Terms of Reference for Endline Evaluation

 for

Integrated Resilience Program (IRP) Program

1. **Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of study** | Endline Evaluation |
| **Purpose** | The purpose of the endline evaluation will be to measure the impact and sustainability of the components of the Integrated Resilience Program (IRP)  |
| **Audience** | * Swedish Red Cross (SweRC)
* Bangladesh Red Crescent Society (BDRCS)
* Partner National Societies (PNs)
* IRP donors (PKL, RHJ)
 |
| **Commissioners** | Bangladesh Red Crescent Society (BDRCS) and Swedish Red Cross (SweRC)  |
| **Reports to** | Program Manager SweRC and Program Manager BDRCS |
| **Expected start/end dates, number of work days** | Maximum 23 days (working days) over the period of May - June 2021. **Final report to be submitted by 20th June 2021** |
| **Location** | **Dhaka level:** National Headquarter of BDRCS**Jamalpur level:** Jamalpur Unit office, BDRCS**Islampur level:** Islampur field office, IRP**Community level:** Muradabad & Soshariabari (Pathorshi Union) and Tartapara & Maizbari (Noarpara Union) of Islampur Upazila  |
| **Deadline for receiving applications** | **1st May, 2021**  |

1. **Description of the Program**
	1. **Overview of Integrated Resilience Program**

Integrated Resilience Program (IRP) is a three-years-long disaster resilience program, which is being implemented by Bangladesh Red Crescent Society (BDRCS) with support from Swedish Red Cross, in the four (04) flood prone communities of Islampur Upazila in Jamalpur District. The major focus areas of the program are: enhanced disaster resilience of men and women of the flood prone area, child protection and anti-trafficking and inclusion of person with disabilities in disaster risk reduction. The program started on March, 2018 and ends on June 2021 and covering 8189 direct participants (1978 households). In order to increase the community resilience a number of interventions are ongoing. These include disaster risk reduction actions, Water, Sanitation & Hygiene (WASH) facilities, flood withstand shelters, alternative and adaptive livelihoods options, child protection and anti-trafficking awareness and prevention activities along with disability inclusive disaster risk reduction actions.

To increase people’s knowledge and awareness a number of trainings have been conducted and regular courtyard session, monthly coordination meetings are ongoing. To ensure the community engagement and program sustainability different community groups - Community Disaster Management Committee (CDMC), Community Disaster Response Team (CDRT), Women Squad (WS), Self-Help Group (SHG) have been formed at all the communities of the program. The program has a specific outcome on capacity building of local government institutes and to establish effective linkages between communities and service providing agencies. The program has done baseline, mid-term review and community child protection need assessment to identify the needs and priorities and changes over time.

* 1. **Program Goal and Outcome**
		1. **Program Goal**

Strengthen resilience of women, men, boys and girls, persons with disabilities in vulnerable communities against the impact of hazards, climate change and prevent, mitigate the risk of child trafficking

* + 1. **Program Outcome**

**Outcome 1:** Men and women of different ages and backgrounds including person with disabilities have increased capacities to anticipate, prepare for, and reduce impact of hazards and child trafficking risk in an integrated and inclusive manner

**Outcome 2:** Key institutional stakeholders, including BDRCS and relevant local government units, have increased capacity to support men, women, boys and girls, person with disability in building community resilience and ensure child protection to mitigate trafficking risk

**Outcome 3:** Linkage and coordination strengthened between communities and key institutions to support in implementation and contribute to sustainability of community resilience with child protection, prevention, mitigation of trafficking risk and disability inclusion.

1. **Purpose and Scope of the study**
	1. **Purpose of the study**

The endline evaluation will measure the changes with regards to resilience of the community during the program duration. Further the endline evaluation will assess the performance of Integrated Resilience Program (IRP) and to capture the Program’s achievements, challenges, best practices, key lessons, and recommendations to improve future resilience Programs of BDRCS and Swedish RC (SweRC). It will also be a significant advocacy document for further Program improvements, strategic planning and policy making in the arena of DRR and resilience, especially for the SweRC work in Bangladesh. Identifying examples of best practices and innovations of the IRP would be shared with targeted stakeholders, to advocate for, and make them better understand the importance of resilience Program for reducing the vulnerability of the communities.

The end line evaluation will also review the recommendations of the Mid Term Review (MTR), and other findings of monitoring activities that were conducted during the Program implementation. Besides this, the endline evaluation will assess the overall quality of the implementation.

The evaluation will be done based on the indicators of the program logical framework to identify the appropriate changes and impact during the program phase. The study will explore the specific engagement of women in disaster management and define the role of women in decision making process, along with assessing the extent of mainstreaming Protection, Gender & Inclusion (PGI) minimum standards in program activities. The evaluation should also explore the child protection and anti-trafficking action taken by the community people and look specifically at disability inclusion in disaster risk reduction activities.

* 1. **Scope of the study / evaluation**

The evaluation will be conducted at the four (04) communities of Jamalpur at a point of time when almost all of the Program activities have been implemented and a significant percentage of the funding has been spent. The results of the end line evaluation will be helpful for future resilience Program planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of SweRC and BDRCS. The evaluation findings and results will also be used by the stakeholders or change agents who are involved with this Program and implementing disaster risk reduction and resilience interventions. The end line evaluation will follow a few resilience characteristics mentioned in the IFRC Framework for Community Resilience to articulate the findings and recommendations. The findings of the study will also be compared between endline and baseline study results focusing on the Program indicators.

1. **Evaluation objectives and Criteria**
	1. **Evaluation objective**

**The End Line Evaluation will be conducted for the following objectives:**

* To evaluate whether the Program delivered effective, efficient, relevant and timely

activities to the targeted beneficiaries and community people as set in the Program logical framework

* To assess whether the community resilience has strengthened different groups of people including women, children and persons with disabilities in terms of better anticipation, preparation for and response capacity to floods.
* Explore if the coordination and collaboration among BDRCS, Government, non-government and other humanitarian organizations were strengthened in implementing community resilience interventions.
	1. **Evaluation Criteria**

Following are some standard questions that will need to be adjusted with the successful firm/consultant’s team, in agreement with the Evaluation Management Team, at the stage of the inception report.

**4.2.1: Relevance and Appropriateness**

* To what extent is the Program plan relevant and meeting the needs of the target communities? Is there a need to change Program implementation and/or direction in the future?
* To what extent the Program meets the outcomes and impacts articulated in the proposal?
* Are the activities and outputs of the Program consistent with the overall goal?

**4.2.2: Efficiency**

* How efficient was the delivery of the Program in terms of implementation of its interventions, sharing information and learning among the stakeholders?
* To what extent the Program modality considered the intervention quality?

**4.2.3: Effectiveness**

* To what extent the planned objectives in the logical frame of the Program were reached and delivered timely activities to the community people and targeted stakeholders as per the indicators to match with the Program goal?
* To what extend the program has ensured the recommendation of Midterm review and management response?
* What types of opportunities for collaboration between BDRCS and other stakeholders were explored and strengthened and did this collaboration contribute to increase effectiveness for flood resilience Program?
* To what extent the Program encouraged community engagement and ensured accountability during the Program life cycle management?
* To what extent the Program mainstreamed PGI minimum standards and Community Engagement and Accountability (CEA) minimum actions, as well as, disability mainstreaming in disaster risk reduction?

**4.2.4: Coverage**

* Were the community people, beneficiaries and targeted stakeholders reached as per the Program indicators and targets? To what extent were the beneficiaries, especially, the women, children and the persons with disabilities engaged and reached to the Program?

**4.2.5: Impact**

* To what extent the activities bring positive change to reduce vulnerability and build resilience capacity of the community? What are the changes among the beneficiaries and targeted stakeholders?
* Did the coordination and collaboration among BDRCS, Government and humanitarian organizations bring an effective impact on the community people, beneficiaries and other stakeholders?
* To what extent the communities build their capacity to respond to flood and are able to adapt with changing hazard situation?
* To what extent the community people changed their economic condition through the livelihood support?
* To what extent the community people adopted the water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) behaviors to improve their lifestyle?
* To what extend the communities people adopt local knowledge for the flood withstand shelter and how it has reduced the hardship of the vulnerable people of the area?
* Did the women have significant improvement of women in disaster management from proactive to reactive role?

**4.2.6: Sustainability and connectedness**

* Will the achievements accumulated under the Program retain its continuation in the targeted communities and stakeholders?
* What mechanisms were set in Program areas to retain the key Program outcomes in future?
* Were there any potential risks for retaining the Program results and continuing the achievement?
* To what extent are the relationships between key stakeholders and change agents likely to be sustained beyond the end of the project? Is there anything that could be done to strengthen these?
* To what extent are the capacities of the different stakeholders including BDRCS have been built by the project?

**4.2.7: Quality Standard**

* Does the operation include sex- and age disaggregated data?
* Any activities that aim to address the specific needs, protection risks, vulnerabilities and priorities of women, men, boys and girls, including persons with disabilities?
* Does the operation mention how vulnerable men and women of all ages and backgrounds were involved in the design, implementation and evaluation of the operation?
* Did the Program intervations prevent or mitigate specific safety/ protection/ risks/negative effects for women, men, boys and girls of all ages and backgrounds, created by the context (e.g. discrimination, sexual- and gender-based violence, forced labour or forced recruitment) or by the action itself (creating tension, reinforcing traditional power relations and gender roles, stigmatising beneficiaries or sexual exploitation and abuse of beneficiaries or other actions that risk doing harm)?
1. **Study management**
	1. **Supervision and management of the study**

A supervision team shall be formed with active participation from both SweRC Program Manager and BDRCS Program Manager. The team shall consist of SweRC Program Manager, SweRC Program Officer, BDRCS Program Manager, BDRCS IRP PMER Officer, PMER officer from BDRCS PMER Department, SweRC DRR and PGI Advisor from NHQ. Other relevant person from IRP team shall also provide need-based feedback in the study and the report.

* 1. **Coverage of Study**

The endline evaluation shall cover the four (04) IRP communities, which are: Sashariabari, Muradabad, Tartapara and Maizbari of Islampur Upazila in Jamalpur District. Along with this, the study shall also collect relevant information from Islampur field office, Jamalpur unit office and BDRCS NHQ.

1. **Methodology**

As part of the contract, the selected consultant/consultants shall provide a complete and detailed methodology of conducting the survey, which shall include: timeframe, research tools, methods, sample size and any other relevant segments to be used by the consultant.

The data collection will be both qualitative and quantitative in nature and will include information gathered on indicators mentioned in the program logframe. All data, qualitative and quantitative, collected through the assessment must be disaggregated by Sex Age Disability Disaggregated Data (SADDD). The result and discussion should clearly highlight the findings of the study, in relevance to the program outcome and should be self-explanatory with usage of graphical representation.

* 1. **Quantitative Data Collection:**

The consultant will design the questionnaire for quantitative survey based on the logical framework of IRP and share with IRP team before it is finalized, and field tested. The data collection modality, either paper or mobile based, need to be agreed with the team prior to application. BDRCS will provide necessary information and support to connect with relevant shareholders, community people and administration. The consultant will be solely responsible for data collection, setting up meeting, conducting survey, Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and Key Informant Interview (KII), data management and analysis.

The study will prepare and use appropriately designed questionnaires to be used in interviews to extract information from stakeholders. The sample size for study will be appropriately selected. The consultant must ensure that the procedure of sample design causes the least sampling error possible and helps to control the systematic bias in an efficient way. The methodology will be further detailed with the assistance of the consultant once commissioned, e.g. with an inception report. The final inception report is required to demonstrate a clear understanding and realistic plan of work for the survey. The inception report interprets the key questions and how the quantitative data will be used for triangulation of the quantitative data. It also elaborates a reporting plan with identified deliverables, draft data collection tools if needed, travel and logistical arrangements for the survey. The consultant, will start with a desk study, to detail the evaluation methodology and set-up.

* 1. **Qualitative Data Collection:**

The qualitative part will allow verifying the perceptions and knowledge of the beneficiaries in the communities. The questions of the qualitative data should be made in such a way that they reflect and strengthen the data driven from the quantitative survey, and also compliments the indicators whose results could not be driven from the quantitative survey. The following should at least be done in each selected community:

* Focus Group Discussion (FGD) with women, man, and person with disabilities who were the direct beneficiaries of the communities from the program
* FGD with school children
* FGD with the established committees under the IRP program (CDMC, CDRT, WS, SHG, Contingency Plan Groups)
* Key Informant Interview (KII) with community leader (CDMC and CDRT, SHG)
* KII with person with disabilities
* KII with school teacher
* KII with local government representatives (Union chairman, members)
* KII with SweRC and BDRCS IRP staffs
* KII with district and Upazila level government officials
* KII with Project Implementation Committee member in Jamalpur district and Water development board on flood early warning system

Triangulation of information gathered during the quantitative and qualitative research is crucial in this study, with reflection on how the findings relate to the secondary documentation.

The logical framework of IRP, from which the indicators are to be driven, is given as an annex inside the ToR.

1. **Key Deliverables and Timeframe**
	1. **Evaluation deliverables**

**Inception Report** – The inception report will be a scoping exercise for the evaluation and will include the Background/Introduction, proposed methodologies, data collection and reporting plans with draft data collection tools such as interview guides, the allocation of roles and responsibilities within the team, a timeframe with firm dates for deliverables, and the travel and logistical arrangements for the team etc. The inception report should be approved by the Evaluation Management Team.

**Debriefings / feedback to management at all levels**: The evaluation team will report its preliminary findings to the SweRC Bangladesh Country Office, BDRCS and operational partners.

**Draft report:** A draft report identifying key findings based on facts with conclusions, recommendations, and lessons for the current and future operation, will be submitted by the consultant within one weeks of the evaluation team’s return from the field.

**Final report:** The final report will contain a short executive summary (not more than 1,000 words) and a main body of the report (not more than 10,000 words) covering the background of the intervention evaluated, a description of the evaluation methods and limitations, findings, conclusions, lessons learned, recommendations and action points related to these. The evaluation findings should be presented in outcome wise and outcomes and further analysis under evaluation criteria. The specific recommendation should be made based on specific thematic of women involvement in disaster management, child protection and anti-trafficking and disability inclusive disaster risk reduction. Recommendations and action points should be SMART. The report should also contain appropriate appendices, including a copy of the ToR, cited resources or bibliography/reference, a list of those interviewed and any other relevant materials. The final report will be submitted one week after receipt of the consolidated feedback from BDRCS and IFRC. Last but not the least, the report should be conspicuous and lucid for readers of all levels.

**Case Studies:** To highlight stories of success in the field.

All products arising from this evaluation will be owned by the SweRC. The evaluators will not be allowed, without prior authorization in writing, to present any of the analytical results as his/her own work or to make use of the evaluation results for private publication purposes.

The draft and final reports will be submitted to Evaluation Management Team (BDRCS and SweRC), who will ensure the quality of the report providing input if necessary. The Evaluation Management Team will submit the report to the key stakeholders interviewed for review and clarifications. The Commissioner will oversee a management response and will ensure subsequent follow up.

**The Final Report will sketch with the following headings:**

* Acknowledgements
* Acronyms
* Glossary
* Executive Summary
* Introduction/Background
* Rationale and Objectives of the End Line Evaluation
* Scope of the End Line Evaluation
* Evaluation Methodology
* Findings and Discussion
* Recommendations
* Conclusion and lessons learned
* References

Annex (including a copy of the ToR, cited resources or bibliography/reference, a list of those interviewed, case studies and any other relevant materials etc.).

**7.2 Timeline**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activities** | **Key Deliverables** | **Time for the activity** |
| Review relevant program documents for better understanding on the program, along with secondary documents for literature review | Better understand the program and deliverable  | 2 days |
| Inception meeting with IRP team on key background documents and existing data collection tools | Presenting updated methodologyPresent final data collection tools (including questionnaire)Present timeline, which shall include: interview and community visit schedule (all levels)Inception report  | 1 day |
| Feedback by SweRC on questionnaire/and other data collection tools by IRP team | Feedback on questionnaire and checklist to consultant | 2 days |
| Finalize the questionnaire and approval from the IRP team  | Final questionnaire and checklist | 1 day |
| Data collection at all levels (NHQ, Jamalpur, Islampur and communities) | Qualitative data collectionQuantitative data collectionData cleaning | 8 days |
| Data analysis and report writing | Draft findings with statistics and graphical representation of data | 5 days |
| Feedback on draft report from IRP team | Draft report with analysis | 1 day |
| Revise, finalize and submit the final report, along with a brief presentation on the overall data analysis | Final report Presentation on the data analysis | 3 days |
| **Total 23 working days for the completion of the endline evaluation** |

1. **Quality and Ethical Standard**

The consultant hired should take all reasonable steps to ensure that the study is designed and conducted to respect and protect the rights and welfare of people and the communities of which they are members, and to ensure that the study is technically accurate, reliable, and legitimate, conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and contributes to organizational learning and accountability. The consultant should need to sign IFRC code of conduct and child protection policy. Therefore, the study team should adhere to the evaluation standards and specific, applicable process outlined in the IFRC Framework for Evaluation[[1]](#footnote-1). The IFRC standards for baseline and end line studies are:

**1**. Utility: Evaluations must be useful and used.

**2.** Feasibility: Evaluations must be realistic, diplomatic, and managed in a sensible, cost effective manner.

**3.** Ethics & Legality: Evaluations must be conducted in an ethical and legal manner, with particular regard for the welfare of those involved in and affected by the evaluation.

**4.** Impartiality & Independence; Evaluations should be impartial, providing a comprehensive and unbiased assessment that considers the views of all stakeholders.

**5.** Transparency: Evaluation activities should reflect an attitude of openness and transparency.

**6.** Accuracy: Evaluations should be technical accurate, providing sufficient information about the data collection, analysis, and interpretation methods so that its worth or merit can be determined.

**7.** Participation: Stakeholders should be consulted and meaningfully involved in the evaluation process when feasible and appropriate.

**8.** Collaboration: Collaboration between key operating partners in the evaluation process improves the legitimacy and utility of the evaluation.

**9.** It is also expected that the endline evaluation will respect the seven Fundamental Principles of the Red Cross and Red Crescent: 1) humanity, 2) impartiality, 3) neutrality, 4) independence, 5) voluntary service, 6) unity, and 7) universality. Further information can be obtained about these principles at: [www.ifrc.org/what/values/principles/index.asp](http://www.ifrc.org/what/values/principles/index.asp)

1. **Accountability and Communication Network**

The ownership of the output of this assignment belongs to IRP and shall be utilized for the defined purposes of the program. The consultant will ensure confidentiality of all information obtained during the assignment and related to the projects mentioned above. All data, materials in soft and hard copies remain the properties of IRP and are to be returned to IRP at the end of the assignment. The use of the data remains the sole right of IRP and any usage of data without prior approval from the IRP team shall be held illegal

1. **Obligations of Key participants in the Study**
	1. **Obligations of the Consultant**
2. Inform the IRP team in a timely status of progress made and of any problems encountered.
3. Implement the activities as expected, and if modifications are necessary, bring to the attention of IRP team before enacting any changes.
4. Report on a timely basis of any possible conflicts of interest.
5. Share the study report along with database (both soft and hard copy) to the IRP team
6. Share at least three copies of printed report with bindings
7. All types of cost for completing study from work start to final report (receiving final version by IRP team) submission will be carried by consultant
	1. **Obligations of the IRP team**
8. Make sure that the consultant is linked with the required human resources and logistics support and answer any day-to-day enquiries.
9. Facilitate the work of the consultant with beneficiaries and other local stakeholders.
10. Monitor the daily work of the consultant and flag any concerns.
11. Receive and sign off on deliverables and authorize payment
12. Coordinating with target communities to plan the survey data collection

	1. **Obligations of BDRCS - NHQ Technical Team**
13. Review and approve the proposed methodology.
14. Provide technical oversight in the review of all deliverables.
15. Monitor data collection process at community level
16. Provide timely comments on the draft report.
17. Receive and sign off on deliverables and authorize payment
18. **Responsibility and Competence**

The consultant agrees to comply in all professional tasks with the rules and regulations of IRP. Either party can cancel this agreement within a 7-day written notice. IRP team can terminate the agreement without notice and payment in the following cases:

* If the consultant cannot fulfil the requirements and the agreed deadlines
* If the consultant cannot submit the deliverables within the time specified in the mandate
* If the quality and standards of the work fail to meet reasonable standards that have so been communicated in writing.
1. **Required Qualifications**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Qualification** | **Required** | **Preferred** |
| Proven experience of conducting endline evaluation of a disaster resilience program |[x]   |
| Demonstrated experience from involvement in a resilience project and community resilience framework |[x]   |
| Demonstrated experience of working with Child protection and Anti-trafficking issues |  |[x]
| Demonstrated experience of working with mainstreaming of disability in disaster risk reduction |  |[x]
| University degree at post-graduate level in Social Science/ Environmental Science /Disaster management /Development Studies/ Statistics or other relevant subject |[x]   |
| Strong analytical skills and ability to clearly synthesize and present findings, draw practical conclusions, make recommendations and to prepare well-written reports in a timely manner |[x]   |
| Excellent in English and Bangla writing and presentation skills |[x]   |
| Immediate availability for the period indicated |[x]   |
| Experience working with RCRC Movement |  |[x]
| Well acquainted on disaster management structure of local government and experience to work with local government institutes |[x]   |

1. **Application and Selection Details**
	1. **Application material**

SweRC / IFRC is expecting application of team / consultancy firm with specific knowledge and expertise on disaster resilience, child protection and disability inclusion. The proposal should

include the following below six items. Please note that any proposal which does not contain all six items will be rejected.

1. **Cover letter** clearly summarizing your experience and competency as it pertains to this assignment (addressing Country Representative Swedish Red Cross, Bangladesh office, C/O: IFRC SweRC, 684-686 Red Crescent Sarak, Baro Moghbazar, Dhaka-1217.).
2. **Technical proposal** not exceeding eight (08) pages expressing an understanding and interpretation of the ToR, the proposed methodology, relevant experience and time and activity schedule.
3. **Financial proposal** itemizing estimated costs for services rendered (daily consultancy fees), accommodation and living costs, transport costs, stationery costs, and any other related supplies or services required for the review in BDT and modality of payment. Please also attach a TIN/Registration Certificate.
4. **Detailed CVs** of all professionals who will work on the process. CVs of proposed study team, please attach a table describing the level of effort (in number of days) of each team member in each of the endline evaluation activities.
5. **Professional references** needed to provide two or three references from your previous clients.
6. **Short example from previous endline** evaluation report (disaster resilience preferred) that is relevant to this work (5-7 pages)

*(Application materials are non-returnable, and we thank you in advance for understanding that only short-listed candidates will be contacted for the next step in the application process and the selection panel does not have the capacity to respond to any requests for application feedback. Please take note that expressions of interest that do not cover these requirements will not be considered.)*

* 1. **Application Procedure**

Please email complete applications to aminul.haque@redcross.se and copy to khalid.masud@redcross.se and anisur.rahman@bdrcs.org

* 1. **Deadline for Application:** The application deadline is 1st May, 2021.
1. [www.ifrc.org/what/values/principles/index.asp](http://www.ifrc.org/what/values/principles/index.asp) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)