



ACTED

Terms of reference

Final External Evaluation

Reducing Disaster Risk Vulnerability in Eastern Ukraine

DONOR	ECHO
PROJECT DURATION	1 May 2019 – 31 October 2020 (18 months)
LOCATIONS	Donetsk: Toretsk Municipality; Yasinuvata, Bakhmut raions, Southern Donetsk (Volnovakha and Mariupol area); Luhansk: Popasna raion. GCA only.
PARTNERS (IF ANY)	IMPACT Initiatives, Danish Red Cross (DRC) (jointly with Austrian Red Cross and Ukrainian Red Cross Society), Right to Protection (R2P).
MAIN PROJECT OBJECTIVE	This Action will seek to improve understanding of, and promote and take measures towards preparedness to industrial/ecological in conflict-affected Eastern Ukraine.
OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION	Overall objective: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- To provide an external opinion on the relevance and performance of the project, as compared to the project document and with a strong focus on results.- To highlight key lessons learnt, best practices and recommendations to feed back into current and future ACTED programming in the same sectoral areas and using similar approaches to meeting their objectives.
OVERVIEW OF THE METHODOLOGY FOR THE EVALUATION	The consultant will assess the project according to three DAC criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness). The methodology for data collection is to be determined by the consultant with ACTED approval. The consultant is however expected to either conduct in-country missions to obtain the necessary qualitative and quantitative data that provides evidence of the impact of the response with members of communities targeted by the project or do so remotely by requesting information online and via skype/zoom calls. The evaluation should be conducted mainly through secondary data review, interviews with remote data collection methods with a broad range of project stakeholders, including beneficiaries, program staff and management and/or key informant interviews. In case in-country mission is possible, in-person meetings and interviews may be conducted in Kyiv. .

TABLE OF CONTENTS²

ACTED.....	3
ACTED WORLDWIDE	3
ACTED IN UKRAINE.....	3
Project Background.....	4
BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE OF THE PROJECT.....	4
ACTIVITIES OF THE PROJECT	5
Key Project Stakeholders	6
Scope and purpose of the evaluation.....	7
Research criteria and questions.....	7
1/ RELEVANCE	7
2/ EFFICIENCY.....	8
3/ EFFECTIVENESS.....	8
Evaluation methodology.....	9
Schedule.....	10
Deliverables.....	11
INCEPTION REPORT.....	11
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT	11
FEEDBACK ON DELIVERABLES	13
Expertise requirements.....	14
Application process.....	14
Applications' scoring.....	15

¹ Evaluation dates are subject to change depending on epidemiological situation and donor approval of the project extension requested by ACTED on September 21th, 2020 (Ref 2019/00644/MR/01/01).

² Based on the European Union's ROM Handbook and guidance for final evaluations.

ACTED

ACTED WORLDWIDE

ACTED is a non-governmental organization with headquarters in Paris, founded in 1993. Independent, private and not-for-profit, ACTED respects a strict political and religious impartiality and operates according to principles of non-discrimination and transparency.

ACTED endeavors to respond to humanitarian crises and build resilience; promote inclusive and sustainable growth; co-construct effective governance and support the building of civil society worldwide by investing in people and their potential.

ACTED's mission is to save lives and support people in meeting their needs in hard to reach areas.

ACTED develops and implements programmes that target the most vulnerable amongst populations that have suffered from conflict, natural disaster, or socio-economic hardship.

ACTED's approach looks beyond the immediate emergency towards opportunities for longer term livelihoods reconstruction and sustainable development.

As of 2019, ACTED was present in four continents, implementing projects in 37 countries, for the benefit of 20.7 million people, responding to emergency situations, supporting rehabilitation projects and accompanying the dynamics of development.

ACTED IN UKRAINE

Conflict in Eastern Ukraine combined with ecological/industrial hazards present significant threats to the lives and well-being of populations living on both side of the Line of Contact (LoC). Since the conflict erupted, both the Ukrainian Civil Protection/Emergency Services system and the international humanitarian response structure have been focusing on providing relief/respond to humanitarian and emergency needs. In contrast, joint preparedness/contingency planning in relation to conflict related hazards by international and national response structures is limited, particularly at local level; mitigation and preparation for industrial/ecological hazards are largely inadequate; national policy/legal frameworks are outdated and inadequate; while coordination between the national and international responses is often limited to exchanges of information.

ACTED has been operational in Ukraine since 2015 (offices in Kyiv, Sloviansk, Severodonetsk, Mariupol, 60+ international and national staff and 700+ key informants). ACTED partners with IMPACT through the REACH initiative to conduct humanitarian needs and vulnerability assessments in GCA (incl. 0-5km) and NGCA to inform Humanitarian Programme Cycle. In 2017/2018 IMPACT conducted area-based assessments (ABAs) in 8 raions along the LoC. Since 2017, ACTED has been working with LAs at raion and oblast level, covering 10 raions/municipalities along the LoC, to strengthen preparedness/contingency planning (supported by OFDA and ECHO). ACTED now provides tailored support for local contingency planning to authorities in 4 raions & 1 municipality along the LoC (GCA only): they are this Action's areas of intervention. ACTED also implements cash-based interventions in the 0-5km area, incl. as part of the ECHO-funded ACCESS Consortium. Through field presence and experience in Donetsk and Luhansk, incl. 5km area, ACTED/IMPACT have the operational capacity and access necessary for proposed activities. ACTED's has successfully yielded buy-in from key stakeholders, e.g. Ministry of Temporarily Occupied Territories and IDPs (MTOT) who expressed interest in supporting ACTED's preparedness programme

PROJECT BACKGROUND

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE OF THE PROJECT

This ACTED's project in Ukraine seeks to improve understanding of preparedness and resilience to industrial/ecological risks (including as exacerbated by the conflict) in conflict-affected Eastern Ukraine. As discussed with donors (ECHO), national and local authorities (LAs), and humanitarian stakeholders, ACTED and its partners proposed a Disaster Risk Management Project, focusing on vulnerability to risk, to be implemented by a Consortium led by ACTED and including IMPACT Initiatives, the Red Cross Movement (through the Danish Red Cross) and Right to Protection (R2P). The Consortium has identified and mapped out ecological/industrial risks; jointly with LAs, it developed local mitigation/response/evacuation plans in relation to these risks; it supported plan implementation, including through targeted material investments; it enhanced LAs' capacity to manage risk and build population resilience; worked with communities to increase resilience, preparedness and capacity to cope with risk; and advocated towards national authorities and donors for policy change and investments in DRR.

The Action focused support to raion/city authorities in 5 areas (GCA)–Popasna (Luhansk), Bakhmut, Yasinovata, Toretsk, and Volnovakha (Donetsk)–where populations are exposed to industrial/ecological risks and commitment has been demonstrated through engagement with ACTED on soft projects that did not provide for material investments. These 5 areas cover 53% of the population living in the 10 raions/cities that border the LoC. ACTED also explores overlapping government structures in Southern Donetsk (Mariupol city; hromadas-e.g. Sartana OTG) and options for engaging other administrations on planning.

The response addresses coordination/institutional capacity gaps under Results 1&2, and engages communities directly under Result 3 to reduce their vulnerability to industrial/ecological risks linked to conflict, in line with ECHO DRR priorities (Thematic Policy Document no. 5), HIP 2019 and the Sendai Framework. The Action fits within a 5-year programme logic: while a precipitated reduction of the work would result in overall lower improvement of DRM in Ukraine, incremental milestones (e.g. contingency plans put in place by LAs) at the end of each phase will ensure that stakeholders gradually establish ownership of the process, and that local capacities are sufficiently enhanced to contribute to a responsible transition in the long term (in line with ECHO DRR guidance).

The Action builds on successes achieved/address gaps identified under work implemented since 2017. ACTED currently works with 5 raions/municipalities to develop hazard specific area based contingency plans and adapt OCHA's Inter-Agency Rapid Assessment (IARA) toolbox to LA (raion/oblast) needs. Leveraging the Area Based Assessments (2017), ACTED/IMPACT conducted 8 Capacity and Vulnerability Assessments (CVAs) to evaluate barriers to provision of/access to basic services in conflict-affected areas, esp. GCA locations disconnected from NGCA urban cores by the LoC. The ABA/CVA approach was key to determine LA capacity to respond to crises and understand local level vulnerabilities to industrial/ecological hazards.

The Action has been designed and implemented in complementarity with a BHA-funded DRR project. Duplication have been avoided as per:

- Thematic focus - this Action focused on ecological/industrial risks linked to the conflict including its cascading consequences, while the BHA-funded project focused on multi-hazard, natural and WASH-related risks;
- Geographical focus - the Action focused on areas where ecological/industrial hazards are found close to the LoC and communities located in catchment areas, while BHA-funded project focused more on district/raion-level plans and water safety plans.
- Activities - the RC's household and community awareness/preparedness programme was implemented in Popasna, Bakhmut, Yasinovata, and Toretsk with support from ECHO, and in Volnovakha with support from OFDA. R2P's legal and policy analysis under the Action focused on the legal framework guiding industrial/ecological risks and regulatory gaps in the normative basis for CP which cause practical obstacles to a systematic approach to impact mitigation. With support from BHA, R2P conducted trainings on protection mainstreaming to project stakeholders.

Given different thematic and geographic foci, activities that were similar across projects (e.g. Area Based Risk Assessments) acted as multipliers rather than duplicators, avoiding inefficient use of resources and creating linkages between interventions.

Similarly, activities envisioned to be essentially funded by both projects fed into the logic of both projects and strengthened sustainability of results (facilitation of a working group on DRR and IMPACT's provision of technical support to authorities).

By capitalizing on complementary donor priorities and strategies, the Consortium proposed an Action which fitted within a comprehensive DRM Programme to address a wider range of risks faced by conflict-affected populations in Donbas (ref. ECHO DRR guidance on complex emergencies).

Finally, the Action fed into the Sendai Framework by reducing vulnerability and increasing preparedness to industrial/ecological risks and working to support the GoU fulfil its commitments – incl. reduce mortality, the number of affected people, and damage to critical infrastructure/disruption to basic services.

ACTIVITIES OF THE PROJECT

Result 1: Legislative gaps and investment priorities in DRM are advocated for at national level, and coordination amongst key DRR stakeholders in Ukraine is enhanced

- Conduct workshops on ecological and industrial risks at national level
- Facilitate regular coordination on DRR
- Conduct desk research on legislation regulating industrial/ecological risks
- Conduct desk and field research on legislation/policies pertaining to the Civil Protection sector
- Elaborate practical recommendations into legislative amendments to normative acts

Result 2: Local authorities and first responders have an improved understanding of risks and strengthened risk management capacity

- Area-based risk analyses
- Local level, area-based, disaster risk planning
- Build disaster risk management capacity at raion/city and oblast level
- Provide ongoing technical support to local and regional authorities on risk data analysis, mapping, and planning

Result 3: Community awareness, preparedness and response are enhanced at local level

- Increase household/community awareness of/preparedness to industrial/conflict risks in 25 communities
- Develop Community Emergency Plans on industrial/conflict risks in 25 communities
- Conduct community-based FA trainings
- Conduct community-based PFA trainings
- Provide material support to LAs and communities to enhance preparedness capacities (SESU, Coordination Center, evacuation plans)

KEY PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS

Stakeholders	Role/responsibilities within the project
ACTED	Consortium leader and implementing actor in charge of regional/district capacity building and planning under result 2, to further support coordination mechanisms under result 1 and equip local authorities to reinforce preparedness and response capacities under result3.
IMPACT Initiatives	Implementing actor (consortium partner) to conduct area-based risk analyses of key conflict/industrial/ecological hazards conducted in the 5 areas of intervention
Right to protection (R2P)	Implementing actor (consortium partner) to implement Result 1 of the Project (advocacy efforts on legislative gaps and investment priorities)
The Danish Red Cross	Implementing partner (consortium partner) partnering with Ukrainian Red Cross Society (URCS) for their capacity development and strengthening and Austrian Red Cross (AutRC) to inform the Action' relevance and sustainability. The DRC is responsible for capacity building of local authorities (Result 2) and enhancing community awareness, preparedness and response (Result 3)
ECHO	Donor
National level authorities (ministries, parliament, office of the President)	Beneficiaries. In addition, involved in collaboration, coordination and joint implementation of activities
Local Authorities and Emergency services	Beneficiaries, In addition, involved in collaboration, coordination and joint implementation of activities
Academic institutions	Beneficiaries
Population (15,150 direct and 150,000 indirect beneficiaries)	Beneficiaries across 5 target areas benefitting from developed response/mitigation plans, hazard mapping and community projects
Humanitarian and development actors (UN OCHA, IFRC, ICRC, WASH Cluster, WHO, Environmental stakeholders if possible...)	Coordination

SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The main objective of this evaluation is to provide ACTED and the donor with an assessment of the project, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, efficiency and effectiveness of the project. The evaluation should provide information that is evidence-based, credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the future decision-making processes of ACTED and the donor.

The evaluation will specifically:

1. Assess the extent to which the project met planned outputs and outcomes;
2. Highlight lessons learnt, best practices and recommendations for improvements to feed back into current and future ACTED programming in the same sectoral areas and using similar approaches to be meeting their objectives.

RESEARCH CRITERIA³ AND QUESTIONS

The evaluation shall use 3 of the following DAC criteria and corresponding questions. The consultant will be able to review and revise the questions (not the criteria) in consultation with ACTED country office AME team, as part of the inception phase of the evaluation, and as relevant. It was indeed discussed and agreed upon with ECHO at field level to conduct a more limited and lighter exercise than initially envisioned at proposal stage, considering the worsening epidemiological situation with COVID-19. As such, relevance, efficiency and effectiveness criteria were selected as the most appropriate and possible to measure in the current situation considering time, access, travel and resource limitations. Specifically, impact and sustainability criteria were excluded, as it would be challenging to measure on an ongoing first phase project, with limited physical access to implementation locations during the evaluation.

1/ RELEVANCE

The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries', global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.

Note: "Respond to" means that the objectives and design of the intervention are sensitive to the economic, environmental, equity, social, political economy, and capacity conditions in which it takes place. "Partner/institution" includes government (national, regional, local), civil society organisations, private entities and international bodies involved in funding, implementing and/or overseeing the intervention. Relevance assessment involves looking at differences and trade-offs between different priorities or needs. It requires analysing any changes in the context to assess the extent to which the intervention can be (or has been) adapted to remain relevant.

The following questions should be answered:

- 1.1 Was the action adequately designed to respond to the needs of the direct beneficiaries?
Specifically:

³ All criteria definitions are extracted from the document titled "Better Criteria for Better Evaluation", released by the DAC Network on Development Evaluation in December 2019.

- a) How did the project objectives and design respond to identified need for reduction or mitigation of anthropometric and natural risks in conflict-affected Eastern Ukraine?
- b) To what extent did the intervention respond and adapt to the recurring, as well as, unforeseen situations occurring during the implementation period?

2/ EFFICIENCY

The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.

Note: “Economic” is the conversion of inputs (funds, expertise, natural resources, time, etc.) into outputs, outcomes and impacts, in the most cost-effective way possible, as compared to feasible alternatives in the context. “Timely” delivery is within the intended timeframe, or a timeframe reasonably adjusted to the demands of the evolving context. This may include assessing operational efficiency (how well the intervention was managed).

The following questions should be answered:

- 2.1 Was the project managed in a cost-efficient manner (in terms of human, financial and other resources versus the results)? Specifically -
 - a) How did the project manage its resources to achieve the expected results?
 - b) Did the project use the available resources to capitalize on synergies with Consortium partners and actors (local and international) involved in similar projects ?

The consultant shall analyze the efficiency of project management arrangements and duly justify any issue. Factual statements on the quality and quantity of inputs shall be provided, delays should be measured by means of comparison with the latest update of the planning. Any significant deviations shall be analyzed. Conclusions on cost efficiency of outputs shall be drawn.

3/ EFFECTIVENESS

The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups. These include the achievement of project specific objective from advocacy and planning activities, specifically with regards to the commitments made – either normative, i.e. through acts, or financial – towards the implementation of DRM measures in Ukraine at the end of the project.

Note: Analysis of effectiveness involves taking account of the relative importance of the objectives or results.

- 3.1 Were the expected results realized?
 - a) Did the project results contribute to the better preparedness to anthropometric and natural risks? If so, how?
 - b) Did the project actions influence/support local/regional government and international assistance planning? If so, how?

The consultant’s focus should be on outputs' and outcomes' delivery and quality (not activities); he/she is expected to explain any causes of deviations and the implications thereof. The level of achievement of results should be assessed as reflected by indicators covering the specific objective (outcome), providing a transparent chain of arguments.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

While ACTED suggests consideration of the following mixed-methods methodology in order to collect the relevant data, the consultant is expected to determine the final methodological approach for presentation and approval during the inception phase. Final approval will be made by ACTED, as the main focal point representing the Consortium towards the Consultant.

The evaluation is expected to be based on the findings and factual statements identified from review of relevant documents including the project document (English), ad-hoc, monthly, quarterly and interim reports to the donor (English), monthly Project Manager reports (English), in addition to the technical reports (Ukrainian, English) produced by the project, the AME surveys (post-monitoring data and reports on outcome-level indicators, databases, Ukrainian, English) produced for these projects. ACTED will provide the Consultant with all available project documentation at the beginning of the consultancy. Project specific context shall also be taken into account.

Depending on the epidemiologic (COVID-19) and security situation, the Consultant will either conduct the evaluation in-country (with visits to Kyiv only for in-person interviews, where possible⁴, with working groups, national level counterparts in the government and other stakeholders in the capital) and interview the stakeholders including the target beneficiaries, government officials, etc. using online tools, such as skype, zoom, etc. or conduct the evaluation exclusively via remote methods of data collection. Participation of stakeholders in the evaluation should be maintained at all times, reflecting opinions, expectations and vision about the contribution of the project towards the achievement of its objectives. The following persons should be visited and interviewed:

- Consortium Partners
- National level authorities
- Local authorities and emergency services
- Community members and representatives (CSO and URCS volunteers)
- Academic institutions
- Humanitarian and development actors

The table below provides details on the persons to be interviewed:

Persons	Details	Research questions
Consortium project implementation staff	DRR team: will provide all the necessary documents and assist in data collection if needed, as well as provide their insights on the project	Relevance 1.1 (a, b) Effectiveness 3.1 (a, b)
ACTED AME staff (including accountability)	Depending on the evaluator's plans, AMEU may either be part of the evaluation team, assisting in data collection, analysis and reporting or serve as a focal point, conducting day-to-day monitoring of the exercise and providing comments and suggestions. Will also be interviewed to provide data on logical framework, any assessments that	Relevance 1.1 (a, b) Effectiveness 3.1 (a, b)

⁴ The Consultant will be required to comply with ACTED's current internal global guidance on Covid-19 measures to safeguard beneficiaries and staff.

	took place during the project and report on achievement of indicators.	
Consortium Senior Management	Will be interviewed for their reflections and assist in coordination where needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Manager (Head of Consortium): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Relevance 1.1 (a, b) ○ Efficiency 2.1 (a, b) ○ Effectiveness 3.1 (a, b) • Finance/Admin Manager: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Efficiency 2.1 (a) • Country Director: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Relevance 1.1 (a, b) ○ Efficiency 2.1 (a) ○ Effectiveness 3.1 (b)
Beneficiaries (including national-level authorities, LAs, emergency services and academic institutions)	Will be primary interviewees for sharing their reflections, feedback and suggestions about the project	Relevance 1.1 (a, b) Efficiency 2.1 (b) Effectiveness 3.1 (a, b)
Humanitarian and development actors	How the coordination took place and whether it made an impact on interventions	Relevance 1.1 (a) Efficiency 2.1 (b) Effectiveness 3.1 (b)

The methodology must consider participants' safety throughout the evaluation (including recruitment and training of research staff, data collection / analysis and report writing) as well as research ethics (confidentiality of those participating in the evaluation, data protection, age and ability-appropriate assent processes) and quality assurance (tools piloting, enumerators training, data cleaning).

The above-described methodology is indicative, the consultant is expected to provide a detailed methodology and work plan. He/she will also be free to collect additional data in order to reply to all the research questions.

SCHEDULE

This assignment is expected to begin by mid-November, 2020 and shall be accomplished no later than mid-February, 2021⁵. This schedule is subject to change depending on the epidemiological situation and donor's approval of the project extension requested by ACTED. Bidders should provide an evaluation workplan detailing the number of working days required per evaluation activity (see below table).

Evaluation activities	Suggested Schedule (FTE days)
Review of program activities, implementation policies and reporting mechanisms, based on available documentation	<i>To be filled by bidders</i>
Development of an Inception Report, outlining the methodology for data collection and analysis	<i>To be filled by bidders</i>
Data collection, including interviews	<i>To be filled by bidders</i>
Analysis of program performance based on the five DAC criteria and the corresponding research questions listed above	<i>To be filled by bidders</i>

⁵ Within this evaluation period, it is expected that **35 full-time equivalent (FTE) days** will be worked

Drafting of the Final Evaluation Report	<i>To be filled by bidders</i>
Finalization of the Final Evaluation Report, taking into account ACTED comments on its quality and accuracy.	10 days

The consultant will be expected to meet weekly with ACTED management staff to provide updates on the evaluation timeframe. This can be done either by email or in person.

DELIVERABLES

The following deliverables should be provided to ACTED's representative in Ukraine, Kiev, who will then circulate them to the relevant ACTED departments and partners for feedback.

All deliverables should be in electronic version, Word/Windows compatible format and in English.

Deliverables	Deadline ⁶
Inception Report	TBC
Draft Final Evaluation Report	TBC
Final version of the Final Evaluation Report	TBC

For all deliverables, the consultant is expected to underline factual statements using evidence, and to comment on any deviation.

INCEPTION REPORT

The inception report shall include the following elements:

- Detailed description of the methodology for the evaluation
 - o Data collection methods
 - o Data collection tools
 - o Sampling
 - o Approach to quality control
- Data analysis methods
- Justification for revising the Evaluation Questions (if relevant)
- Detailed workplan
- Analysis of anticipated limitations and mitigation measures

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

The consultant shall use ACTED's Final Evaluation Report template (to be provided at the beginning of the evaluation), including the following elements:

Executive summary (2 pages max)	Should be tightly drafted, and usable as a free-standing document. It should be short, not more than two pages. It should focus on the main analytical points, indicate the main conclusions, lessons learned and
---	---

⁶ The exact timeframe for project evaluation is pending donor's approval for project extension requested by ACTED on September 21th, 2020 (Ref 2019/00644/MR/01/01) and may change due to other factors, including but not limited to epidemiological situation. Deadlines will be agreed upon

	<p>specific recommendations. Specific guidance on how to develop the Executive Summary will be provided at the beginning of the evaluation.</p> <p>Note that this section of the template also contains an overview scoring table that should be filled by the consultant in a consistent and sound manner.</p>
<p>Project synopsis</p> <p><i>(this section should not exceed 1 page in length)</i></p>	<p>The project synopsis serves as an introduction and provides background information. It therefore includes a short text on the objectives of the project and issues to be addressed by it, a description of the target groups and a summary of its intervention logic, including the indicators at the three levels of the intervention logic: overall objective/impact, specific objective/outcome, outputs. The synopsis does not include appreciations and observations on issues related to the project implementation.</p>
<p>Methodology</p> <p><i>(this section should not exceed 1 page in length)</i></p>	<p>The methodology section should detail the tools used in the evaluation; locations, sample sizes, sampling methodology, tools used, dates, team composition, limitations faced and other pertinent facts.</p>
<p>Findings</p> <p><i>(max. 2 pages per DAC criteria)</i></p>	<p>The findings section should present the results of the evaluation in an objective and non-judgmental way that gives an honest portrayal of the project.</p> <p>Included in the findings should be a discussion of how well the project achieved each of the three DAC criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency).</p> <p>The consultant shall highlight the most important findings relating to the performance of the project and elaborate on them in detail while also pointing out any critical issues and/or serious deficiencies. Findings shall be accurate, concise and direct. They must be based on and coherent with their answers to the evaluation questions.</p> <p>The consultant is expected to provide a self-sustaining explanation of their assessment which must be understandable by any person unfamiliar with the project while at the same time providing useful elements of information to the stakeholders. The consultant should avoid the following weaknesses: not evidence based, lack of technical content (e.g. experts provide an analysis which does not take into account the state of the art of knowledge in a given sector or topic).</p> <p>Full source details (including file name, page numbers...) are always to be included.</p>
<p>Conclusions, Lessons Learned, Best Practices, and Recommendations</p> <p><i>(max.3 pages)</i></p>	<p>These should be presented as a separate final chapter. Wherever possible and relevant, for each key conclusion there should be a corresponding recommendation. The consultant shall set out the main conclusions and recommendations based on the answers given to the evaluation questions and which are summarized in the findings section.</p> <p>Recommendations should be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible and drafted in a way that the stakeholders to whom they relate are clearly identified. Recommendations are derived from the conclusions and address issues of major importance to the performance</p>

	<p>of the project. They must take in consideration applicable rules and other constraints, related for example to the context in which the project is implemented. They must not be phrased in general terms but constitute clear proposals for solutions and they target the most important issues rather than minor or less relevant aspects of a project.</p> <p>Through conclusions, lessons learned, best practices and recommendation, the evaluation will generate knowledge and support accountability to beneficiaries, the donor, ACTED and the overall humanitarian community. It will provide information on the processes or activities that ACTED implemented to develop insights, knowledge, and lessons from past experiences so as to improve current and future performance.</p>
Annexes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of Reference of the evaluation • Assessment tools used (questionnaires, checklists, scoring grids, etc.) • List of persons (job titles only, no names)/organizations consulted • List of literature and documentation consulted • Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses and other pertinent elements, graphs, etc.)

For consortium and/or multi-country projects, a single project-wide report should still be produced, with agency-specific and/or country-specific findings clearly identified.

FEEDBACK ON DELIVERABLES

Please note that both inception and final reports are subject to ACTED's approval before they are considered as final deliverables and corresponding milestones payment can be released.

Upon submission of the draft inception report / draft final evaluation report by the consultant, ACTED will formulate comments as well as indicate any factual errors, within five working days of reception.

Comments will be formulated on the basis of the Inception Report and Final Evaluation Report Quality Control Checklists that will be provided to the consultant at the beginning of the evaluation.

For the draft final evaluation report, consultants are informed that ACTED will provide an opinion on the quality of the evaluation report and each of its components (synopsis, methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations, and annexes), which should be taken into account by the consultant. For each recommendation, ACTED will also state to what extent (Yes, Partially, No) it agrees with the recommendation and accurately reports the opinion of the consulted stakeholders.

All comments should be considered by the consultant before the two reports are considered completed. The consultant shall take note of these comments and decide whether or not to revise the reports and, where appropriate, succinctly explain why comments cannot be taken into account. The consultant submits a revised version of the report to ACTED, within five days (Inception Report) / five days (Final Evaluation Report) of receipt of ACTED comments. The revised version should clearly highlight all changes made.

EXPERTISE REQUIREMENTS

The consultant should have the following background:

- Post-graduate qualifications in development studies or relevant area
- Experience in monitoring and evaluation of Disaster Risk Management projects
- Strong knowledge and/or demonstrated experience in designing and conducting similar monitoring and evaluation activities in insecure contexts is required
- Strong knowledge of Core Humanitarian Standards
- Strong analytical skills and ability to clearly synthesize and present findings
- Excellent written and oral English essential
- Excellent written and oral Russian/Ukrainian is desired
- Good knowledge of the Ukrainian context of the area is an advantage
- Good knowledge on industrial and environmental risks is desired

The consultant shall identify a focal point for communication and reporting purposes, with appropriate skills and experience. At the briefing session, the focal point should submit a full contact list of all those involved in the evaluation.

APPLICATION PROCESS

Leading consultant is requested to include the following in the application:

- CV(s) of the personnel deployed (including field team)
- Organogram of the team structure
- Sample from previous work (max. 10-20 pages) from at least 2 separate projects; description of similar experience, including description of the evaluation criteria, project, area of intervention, and total budget
- Technical Proposal including a detailed methodology and work plan. This should include both methods of evaluation – one for completely remote without coming to the offices and one with in-country visits to Kyiv.
- Detailed Financial Proposal (cost effective and showing unit costs)

Please note that the consultant or firm will have to comply with all government rules and will be responsible for government taxes.

By undertaking this assessment, consultants are expected to abide to humanitarian principles and to ensure the confidentiality of the data collected. It is also demanded that consultants follow at all times ACTED's Security Plan and Code of Conduct.

All data collected as part of this evaluation will remain ACTED's property. By the end of the final evaluation, the external evaluator shall submit all ACTED-/project-related documentation back to ACTED management. The Final External Evaluation Report produced under the present contract shall not be shared externally without ACTED's prior written approval.

It is the responsibility of the consultant to budget for a translator (if required), as well as a medical / health / repatriation insurance.

ACTED will not take the responsibility of the transportation, access, accommodation and food-related expenses. It is the sole responsibility of the evaluator to take the appropriate measure to insure access and lodging of the team on the field. However, should the evaluation take place in-country, ACTED will support the Consultant with the logistical, organizational and coordination issues (finding a hotel, reserving train tickets, organizing appointments, coordinating tasks, etc.)

To ensure equal treatment of applicants, ACTED cannot give a prior opinion on the eligibility and selection of bidders. ACTED has no obligation to provide clarifications on the call for tender; should ACTED decide to provide additional information, it will be published to be available to all potential bidders.

APPLICATIONS' SCORING

Applications will be scored on the following criteria:

I. Technical Proposal		70pts
a.	Technical skills of personnel deployed (CVs, organizational structure of the team, experience in conducting similar final evaluations - similarity to the evaluation criteria, project and covered area will be scored equally)	35pts
b.	Context specificity /relevance of Methodology and work plan	20pts
c.	Sample from previous work	15pts
II. Financial Proposal		30pts
TOTAL		100pts

Any offer submitted after the deadline will be automatically rejected. Any missing document will lead to the direct disqualification of the applicant.

Offers that do not comply with the overall length and deadline of the assignment (as provided above), do not include field visits and/or do not plan to assess each of the five DAC criteria will be disqualified.

Any error or major discrepancy related to the instructions listed in the Terms of Reference may lead to the rejection of the bid.

Clarifications will only be requested by ACTED to bidders when information provided is not sufficient to conduct an objective assessment of the submitted offer.

Application deadline: October 16, 2020.

Company Name: _____

Authorized Representative Name: _____

Signature: _____

Stamp:

