

## Terms of Reference

### Evaluation of the Church of Sweden's Refugee Programme in Eastern Africa

#### Background

The overall objective of the Church of Sweden (CoS) Humanitarian Programme 2014-2016 is to save lives, alleviate suffering and strengthen the dignity, well-being and resilience of emergency-affected communities. CoS works worldwide with some of the most vulnerable communities and individuals through its membership in the ACT Alliance (ACT), which has over 140 member organisations and churches. The humanitarian work of Church of Sweden endeavours to respond to emergencies around the world, local or global, large or small, and it is the lead agency within the ACT network in Community-based Psychosocial Support (CBPS).

In February 2015, CoS went through the HAP mid-term audit and was at the same time, as the first organisation in the world, audited against the new Common Humanitarian Standards (CHS). The Church of Sweden is, as the first organisation in the world, certified against the new CHS by the new certifying body HQAI.

The CoS Refugee Programme in Eastern Africa (hereafter referred to as the *Refugee Programme*) is a pilot supported by Sida's Humanitarian Aid (hereafter referred to as *Sida*) to try out a new methodology of long-term close support to selected partners working in protracted refugee crisis in a specific region.

In 2014 and 2015 the Refugee Programme supported projects in nine refugee settings in five engaged with providing support to displaced people in Eastern Africa. The volatile situation in the region has created insecurity for millions of people and often the instable situation becomes protracted and chronic for the individuals seeking refuge. Besides the continuous flow of refugees and IDPs in the region this can be seen in the many refugee camps that for a long period of time have been present in many of the East African countries. Compared to sudden emergencies these long-lasting crises need not only short term relief, which is still necessary (such as food and shelter) but also a more long-term approach, where methods are developed and implemented that serve not only the immediate needs but also seeks sustainable solutions.

During the current programme period (2014–2016 +2017), CoS is supporting the implementing partners in this work in a coordinated effort. The partner organisations have together with CoS identified areas of sharing and learning from experiences. In regional consultations, as well as in a joint workshop for all Refugee Programme projects that was held in September 2014, the partners identified education, livelihood, mainstreaming gender and mainstreaming CBPS as prioritised areas. Drawing on the joint experiences with implementing partners in the region allows CoS and partner organisations to actively contribute to the sharing of best practices for protracted emergency situations specifically.

In 2014 and 2015 CoS, through the Refugee Programme, supported projects in nine refugee settings in five countries, out of which the following seven have been funded by Sida: LWF South Sudan (Maban and Ajuong Thok), LWF Kenya-Djibouti (Dadaab and Kakuma in Kenya,

Ali Addeh and Holl Holl in Djibouti), and LWF Uganda (Rwamwanja refugee settlement). In 2016 two more projects have been added, LWF Ethiopia (Jewi camp in Gambella) and LWF Uganda (Adjumani refugee settlement), both supporting South Sudanese refugees. Also included in the Refugee Programme is Church of Sweden's support to LWF Ethiopia (Sudanese refugees in Bambasi camp) and EECMY-DASSC (Eritrean refugees in Aysita refugee camp), which are fully funded by the Church of Sweden. This evaluation will focus on the Sida-funded projects and will therefore only look into the CoS-funded projects in general terms when relevant for this evaluation.

As the psychosocial lead agency in ACT, CoS includes the promotion of basic rights and dignity of women, men, girls and boys, without discrimination, to overall wellbeing, avoiding unnecessary distress, fear, and pain. By building on community self-help strategies, community ownership and control over resources using participatory processes of engagement and decision-making, communities beliefs in their own capacities for change and protection of their overall wellbeing by building on own resources can be strengthened, and hope for long term recovery and resilience enhanced.

## 1. Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of the Refugee Programme, in terms of its relevance and replicability and, on that basis, to determine the programme's potential for impact on affected communities. The evaluation will also focus on deriving potential best practices for improvement of future programming both on CoS's and the implementing partners' levels. Further, as the evaluation report will form a part of the assessment basis for Sida's future support to CoS, the added value of CoS (including the role of the Programme Coordinator) to the Refugee Programme is to be examined.

## 2. Interpretation of key concepts

For the purpose of this evaluation key concepts will be interpreted in line with CHS glossary:

**Accountability:** the process of using power responsibly, taking account of, and being held accountable by, different stakeholders, and primarily those who are affected by the exercise of such power.

**Communities and people affected by crisis:** the totality of women, men, girls and boys with different needs, vulnerabilities and capacities who are affected by disasters, conflict, poverty or other crises at a specific location.

**Document:** any form of record of discussions, agreements, decisions and/or actions that is reproducible.

**Effectiveness:** the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.

**Efficiency:** the extent to which the outputs of humanitarian programmes, both qualitative and quantitative, are achieved as a result of inputs.

**Engagement:** the processes by which organisations communicate, consult and/or provide for the participation of interested and/or affected stakeholders, ensuring that their concerns, desires, expectations, needs, rights and opportunities are considered in the establishment, implementation and review of the programmes assisting them.

**Humanitarian action:** action taken with the objective of saving lives, alleviating suffering and maintaining human dignity during and after human-induced crises and natural disasters, as well as action to prevent and prepare for them.

**Organisation:** an entity that has the management structure and power to apply the CHS.

**Partners:** organisations working jointly within a formal arrangement to achieve a specific goal, with clear and agreed roles and responsibilities.

**Policy:** a documented statement of intent and rules for decision-making.

**Protection:** all activities aimed at ensuring the full and equal respect for the rights of all individuals, regardless of age, gender, ethnic, social, religious or other background. It goes beyond the immediate life-saving activities that are often the focus during an emergency.

**Quality:** the totality of features and characteristics of humanitarian assistance that support its ability to, in time, satisfy stated or implied needs and expectations, and respect the dignity of the people it aims to assist.

**Resilience:** the ability of a community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner.

**Staff:** any designated representative of an organisation, including national, international, and permanent or short-term employees, as well as volunteers and consultants.

### 3. Assignment

The consultant will be expected to gather and to analyse information through desk studies, interviews, and field visits in order to produce an evaluation report.

#### 3.1 Assessment areas

As specified in the overall purpose of the assignment, the evaluation shall look at the effectiveness, efficiency and the relevance of the Refugee Programme. The evaluation should use the Core Humanitarian Standards and its nine commitments and quality criteria as a point of departure. The assessment areas are stipulated in more detail through the series of questions below. The inception report will further elaborate on how this methodology is to be used.

##### *Relevance*

- i) To what extent does the programme match the needs and priorities of the targeted communities and the beneficiaries?
- ii) Is the programme well adapted to the humanitarian contexts of the targeted communities and the beneficiaries?
- iii) To what extent are the design and implementation of the Refugee Programme projects based on impartial assessments of needs and risks, and on understanding of the vulnerabilities and capacities of different groups?

##### *Effectiveness*

- iv) Determine the extent to which the Refugee Programme is delivering humanitarian response in an effective and timely manner.
- v) Are the commitments of the Refugee Programme in line with partners' organisational capacities?

- vi) Are the activities of the Refugee Programme monitored in systematic, objective and regular manner? Are findings from monitoring used to adapt and improve the implementation?

*Do no harm*

- vii) Do the projects within the Refugee Programme build on and strengthen local capacities, such as community leadership? Do they work towards improving the resilience of communities and people affected by protracted refugee crises?
- viii) How do CoS and the partners prevent projects from having any negative effects, such as exploitation, abuse or discrimination by staff against communities and people affected by crisis?

*Communication, participation and feedback*

- ix) Identify whether ownership is extended to the targeted communities and the beneficiaries. To what extent does the programme involve them in the design, implementation and evaluation of the support they receive?
- x) In what ways do partners ensure that information to community members is shared in an easily understood, culturally appropriate and respectful way?

*Complaints and response systems*

- xi) To what extent does the Refugee Programme enhance the capacity of the targeted communities and the beneficiaries to demand accountability from CoS and the partner organisations?
- xii) Does the Refugee Programme nurture a culture in which complaints are taken seriously and acted upon according to established policies and processes?

*Coordination*

- xiii) How does the Refugee Programme complement the humanitarian response of other actors?
- xiv) Does CoS and its Refugee Programme partners participate in relevant coordination bodies and collaborate with others in order to maximise the coverage and service provision?
- xv) Is necessary information shared with partners, coordination groups and other relevant actors through appropriate channels?
- xvi) In what ways does CoS, particularly through the Programme Coordinator, contribute to communication and cross-fertilisation between projects of the Refugee Programme?

*Learning and improvement*

- xvii) To what extent is partners' capacity to meet humanitarian needs strengthened? Identify at what level local capacity building occurs and discuss the relevance of this in terms of ensuring that humanitarian efforts have a longer-term impact, and contribute to laying the foundations for longer-term development.

- xviii) To what extent does the Refugee Programme contribute to learning, sharing experiences between implementing partners in the region, lessons harvesting, and exchange of best practices?

*Human resources management*

- xix) In what ways does the Refugee Programme contribute to the security and well-being of staff?

*Resource management*

- xx) Are resources within the Refugee Programme managed and used responsibly for their intended purposes?  
xxi) Is the risk for corruption managed and appropriate actions taken if it is identified?

*Other questions*

- xxii) What is the added value of CoS, considering both support from Uppsala and the role of the Programme Coordinator in Nairobi?  
xxiii) To what extent do partners consider themselves as part of a regional Refugee Programme?  
xxiv) To what extent has the Refugee Programme contributed to increased regional contact and collaboration among Refugee Programme partners?  
xxv) How does the fact that Sida funding is approved on annual basis affect partners' planning and implementation?

## 3.2 Assessment phases

The assessment will consist of these phases:

### Phase 1: Inception report

During Phase 1 the consultant is expected to elaborate and finalise the assessment methodology. The final methodology must be presented in an inception report produced and finalised during this phase. Its possible limitations shall also be discussed therein. The inception report shall also include a detailed implementation plan with clear timeframes. Moreover, a stakeholder analysis shall be made with a plan for stakeholders' involvement (see *Stakeholder involvement* below).

The inception report must be submitted to CoS a maximum of 10 days after the signing of the contract. The inception report must, thereafter, be approved by CoS.

### Phase 2: Collection of data

As a minimum for the empirical foundation of the assessments, the consultant is expected:

- To gather and to analyse documentation concerning the Refugee Programme. The documentation should principally be provided by CoS.
- To conduct interviews with relevant persons at CoS and with staff of implementing partners of the Refugee Programme, both at country office and field level.

- To visit selected implementing partners and project sites in the field where activities are implemented as part of the Refugee Programme.

The plan for field visits shall be determined in consultation with CoS so as to ensure a sufficient empirical foundation while ensuring field visits are conducted in an as cost-efficient manner as possible.

#### Phase 3: Collation, analysis and presentation of data

The consultant is expected to analyse all gathered data using the agreed methodology (see Phase 1). Findings shall, thereafter, be presented in a draft report. The consultant will be expected to share the draft findings with CoS for feed-back on factual errors. The draft report must clearly distinguish and present *findings* vs. *analysis* vs. *conclusions* vs. *recommendations*.

The evaluation shall be carried out in accordance with DAC's Evaluation Quality Standards. Sida's Evaluation Manual and other subject matter specific evaluation guides such as UNICEF's Guide to the Evaluation of Psychosocial Programming in Emergencies may also serve as additional quality tools.

#### Phase 4: Production of final report

The consultant shall produce a final report. The primary users are CoS and Sida. The final report shall not exceed 30 pages (excluding annexes). The final report shall be approved by CoS and Sida.

### 3. Stakeholder involvement

The consultant shall plan and carry out the assignment in close consultation with CoS. The programme officer responsible for the Refugee Programme at CoS Uppsala office will be the focal point for the assignment. The focal point will make herself available to meet the consultant, answer questions and provide direction to the consultant concerning the implementation of the assignment. The focal point may also assist the consultant with identifying relevant documents concerning Sida's cooperation with CoS. CoS will be expected to provide the consultant with necessary documentation concerning its efforts to support and build capacity within the Refugee Programme with Sida funding. The consultant may also find it useful to interview and/or consult with other CoS staff members with previous experience in handling this particular programme or other programmes that may appear as relevant throughout the assignment.

The involvement of CoS during Phase 2 shall be broad and include stakeholders as deemed necessary in order to achieve the evaluation purpose (i.e. headquarter, field offices, implementing partners, targeted communities and beneficiaries). A stakeholder analysis and a plan as to how stakeholders will be involved to ensure adequate data collection shall constitute a part of the assessment methodology and, subsequently, be included in the inception report for CoS' approval.

CoS will be expected to ensure that implementing partners and their subsequent stakeholders make themselves available for interviews and provide required documentation for the consultant's analysis. The following contacts shall, at a minimum, take place with CoS:



- During Phase 1 and as a point of departure for the assignment, CoS shall organise a meeting between the consultant and CoS to discuss the methodology and time-frame for the assignment as presented in the proposal, whereupon the consultant shall present an inception report within 10 days for CoS's approval.
- Early during Phase 2 and once the consultant has come up with a proposal for field visits, the consultant will arrange a meeting with CoS to correlate this plan with CoS's suggestions.
- Moreover, during Phase 2, and as part of the required Data Collection, meetings with relevant CoS staff will take place.
- During Phase 3 and once the draft report is produced, the consultant shall organise a meeting with CoS and relevant Sida staff to present tentative findings and conclusions and also to discuss eventual problems when carrying out the assignment, as well as provide an opportunity to address potential errors of fact.
- During Phase 4 and once the final report has been submitted, the consultant should make himself/herself available to present the final report to CoS and Sida.

#### 4. Assessment questions and recommendations

The assessment shall answer the questions specified within Assignment Areas (see above). The consultant will also be expected to make recommendations stemming from the undertaken analysis and drawn conclusions. Recommendations should include an aspect of potential replicability of the programme methodology in other regional and/or thematic settings. Recommendations that provide Sida with guidance concerning continued funding could also be included as a logical consequence of the undertaken analysis and conclusions. Recommendation on how potential shortcomings identified in the Refugee Programme could be addressed should be included. Consequently, any undertaken analysis and drawn conclusions that can be formulated into clear recommendations that may assist CoS in improving its efforts to support and build capacity of implementing partners should be included.

#### 5. Time schedule and report format

The evaluation assessment shall start no later than **2016-09-01**. The final report should be submitted to CoS no later than **2016-11-15**. The proposed timeframes shall be included in the inception report (see Phase 1).

The final report shall not exceed 30 pages excluding Annexes and be submitted electronically. Approval of the Final Report will be based on its adherence to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

The reports shall be written in English with an executive summary in Swedish. The final report must be presented in a way that enables publication without further editing, which includes having been professionally proof read. The format and outline of the report shall therefore follow, to the greatest extent possible, the guidelines in Sida Evaluation Manual – a Standardised Format.

## 6. Required qualifications and selection criteria

The assignment shall be carried out by a team of maximum two persons. One person should be responsible for initiating and supervising the process (Category I). The members are expected to take shared responsibility for data collection and analysis. The consultant(s) shall submit CVs that include the information below.

### 6.1 Specific for Category I consultant

#### *General experience:*

- Advanced academic degree in a relevant field of social science e.g. development studies, political science, sociology.
- A minimum of 7 years of relevant professional working experience from development cooperation and humanitarian assistance. Fluency in written and spoken English (at least equivalent to Level 2 of Sida's Language Level Definition).
- Working experience from geographically different regions.
- Work experience within humanitarian assistance shall include experience from both sudden onset crises and from protracted crises (this might include evaluation work, providing technical support, or working with implementation).

#### *Specific experience and qualifications:*

- A minimum of 3 years work experience in evaluating projects/programmes within international development and/or humanitarian assistance.
- Preferably previous experience in evaluating support in refugee settings

### 6.2 Specific for Category II consultant

#### *General experience:*

- Advanced academic degree in a relevant field of social science e.g. development studies, political science, sociology.
- A minimum of 3 years of relevant professional working experience from development cooperation and humanitarian assistance.
- Fluency in written and spoken English (at least equivalent to Level 2 of Sida's Language Level Definition).
- Working experience from geographically different regions.
- Work experience within humanitarian assistance can include experience from sudden onset crises or from protracted crises (this might include evaluation work, providing technical support, or working with implementation).

#### *Specific experience and qualifications:*

- A minimum of 2 years of work experience in evaluating projects/programmes within international development and/or humanitarian assistance.

### 6.3 Required qualifications for the evaluation team as a whole

- A minimum of 2 years of work experience in project/programme management



- A minimum of 2 years of work experience in providing humanitarian support in the global South.
- Work experience in the areas of local capacity building (in particular community/ institutional/ organisational), results based management, gender equality, social welfare, psychosocial issues, and beneficiary involvement (this might include evaluation work, providing technical support, or working with implementation).
- Familiarity with the IASC Guidelines on Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Emergency Settings and the IASC Psychosocial Intervention Pyramid.

## 6.4 Selection criteria

The selection criteria shall include:

- a) the consultants' relevant experience for the assignment, particularly considering the Eastern African and/or refugee contexts
- b) the quality of the methodology proposed
- c) the quality of the proposal's language in terms of clarity and conciseness

Each criterion will be graded on a scale of 1–3, 1 being not adequate and 3 being fully meets requirements.

## 7. Days and costs for assignment

Each consultant is expected to spend a maximum of 32 days on the assignment. The total maximum cost for the consultants' fee is 460,000 SEK, including all costs for carrying out the assignment (e.g. travel) as well as taxes, social security costs, pension costs and vacation and any other benefits.

## 8. Administrative / financial information required

The tender should include the following information:

- Budget
- If Swedish consultancy firm: F-tax registration
- If international firm: VAT No.
- Does the company have a comprehensive insurance?
- If Swedish consultancy firm: do you have a collective agreement, or if not, do you have other kinds of employment security in the company?
- International firm: what form of employment security do you have in your company?

Please note that additional administrative information might be required upon signing an agreement.