

Evaluation for project entitled “Responding to the Syrian Crisis: A multisectoral approach to providing essential, life-saving support to communities impacted by the Syrian conflict”**1. Background**

DanChurchAid (DCA) provides support to conflict affected communities to strengthen their rights for a dignified life. DCA has provided life-saving support to conflict affected communities in Northeast Syria (NES) since 2015 through the delivery of Shelter, Food Security, Multipurpose cash, Protection, and Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA). With funding from the Danida Special, DCA provided emergency support, school rehabilitation, explosive ordnance risk education, provision of psychosocial support and case management services to address target communities’ basic needs and improve the well-being of conflict affected individuals and families in NES.

2. Evaluation Objective

The overarching objective of the final evaluation focuses on the assessment of the project’s appropriateness / timeliness / relevance / effectiveness to achieve its overall objective of “Enabling conflict-affected people and communities to meet their basic needs and live in safe and dignified conditions, enabling the building back of personal and local resilience”. Additionally, the evaluation will aim to assess outcomes of the project in line with project indicators (as detailed below).

Specific sub-objectives of the evaluation include:

- Assess achievement of project targets against project indicators (outcome).
- Assess the intervention against PANEL principles (participation, accountability, non-discrimination, empowerment and linking to rights).
- To determine the appropriateness, relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability of project interventions in the context of the target areas.
- To capture intended and unintended changes in behaviours, actions, capacities, and relationships of program stakeholders.
- To assess the implementation of interventions (successes, challenges, constraints) and provide recommendations to improve the program going forward.
- Identify project lessons learned (positive and negative) to facilitate implementation of future projects. Specifically, this will inform the modality of future emergency assistance in the region.

3. Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation will be informed by and structured around the OECD/DCA criteria with questions framed to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of actions and achievements.¹

The main audience of the evaluation and dissemination of report:

- DCA - Syria country office and globally.
- Danida and other potential DCA donors.

¹ <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

DCA will, internally and together with partners, discuss findings and take them into account in the design, planning and implementation of the 2023/2024 program. By the end of the evaluation DCA will discuss the general findings as mentioned above and will take concrete actions on recommendations relevant for their respective activities.

4. Evaluation Type

The evaluation will be a summative evaluation of the project’s processes, relevance and effectiveness with regard to empowering conflict- affected communities in accessing basic goods and services, improving psychosocial wellbeing and resilience of children and adolescents in conflict affected communities, supporting behavioural change and improving safe practices amongst populations affected by explosive ordnance contamination, and reducing use of negative and irreversible coping strategies by the assisted population.

Table 1: Project Outcome Indicators to be measured	
Indicator	Target value
Proportion of population living in households with access to basic services	80%
Reduction in average rCSI* score for the target population	20% reduction in HHs scoring >10 in Coping Strategies Index (rCSI)
% of beneficiaries increase their knowledge about the dangers of EOs and how to practice safe behaviour	80%
% of people reporting cash distributed enabled them to better meet their basic needs	90%
% increase in children, teachers, and other staff who report feeling safe in the rehabilitated school	90%
% of HHs reporting feeling more safe / secure in their homes as a result of adapted shelter support	90%
% of targeted learning spaces with gender- and disability-sensitive WASH facilities	100%
% of affected people indicating that shelter and settlement assistance reflects their needs and priorities and contributes to a more durable solution	80%
% of households that report having received appropriate technical assistance and guidance	80%
% of targeted community members who report that they are better able to withstand future shocks and stresses	80%
% of people who have received PSS support who report improved wellbeing and reduced symptom	80%

Table 2: Evaluation questions (guiding) ²

Criteria	Questions
Relevance	Was the planning and timing of the activities adequate to the local context? How was this perceived by different groups?
Effectiveness	To what extent were the project objectives achieved? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the project objectives? What approaches did the project use to maintain gender, age, disability and what was the impact of the project on the gender equity and related issues? How far the coordination mechanism has been effective to achieve the project’s objectives, what was DCA’s contribution towards coordination mechanism?
Efficiency	How cost- effective was the project? Was the project implemented in the most efficient manner and with the best use of the existing resources? What cost- effective alternatives could have been used taking into consideration the lesson learnt from this project?
Sustainability	Is the project sustainable for the targeted population? How would you improve/ complete the project with other activities, so the intervention is sustainable in the future? What exit strategy options were to put in place to ensure that the end of the project does not negatively affect the welfare of BNFs?
Impact	What were the intended and unintended, positive and negative impacts of the project as perceived by beneficiaries? On the beneficiary’s life? On the community? Are the BNFs (after this intervention) ready to build upon this intervention?

5. Evaluation methods

The evaluation requires collaborative and participatory mixed methods approach that was drawn on both existing and new quantitative and qualitative data to answer the evaluation questions.

5.1 Quantitative

Quantitative aspects aim to measure the project outcomes by using monitoring reports and collecting data from the targeted beneficiaries, ensuring equal gender representation wherever possible.

5.2 Qualitative

This is to acquire in-depth information based on the evaluation areas and around the overall and specific objectives of the program. A suggestion is to use sex and age disaggregated focus

² These are guiding questions for the external evaluation, final survey questions will be defined in collaboration with the external evaluation consultant, once contracted.

group discussions (FGD) and be gender balanced when conducting FGDs and key informant interviews (KIIs).

The consultant should come up with a statistically significant and appropriate sampling method for all different activities which should cover all the districts (Menbij, Kobane and Raqqa) where the project was implemented. The selected sample size should represent all the beneficiaries of both sexes, diverse age group, status and socio- economic backgrounds.

The data within the tools will be collected using local enumerators, who will be trained by the evaluation consultant. Data collection will be done using tablets, compiled onto the KOBO online data platform, cleaned, and analysed by the external consultant.

Beneficiary participation (stakeholders to interview):

The evaluation will include interviews with relevant stakeholders, more specifically key informants for individual interviews and focus groups should include:

- Beneficiaries, IDPs, host community and returnees (HH who received cash, shelter support, PSS assistance or participated in RE activities)
- Local Authorities (Humanitarian Affairs Office - HAO)
- Community Leaders (Kumins) and representatives (women's groups, youth groups, traders)
- Program team members

The methods applied shall include participatory techniques and tools like mapping, surveys, focus group and semi-structural in-depth interviews with key informants and target population.

6. Ethical guidelines

It is expected and required that the evaluation will adhere to ethical guidelines as outlined in the Code of Conduct for contractors (ethical principles and standards and will be shared with the consultancy contract. It will include the following:

- 1. Informed Consent:** All participants are expected to provide informed consent following standard consent protocols.
- 2. Systematic Inquiry:** Evaluators conduct systematic inquiries.
- 3. Competence:** Evaluators provide competent performance to stakeholders.
- 4. Integrity/Honesty:** Evaluators display honesty and integrity in their own behaviour and attempt to ensure the honesty and integrity of the entire evaluation process.
- 5. Respect for People:** Evaluators respect the security, dignity and self-worth of respondents, program participants, clients, and other evaluation stakeholders. It is expected that the evaluator will obtain the informed consent of participants to ensure that they can decide in a conscious, deliberate way whether they want to participate.
- 6. Responsibilities for Information Management:** Evaluators act and take into account the necessity to manage sensitive information on location, scope and connections of operation in line with the local and wider humanitarian community interest to not endanger lifesaving aid.

7. Evaluation Timeline, Facilitation and Deliverables

The evaluation is planned to take place in July/August 2023.

7.1 The key outputs expected from the evaluation:

- Evaluation tools in English and Arabic.
- Enumerator training.
- Findings of programme achievements in improving self-sufficiency
- Recommendations for improving Multipurpose cash assistance, shelter response, PSS and RE programming.
- Final evaluation report (addressing DCA’s comments)

A final report outlining the evaluation, recommendations, and next steps (lesson learnt) will be provided by the evaluator within 3 weeks of the last data collection (sample structure of the report is as below). As well, evaluation design should be shared prior to the task and evaluation data made available to DCA in an easy-to-read format that is organized and fully documented for use by those not familiar with the project or evaluation. DCA has sole ownership of all the final data and any findings shall not be reproduced or shared without the written permission of DCA.

- 1) Executive Summary.
- 2) Introduction.
- 3) Methodology, including sampling frame.
- 4) Limitations of the evaluation.
- 5) Analysis and findings of the study, both quantitative and qualitative. Should specify how the qualitative data was analysed, and how the data compared to desk reviews.
- 6) Evidence of success/failures.
- 7) Conclusions, recommendations, lessons learned and best practices.
- 8) Annexes
 - a) Relevant maps and photographs of the study areas
 - b) Bibliography of consulted secondary sources
 - c) Finalized data collection tools (in English and Arabic)
 - d) A clean dataset including all interview transcripts and recordings (both quantitative and qualitative) in agreed format.

Table 4: Proposed evaluation timeline		
Duration	Activity	Evaluation deliverables
Week 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inception meeting between DCA and Consultant to review ToRs, clarify timeframe and deliverables, expectations and logistics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minutes of meetings
Week 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Undertake desk review of the relevant program documents. 	
Week 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop and finalize data collection tools ▪ Hire Enumerators/Surveyors. ▪ Train Enumerators/Surveyors; Pre-test data collection instruments. ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluation tools in English and Arabic (HH survey, FGDs, KII) designed and tested

Week 2-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conduct data collection ▪ Oversee data collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data collection completed in all targeted locations
Week 3-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Encode and analyse data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Database (raw data)
Week 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prepare draft evaluation report (including a success story and a learning story) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Draft evaluation report for DCA review
Week 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conduct debrief meeting to present draft report, collect initial feedback from DCA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minutes of meeting with DCA to present key findings of the evaluation
Week 7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ DCA to provide detailed feedback to the draft report 	
Week 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Finalize report, produce presentation of findings, and share back with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Final evaluation reports with comments addressed (including executive summary, methodology, results and supporting analysis, lessons learnt and recommendation) including all raw data, original field notes for all in- depth interviews conducted.

The final evaluation report should not exceed 35 pages, and offer a concise, readable, overview of the outcomes of the project. Recommendations will be structured towards different levels of responsibility: donors / DCA/ local partners / authorities.

7.2 Logistics arrangements, and additional support: DCA will provide the following references and resources - those relevant to the project - to the consultant:

- Project proposal
- Monitoring reports
- Data of baseline and Post Distribution Monitoring.
- Situation reports.

7.3 Evaluator profile:

- University level education in research related field
- Background in the Middle East (NES will be preferred)
- Fluency in English is required.
- Experience evaluating programmes focusing on Shelter, Risk Education, and PSS interventions.
- 5 to 8 years of experience working in and knowledge of emergency contexts.
- Proven experience in conducting programs evaluations or research (at least 6 previous projects)

- Demonstrated experience in both quantitative and qualitative data collection and data analysis techniques, especially in emergency operations.
- Strong analytical skills and ability to clearly synthesize and present findings, draw practical conclusions, make recommendations and to prepare well-written reports in a timely manner.
- Experience in undertaking field-based research/evaluations.
- Experience with gender sensitive programming and knowledge of gender-sensitive evaluation methods.
- Willingness to travel to the field (given the specific context).

7.4 Management of the Evaluation

The evaluation will be directly implemented and managed by the selected consultancy firm in collaboration with DCA Syria. The MEAL Coordinator and Head of Programmes will monitor implementation and provide quality assurance throughout the process.

8. Structure of the Proposal and Submission Guidelines

Interested Consultant/s and evaluation teams should submit a proposal using the structure and main sections identified below:

8.1 Rationale

Any comments on the Terms of Reference of importance for the successful execution of activities, its objectives, and expected results, thus demonstrating the degree of understanding of the Contract. Any comments contradicting the Terms of Reference or falling outside their scope will not form part of the final contract. An opinion on the key issues related to the achievement of the Terms of Reference and expected results.

8.2 Strategy

A detailed outline of the approach and methodology proposed for the evaluation. An outline of the proposed activities considered to be necessary to achieve the contract objectives.

8.3 Timetable of activities

The timing, sequence and duration of the proposed activities considering mobilisation time. The identification and timing of major milestones in conducting the evaluation, including an indication of how the achievement of these would be reflected in any reports particularly those stipulated in the Terms of Reference.

8.4 Key Experts

The proposal should include a detailed description of the role and duties of each of the key experts or other non-key experts, who are proposed as members of the evaluation team. The CV of each key expert shall be included highlighting his/her experience in the specific field of the services and his/her specific experience in the domains/country where the services are to be performed.

The proposal should clearly state existing commitments of experts which may affect their availability to participate in the evaluation to the extent possible.

The proposal should include 1 or 2 examples of previous work from previous evaluation assignments or similar, in English.

Table 4: Description of Personnel³

	Role	Years of Experience	Number of Personnel	Names with Submitted Resumes
1	Lead Consultant			
2	Assistant Consultants			
3	Junior Consultants			

8.5 Evaluation Process

Each proposal will be assessed first on its technical merits and subsequently on price. The proposal obtaining the overall highest score - after adding the scores of the technical and financial components – is that which offers best value for money, and thus selected for the contract. **Proposals submitted will be evaluated against the following elements:**

A: Technical Proposal

The total amount of points allocated for the technical component is 100. DCA evaluators will read the submission and give scores according to the table below. Only bidders that obtain 65 points and above from the technical evaluation will be considered for the financial evaluation stage.

Table 5: Grading criteria for evaluation proposals

		Max. Points
Technical Evaluation Criteria (70%)		
1. Overall Response		35
1.1	Completeness of the technical proposal with reference to requirements outlined in the <i>Application Process</i> section above	15
1.2	Quality and completeness of the proposed work plan to achieve the evaluation objectives	20
2. Overall Experience of the Firm and Key Personnel		45
2.1	Relevant experience in leading remote and large-scale evaluations for integrated projects in middle east or other humanitarian contexts	20
2.2	Quality of evaluation reports from previous engagements	10
2.3	Capacity to provide sufficient team members in NES for the scale and scope of work required	15
3. Proposed Methodology and Approach		20
3.1	Detailed methodology that aligns with evaluation objectives and the DAC evaluation criteria	20

B. Financial Proposal

The Candidate shall indicate in his/her proposal his/her proposed global remuneration for the performance of the Services. The proposed global remuneration shall cover all obligations of the successful Candidate under the Contract (without depending on actual time spent on the

³ For ease of reference, DCA has defined the following categories of consultants/personnel. Bidders are free to provide alternative titles/descriptions for each of the designations used above.

assignment) and all matters and things necessary for the proper execution and completion of the Services and the remedying of any deficiencies therein.

The total amount of points allocated for the price component is 20 and will be calculated as a weighted score inversely proportional.

In case of any inquiries, contact DCA MEAL Coordinator at: alza@dca.dk keeping ayle@dca.dk in copy of the emails.