Dietmar Mälzer
Stabsreferat Ergebnismanagement und
Verfahrenssicherung
Caroline-Michaelis-Straße 1
10115 Berlin
dietmar.maelzer@brot-fuer-die-welt.de

Evangelisches Werk für Diakonie und Entwicklung
e.V.
Isabelle Freimann
Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe
Project Officer
Caroline-Michaelis-Straße 1
10115 Berlin
isabelle.freimann@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.de