



# ACTED

## Terms of reference

### Final External Evaluation

#### Reducing Disaster Risk Vulnerability in Eastern Ukraine

DONOR	USAID/OFDA
PROJECT DURATION	1 August 2019 – 31 July 2021
LOCATIONS	Luhansk Oblast: Pospana raion; Donetsk Oblast: Toretsk municipality, Yasinuvata raion, Bakhmut raion, Southern Donetsk (incl. Volnovakha/Mariupol). Government Controlled Area only.
PARTNERS (IF ANY)	IMPACT Initiatives, Red Cross Movement actors (RC), and Right to Protection (R2P)
MAIN PROJECT OBJECTIVE	To improve understanding of, promote and take measures towards preparedness to disaster risks in conflict-affected areas in Eastern Ukraine
OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION	<p>Overall objective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- 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.</li><li>- 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.</li></ul>
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.
EVALUATION DATES	August 1 – September 15, 2021



ACTED

# TABLE OF CONTENTS<sup>1</sup>

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
4/ IMPACT .....	Erreur ! Signet non défini.
5/ SUSTAINABILITY .....	Erreur ! Signet non défini.
Evaluation methodology .....	9
Schedule .....	10
Deliverables.....	11
INCEPTION REPORT .....	11
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT .....	12
FEEDBACK ON DELIVERABLES.....	13
Expertise requirements.....	14
Application process.....	14
Applications' scoring.....	15

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

# PROJECT BACKGROUND

---

## BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE OF THE PROJECT

3.5 million people are in need of humanitarian assistance in Ukraine, out of a total of over 5 million affected by the conflict. Beyond humanitarian needs, pre-existing hazards such as extreme weather events in winter, including as exacerbated by the conflict, also threaten basic human rights of affected groups. The rights to a decent standard of living, to health, to property, are all under threat in conflict-affected areas and would be seriously impacted if disaster risks, including those that may be exacerbated by the conflict because of additional vulnerability or decreased capacity to respond as compared to pre-2014, were to realize. Noting that protection of human rights was a key aspect of DRM (Sendai Framework), it was crucial to implement interventions which mitigated impact by working to reduce multi-hazard vulnerability – both of systems (i.e. LAs/PUCs) and populations (i.e. communities).

Leveraging in-country and global capacity, and based on needs and gaps identified, ACTED and its partners sought to improve understanding and management of, advocacy on and preparedness to disaster risk in conflict-affected areas (including as pertains to extreme weather events (especially in winter) compounded by utility outages, water supply, forced mass evacuation/displacement and other cascading disasters).

By their very nature, disaster risks themselves were sensitive in a conflict setting. To tackle these issues effectively, it was therefore essential to keep developing and strengthening trust with and buy-in from authorities at local, regional and national levels. The proposed intervention expanded on the work done by ACTED, IMPACT and local/regional authorities to enhance preparedness capacities in Donetsk and Luhansk since September 2017. Through the Consortium, the intervention also leveraged additional partners' expertise, notably R2P's protection monitoring and mainstreaming capacity; ACTED's global technical WASH expertise and experience, and the Red Cross Movement's Community Emergency Planning methodology and community First Aid (FA) and household preparedness programme.

As a result of the work done with support from OFDA since 2017, there was a solid basis of cooperation between LAs and ACTED/IMPACT. The Consortium was in position to leverage this to implement activities supporting DRM. ACTED's work and successes/results in target areas have encouraged buy-in from regional/national level stakeholders, illustrated by the commitment of LAs from the 5 target areas to work with ACTED on soft projects which do not provide for material investments. Noting, however, that while they thus demonstrated willingness to work on time-consuming activities without any material support, it was then relevant and justified to start investing in priorities that had been identified as a result of this work.

Noting that, at oblast/raion level, noticeable differences exist among authorities' willingness to engage on discussion/management of risks with international actors (sensitivity issues), the Consortium has elected to optimize engagement of and work with LAs by first targeting areas where productive relationships have been fostered/exist – i.e. Donetsk and Luhansk oblast administrations; State of Emergency Service in Ukraine (SESU) in both oblasts; Volnovakha, Yasinuvata, Bakhmut, Popasna and raions, and Toretsk municipality. Other areas where significant risks are also present, but where stakeholders were reticent, would be targeted under a future phase, once the added value of the activities has been reliably demonstrated. ACTED also leveraged buy-in from national stakeholders, e.g. the Ministry of Temporarily Occupied Territories and IDPs (MTOT).

While limited by insufficient resources and staffing, local capacity does exist. ACTED's work with district authorities has demonstrated their motivation and willingness to engage on and make commitments to

DRM. E.g., Toretsk administration has committed to renovating emergency shelters if equipped by the Consortium. LA staff turnover tends to be low, informing the sustainability of capacity building activities. Therefore, in line with this justification for intervention and based on preliminary discussions held with OFDA, ECHO, the WASH cluster and national and local authorities, the Consortium proposed a 24-months program which a) identified and analyzed disaster risks in conflict-affected areas; b) developed, with LAs, local DRM plans in relation to these risks; c) worked with communities to increase their knowledge, preparedness and capacity to engage with LAs on these risks; d) supported the implementation of local plans and other DRM measures, including through targeted material investments; e) enhanced the technical and material capacity of LAs to manage disaster risks in conflict-affected areas and of communities to cope with the impacts; and f) raised awareness at regional and – where feasible – national level of DRM priorities (normative/material) among national authorities and donors.

This intervention was designed to feed into the Sendai Framework, through the achievement of results which contributed to realize targets d. reduction in disruption of basic services, e. local disaster risk reduction strategies and f. availability of disaster risk information and assessments. This was also in line with OFDA's DRR strategy and priorities.

This project benefited a total of approximate 150,000 individuals affected by disaster risks (including extreme weather events during winter) in conflict-affected areas (the population within 10km of the LoC in the target areas, who were covered by the local DRM action plans), among which 4% are estimated to be IDPs, i.e. 6,000 persons. Of these 150,000, 10,000 benefited from WASH activities (including an estimated 400 IDPs). An estimated 15 humanitarian organizations and 12 other key humanitarian actors also benefited from coordination activities.

By adopting a multi-stakeholder approach and tackling preparedness and response gaps within community and authority structures at multiple levels of governance, the Consortium helped shift the responsibility for managing risks, investing in resilience and responding to shocks from donors and humanitarian actors to LAs and communities themselves. Ultimately, this intervention reduced the costs – including lost lives and livelihoods – of recurring crises in Eastern Ukraine.

## ACTIVITIES OF THE PROJECT

### SECTOR 1: RISK MANAGEMENT POLICY AND PLANNING

#### Sub-sector 1.1: Policy and Planning

- Conduct Multi-Hazard Area-Based Risk Analyses (ABRA)
- Develop local DRM action plans jointly with LAs
- Develop Community Emergency Plans (CEPs)

#### Sub-sector 2.1: Capacity Building and Planning

- Analyse past incidents
- Review and support 2 pilot volunteer projects
- Provide trainings-of-trainers (ToTs) and material support to 2 EMCs
- Conduct FA and PFA trainings
- Train LAs on protection mainstreaming and humanitarian principles
- Continue the provision of ongoing technical support to LAs
- Material support for local DRM projects/measures

#### Sub-sector 3.1: Building Community Awareness/Mobilization

- Disseminate IEC materials on engaging in/influencing local DRM planning
- Facilitate consultations between LAs and communities

## SECTOR 2: WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE (WASH)

### Sub-sector 2.1: Water supply

- Conduct a Water Risk Assessment
- Develop Water Safety Plans
- Material support for water supply projects

## SECTOR 3: HUMANITARIAN COORDINATION AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

### Sub-sector 3.1: Coordination

- Facilitate regular coordination on DRR/DRM
- Hold a regional level workshop/event
- Continue to support coordination systems and linkages

## **KEY PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS**

Stakeholders	Role/responsibilities within the project
ACTED	Consortium leader and implementing actor in charge of tailored support for local contingency planning to authorities in 4 raions & 1 municipality along the LoC (GCA only), facilitates linkages between the local and humanitarian structures through joint work with LAs to adapt OCHA's IARA toolbox to their needs and to implement the WASH-related activities.
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 carry out protection monitoring to identify on-going and emerging protection risks; provide relevant protection and legal consultations; represent people in the court; and carry out advocacy efforts.
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 and enhancing community awareness, preparedness and response.
OFDA/BHA	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 (150,000 total beneficiaries)	Beneficiaries of the population within 10km of the LoC in the target areas, who will be covered by the local DRM action plans. Of these 150,000, 10,000 will benefit from WASH activities.
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 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 meeting their objectives.

The final evaluation of the complementary project funded by ECHO has been completed, thus findings of the present exercise may overlap and be similar to the ECHO-funded one<sup>2</sup>.

## RESEARCH CRITERIA<sup>3</sup> AND QUESTIONS

---

The evaluation shall use 3 of the 5 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, 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 organizations, 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 analyzing 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:

---

<sup>2</sup> Final Evaluation report of the complementary project is available and will accompany the submission of this TOR

<sup>3</sup> 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 multi-hazard vulnerability to disaster, increased water safety and improved community and institutional capacity 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?

The consultant is expected to analyse the relevance of project management in regard to the needs of the stakeholders involved (beneficiaries, partners, donor) and duly justify any issue. The assessment should analyse the relevance of each different component of the project (e.g., disaster management, WASH). The consultant should analyse any significant concern on the project's relevance. He/she should draw relevant lessons learned and recommendations, as well as highlight best practices, to ensure the relevance of future and current projects.

## 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? If so, how?

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? Specifically:



- a) Did the project results contribute to the reduction of multi-hazard vulnerability, increased water safety and improved community and institutional capacity in conflict-affected areas? If so, how did the Consortium partners achieve that in respect to their specific components?
- b) Was the project able to successfully complement and synergize with the similar project funded by ECHO? 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 possible<sup>4</sup>, 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:

---

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

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)	AMEU will 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 took place during the project and report on achievement of indicators.	Relevance 1.1 (a, b) Effectiveness 3.1 (a, b)
Consortium Senior Management	Will be interviewed for their reflections and assist in coordination where needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Manager (Head of Consortium): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Relevance 1.1 (a, b)</li> <li>○ Efficiency 2.1 (a, b)</li> <li>○ Effectiveness 3.1 (a, b)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Finance/Admin Manager: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Efficiency 2.1 (a)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Country Director: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Relevance 1.1 (a, b)</li> <li>○ Efficiency 2.1 (a)</li> <li>○ Effectiveness 3.1 (b)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
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 August 1, 2021 and shall be accomplished no later than September 15, 2021<sup>5</sup>. This schedule is subject to change depending on the epidemiological situation and other factors that may require the change. Bidders should provide an evaluation workplan detailing the number of working days required per evaluation activity (see below table).

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

<b>Evaluation activities</b>	<b>Suggested Schedule (FTE days)</b>
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>
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 phone 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.

<b>Deliverables</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Inception Report	To be delivered no later than August 15, 2021
Draft Final Evaluation Report	To be delivered no later than September 5, 2021
Final version of the Final Evaluation Report	To be delivered no later than September 15, 2021

For all deliverables, the external expert 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:

<b>Executive summary</b>  <i>(2 pages max)</i>	<p>Should be tightly drafted, and usable as a free-standing document. It should be short, not more than five pages. It should focus on the main analytical points, indicate the main conclusions, lessons learned and 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>
<b>Project synopsis</b>  <i>(this section should not exceed 1 page in length)</i>	<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>
<b>Methodology</b>  <i>(this section should not exceed 1 page in length)</i>	<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>
<b>Findings</b>  <i>(max. 2 pages per DAC criteria)</i>	<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 five DAC criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability).</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><b>Conclusions, Lessons Learned, Best Practices, and Recommendations</b></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 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>
<p><b>Annexes</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terms of Reference of the evaluation</li> <li>• Assessment tools used (questionnaires, checklists, scoring grids, etc.)</li> <li>• List of persons (job titles only, no names)/organizations consulted</li> <li>• List of literature and documentation consulted</li> <li>• Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses and other pertinent elements, graphs, etc.)</li> </ul>

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 project Monitoring and Evaluation, in particular disaster risk reduction 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
- Good knowledge of the Ukrainian context of the area is an advantage.

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 past experience, including description of the evaluation criteria, project, area of intervention, and total budget
- Technical Proposal including a detailed methodology and work plan
- Detailed Financial Proposal (cost effective and showing unit costs)

Please note that the consultancy 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 ensure 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.