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**- Terms of Reference -**

**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.[[1]](#footnote-1)

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.

Inside Turkey, DKH has supported cash/voucher assistance and protection projects with a funding volume of about € 25,8 Mio. during the period from 2015 until mid of 2020, exclusively in cooperation with its longstanding partner organisation *Support to Life (STL)*. While to some extent DKH was able to operate with private donations, until today over € 29 Mio. were raised from back donors such as the *Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (DG ECHO)* and the *German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO* or *AA)*. Nearly 150,000 people have been assisted within 8 projects, including three ECHO-funded actions with a total funding volume of about € 20,9 Mio. having reached nearly 100.000 individual beneficiaries.

**Support To Life (STL) – DKH Partner Organisation in Turkey**

Support to Life (STL)[[2]](#footnote-2), established in 2005, is a Turkey-based humanitarian aid organization founded with the principle objective of helping communities affected by natural or man-made disasters to meet their basic needs and rights. STL conducts its work in areas of Emergency Response, Refugee Support, Child Protection and Capacity Building of Civil Society Organizations. STL upholds the principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality, independence and accountability. Since 2012, STL has been assisting Syrian refugees in Turkey. Having started with in-kind and cash assistance, STL helps refugees access the services they need. Under the framework of its individual protection activities, STL provides refugees personal support when accessing basic rights and services, providing guidance and information services; in its Community Centers, STL focuses on the improvement of mental health and psycho-social support, language trainings, vocational trainings, and contributes to social cohesion through empowerment of refugees and affected communities. STL is currently active in Istanbul, Hatay, Adana, Mersin, Diyarbakir, Batman, Mardin and Sanliurfa. The overall budget for 2018 is 5.54 Million Euro, with funding from INGO partners and UN agencies.

Since its establishment the Partner Organisation (PO) has been supported by DKH through the Headquarter in Berlin (based there since 2012) and was accompanied to a very large extent through the DKH Regional Office (RO) which was located until end of 2017 in Istanbul/Turkey (today the RO is based in Amman/Jordan).

**Purpose and objective of the evaluation**

DKH’s response to the Syria-crisis since 2012 in Turkey for Syrians and other nationals forcibly displaced in Turkey initially focussed on emergency relief mainly by direct distributions of relief goods. Over the years, it started to include more and more projects of “Multi-purpose Cash Assistance (MPCA)” and protection. The sectoral focus on MPCA in between was then actively shifted to protection by mid of 2016.

The purpose of the evaluation is to provide an independent review and assessment of the DKH projects in Turkey with a focus on Protection and to contribute to the overall learning of relevant stakeholders like state- and non-state actors, especially with view to similar future large-scale programmes for the Protection sector in protracted crises.

Against this background, the three actions funded by *DG ECHO* between 2015 and 2020 are of particular importance as they account for two thirds of the total project volume during that period of time. Nevertheless, within the overall DKH program in Turkey it is also needed to look at the 5 complementary projects with a specific view on synergy effects as well as coordination and harmonisation between them.[[3]](#footnote-3)

The evaluation is primarily intended for the use of DKH (Headquarter and Regional Office) as well as the Partner Organisation STL. Results of this evaluation will be presented to DKH’s back donor for this evaluation, *DG* *ECHO* but also to the *GFFO/AA* as well as to other relevant stakeholders.

**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 country, as well as to evaluate the effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and coordination of the program;
* To identify lessons learned for DKH and its PO for the future conceptualisation and implementation of actions in the context of protracted crisis in general.

**Key questions**

It is expected that the evaluation report offers an overview of the DKH response to the Syria-crisis inside Turkey being implemented in the country since 2015 by STL, the different stakeholders involved (e. g. Turkish Govt. institutions, other back donors and national / international relief agencies) and the relations between them. Cross-cutting issues such as Do No Harm, Gender / Age and disability inclusion shall be considered in all of the questions where possible and reasonable.

***Relevance***

1. To what extent were the actions suited to the particular needs and priorities of the target groups in the given context in Turkey? 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)?
2. How far the actions address and reach the most vulnerable and severely affected people? Was the targeting appropriate for the context and needs? Which groups of people were supported and which not, and why (inclusion/exclusion bias)?
3. Was DKH’s and its PO´s response timely and relevant? Was the targeting (of project locations and regions) appropriate for the context and (changing) needs (e.g. sudden influx of refugees or transition from MPCA to protection)? Did the response meet the protection needs?

***Effectiveness***

1. To what extent did the actions achieve their objectives? What were the major factors that influenced the (non-) achievement of objectives?
2. Were applied conditions or restrictions (in cash and voucher programmes) appropriate?
3. Were lessons learned from previous actions adequately incorporated into follow-up actions? To what extend the ECHO notifications after the Monitoring Visits about the quality implementation of the actions have been taken into consideration and corrective measures taken?

***Efficiency***

1. 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?
2. How did the complaint and feedback mechanism develop over time?

***Impact***

1. What difference did the actions bring about for the beneficiaries and communities? Have local capacities been strengthened? Are there any wider (positive or negative) unintended impacts?
2. For the cash transfer projects specifically, what psychological effects has the response had (e.g. do beneficiaries feel dignified, empowered, trusted and respected due to cash)? Did the STL 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.
3. How did the actions contribute to or hinder the adoption of coping strategies of the targeted beneficiaries and communities?

***Sustainability***

1. To what extent did the results of the actions with focus on protection continue or were likely to continue after the actions ceased?
2. Which limiting / encouraging factors can be identified as essential pillars for an appropriate exit strategy? Did the actions contribute to the target groups` resilience? If so, how?

***Complementarity, Coordination and Coherence***

1. Were there any advocacy strategy and advocacy plan through the implementation of the actions? Were they realistic and effective enough? What kind of changes have those advocacy activities caused at district, provincial and national level?
2. To what extent did DKH and STL demonstrate a strategic partnership, including joint development, planning and monitoring of programs, and clarity on the relevant contribution and comparative advantage of each partner?
3. To which extent the information management, coordination, communication and collaboration among the joint projects implemented at the same time in different locations under the same program contributed to achieving synergies from and harmonisation between them?

**Evaluation design / methods**

The evaluation is to be conducted in line with the *OECD/DAC* standards as well as the *ALNAP Guidelines for Evaluation of Protection in Humanitarian Action*[[4]](#footnote-4). 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 project locations and/or stakeholders in person. The evaluators are expected to use a diverse set of methodologies, including, but not limited to: analysis of documents, online-survey, interviews and observations. It is essential to take into consideration gender and age and also to provide information about the testing sample if relevant. Nationality and ethnic background of the beneficiaries shall also be mentioned.

The evaluation is divided into three parts:

* Inception phase: The inception phase will include a kick-off meeting in Istanbul, a desk review of key program documents (all project proposals and logframes, final reports etc.) and explorative interviews (personal or telephone) including relevant back donors, DKH HQ and RO as well as STL staff. Documents and contact details will be made available by DKH via STL.
* Field visit: The field phase includes visits to the six project sites in Turkey[[5]](#footnote-5), consisting of structured interviews with the PO´s management and project staff, selected beneficiaries and

external actors, if deemed necessary. In case that not all project sites and staff can be visited

during the evaluation, an online-survey should ensure that all project field teams can participate and contribute with their experiences and opinions. Documents and contact details
will be made available by DKH via STL.
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 field teams 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 the selected ECHO-funded actions; 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 a political tensed country, should be respectively sensitive. As conducting an evaluation partly in a potentially conflict setting[[6]](#footnote-6) may put evaluators, the Partner Organisation STL and beneficiaries potentially at risk. Hence, safety concerns need to be considered in all stages of the evaluation.

**Process of the evaluation/ time frame**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Deadline | Issue |
| 1 | 14th of February 2020 | Deadline for submitting proposals |
| 2 | March 2020 | Selection of evaluation team and signing of contract |
| 3 | March 2020 | Kick-off meeting in Istanbul |
| 4 | April 2020 | Inception report |
| 5 | April / May 2020 | Presentation and discussion of the amended inception report in Istanbul |
| 6 | May / June 2020 | Field trips to project locations in Turkey (and online survey if necessary) |
| 7 | July 2020 | Draft evaluation report |
| 8 | July 2020 | Presentation in Berlin |
| 9 | August 2020 | 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.

**Deliverables**

Inception Report and Presentation

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;
* the final list of evaluation questions;
* a review of the logic of intervention;
* 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 and STL. Suggestions can be made to supplement or restrict the ToR.

After having discussed among the evaluators, DKH and STL the inception report should be adapted accordingly to specify selection criteria, all methods and approaches to be used for the desk study and field visit phase, including a detailed field schedule. The amended inception report shall be presented and discussed with representatives of DKH and STL in Istanbul.
It is expected that the evaluators present a comprehensible and detailed overview of the ECHO-funded actions to be evaluated with preliminary findings based on the analysis of documents and explorative interviews, and explain possible implications for the desk study and field phase.

Final Report and Presentation

The final report shall be written in English and should not exceed 50 pages plus annexes. The included desk study and online survey focuses on the ECHO-funded actions by taking into account synergies generated with other projects. After presenting the draft final report the evaluation results and recommendations shall be presented and discussed with representatives of DKH and STL 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 English. 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 actions, (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.

**Key qualifications of the evaluators**

The team of evaluators should consist of at least two evaluators. At least one evaluator should be a local or regional evaluator[[7]](#footnote-7) and at least one evaluator should be female.

The evaluation team must demonstrate:

* extensive knowledge of and working experience with emergency and protection actions, especially in the context of refugee crisis (preferably in the host nation) after armed conflicts;
* experience with conducting similar kind of evaluations, preferably in the context of the Syria refugee crises and Turkey;
* experience with participatory evaluation and qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis methods;
* excellent English skills – speaking and writing; Arabic, 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.

**Content of the evaluator’s offer**

Interested consultants, who intend to hand in a proposal, can manifest their intention and ask questions until the 31st of January 2020 using the e-mail-address below. The answers to all of the questions communicated until the 07th of February 2020 will be sent to all of the consultants having announced their interest. After the 31st of January 2020 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-address below by the 14th of February 2020 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 in your offer via e-mail to:**

Evangelisches Werk für Diakonie und Entwicklung e.V.

Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe

Caroline-Michaelis-Straße 1

10115 Berlin / Germany

jobs@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.de

Please direct any queries to:

Evangelisches Werk für Diakonie und Entwicklung e.V.

Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe

Thomas Molitor (Project Officer)

Caroline-Michaelis-Straße 1

10115 Berlin / Germany

thomas.molitor@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.de

**Annex Project Overview**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Serial No.** | **Donor** | **Project Title** | **Project areas** | **Number of individual beneficiaries**  | **Project Period** | **Project Budget (EURO)** |
| 1 | ECHO | Enhancing protection of at-risk and marginalized refugees in Turkey through improved access to services | Istanbul, Central-/South-/SE-Turkey | 32.563 | 01.07.2018-30.04.2020 (extension applied for until 30.06.2020) | 6.133.240,00 |
| 2 | ECHO | Enhancing access to effective services and protection for people of concern in Turkey | Istanbul, Central, South and Southeast Turkey | 36.080 | 01.11.2016 - 31.01.2018 | 4.210.450,00 |
| 3 | AA | Multi-purpose cash assistance (MPCA) and protection for urban Syrian and non-Syrian refugees in southeastern Turkey | Urban regions in the province Sanliurfa | 15.472 | 01.04.2016-31.03.2018 | 1.949.902,27 |
|  | DKH | Additional costs | Province Sanliurfa |  | 01.04.2016-31.03.2018 | 150.000,00 |
| 4 | Church of Sweden | Psychosocial support for Yazidi refugees | Fidanli Camp, Diyarbakir | 2.825 | 01.01.2016 - 31.03.2017 | 464.371,17 |
| 5 | AA | Relief and psychosocial support for Syrian and Iraqi refugees | Province Sanliurfa | 6.060 | 01.04.2015-31.03.2016 | 1.369.081,95 |
| 6 | ECHO | Unconditional Cash Assistance and protection for out-of-camp Syrian and Iraqi refugees settled in southeastern Turkey | Dyarbakir, Batman, Istanbul | 30.000 | 01.04.2015 - 31.12.2016 | 10.633.000,00 |
| 7 | DKH | Facilitating the Protection of Syrian Refugees in Istanbul | Istanbul | 1.200 | 01.03.2015 - 31.12.2016 | 477.816,98 |
| 8 | AA | Emergency assistance for Kurdish refugees from Kobane (Syria) in Turkey | Province Sanliurfa | 20.500 | 01.02.2015-31.03.2015 | 440.000,00 |

1. <https://www.diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.de/en/home> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <https://www.supporttolife.org/> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See annex for a table with the list of actions, year, budget, title, number of beneficiaries. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <https://www.alnap.org/help-library/alnap-guide-evaluation-of-protection-in-humanitarian-action> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Istanbul, Mersin, Diyarbakir, Batman, Mardin and Sanliurfa. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. In some parts of south-eastern Turkey. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Turkey and neighbouring countries. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)