GRC Terms of Reference (ToR)

End-term Evaluation for a CRM/GRC joint project entitled:

Increasing readiness of CRM (Malagasy Red Cross) and humanitarian disaster risk reduction to address humanitarian needs of vulnerable people exposed to natural hazards and disasters in informal urban settlements in Antananarivo, Madagascar

German Red Cross Contacts:

Miriam Morhart, Country Manager, GRC HQ M.Morhart@drk.de

Jonathan Bureau, Project Delegate, GRC Madagascar, J.Bureau@drk.de

Table of Contents

1 Background

Because of its geographic location in the Indian Ocean, Madagascar is regularly affected by devastating cyclones and floods. Multiple disasters such as Tropical cyclone Enawo (2017), infectious disease outbreaks have killed and displaced large numbers from rural areas, eroded people's coping capacities and exposed weak disaster governance and institutional capacity. Exposed to climate change, Madagascar will also in following years be regularly hit by hazards affecting large numbers of people with limited coping capacities. In Antananarivo the combination of unplanned urbanization and population growth, poor land management, and a dominance of informal settlements combined with lack of WASH infrastructure led to significant numbers of people at risk, even from relatively benign rainfall episodes. Disaster responses are coordinated by the BNGRC (Bureau National de Gestion des Risques et des Catastrophes), however, the Malagasy Red Cross (CRM) and other actors lack of institutional capacity to respond adequately to disasters. Lack of updated contingency and well-planned evacuations leads to use of buildings such as schools, offices of the head of *fokontany* (smallest geographical administrative unit in Madagascar) which are ill-equipped for prolonged stays. This in turn multiplies the cost and need of humanitarian assistance that needs to be provided to affected urban populations across sectors (shelter, food security, WASH, protection). Rapid urbanization and poor urban planning processes have resulted in the spread of informal settlements in the Malagasy's Capital. The worst affected groups are those living in low-income and/or informal settlements located in floodplains causing needs that go beyond the (response) capacities of the governmental institutions and overstress the capacities of the urban humanitarian systems/key actors, putting at risk people especially in the sectors of WASH, DRR, Health and Shelter.

Since April 2020, the Malagasy Red Cross (CRM), with the support of the German Red Cross (GRC) and funded by the German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO), is implementing the project "*Increasing readiness of CRM and humanitarian disaster risk reduction to address humanitarian needs of vulnerable people exposed to natural hazards and disasters in informal urban settlements in Antananarivo, Madagascar*". The project will end on 31.12.2022 and focuses on two main pillars:

1. **CRM institutional readiness:**
   - *Support to the realization of the Strategic Plan of the CRM*
   - *Training in Kobo collection and digitization of survey frameworks (emergency assessment, CAP surveys, beneficiary satisfaction assessment)*
   - *Reinforcement of data collection equipment (smartphones)*
   - *Self-assessment of the capacities of the Cash Transfer Programs and definition of an action plan for capacity building*
   - *Self-assessment of the operational capacities of the Analamanga Regional Committee (PER tool - preparedness for efficient response) and definition of an action plan to strengthen them*
   - *Training in Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (VCA) for volunteers of the Analamanga Regional Committee of the CRM and staff of the Disaster Risk Management Schedule of the Municipality of Antananarivo.*
   - *Basic First Aid training for CRM headquarters staff*
   - *Training of CRM volunteers and public service personnel - markets, bus stations, courts - as hygienists and COVID-19 awareness agents*

2. **Urban community-based humanitarian disaster risk reduction:**

- *Evaluation of evacuation sites in the fokontany of the 6 districts of the AUC*
- *Participation in the preparation of the Municipal DRR Plan*
- *Participation in the updating of the Municipal Contingency Plan*

2   Objectives of the End-term Evaluation

2.1   Purpose

The end-term evaluation should analyse and comment on the achieved status of the project and evaluate how effective and efficient the project has been to date in achieving its specific objectives. The end-term evaluation should be carried out based on the approved project proposal, in particular the logical framework, outlining the objectives of the projects and the operational work plans. Based on its results, the evaluation will provide CRM and GRC with lessons learned and detailed, actionable recommendations for a follow-up project.

2.2   Users of the evaluation

The primary audience of the evaluation findings are the staff of i) CRM in Antananarivo, GRC Antananarivo and at HQ in Berlin, ii) the Municipality of Antananarivo (where the project is implemented) iii) the BNGRC, iv) Community members who have been supported through urban humanitarian DRR or their representatives, v) the German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO).

3   Task description

3.1   Evaluation scope

The purpose of this end-term evaluation is to assess the achievement of the project´s expected results, indicators and budget execution as well as to provide detailed recommendations and lessons learned for future projects implemented by GRC and CRM, and especially for a follow-up urban DRR project in the same project area.

3.2   Evaluation criteria

This end-term evaluation process should be based on the following OECD-DAC evaluation criteria. The section below highlights these criteria including specific evaluation questions related to the project/program.

1. Relevance

- Were the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects?
- Were the project priorities in line with or complement those of the communities, authorities, and other national and international humanitarian actors including the CRM?
- Were the project priorities focused on the humanitarian priorities of the identified target groups? If not, why?
- Were the activities related to institutional preparedness (readiness) in line with priorities that CRM defined in this regard? Do the activities adhere to CRM's strategy?

- How do the activities contribute to the overall capacity-building efforts of Partner National Societies working with CRM?
- To what extent were the most vulnerable population reached / provided with assistance relevant to their current humanitarian needs?

2. Effectiveness

- To what extent has the program achieved its expected objectives?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- How effective was the programme in terms of responding to the needs identified by the affected communities and CRM (institutional preparedness/readiness)?
- To what extent could the intended target group be reached?

3. Efficiency

- Were the objectives achieved on time?
- Were activities cost-efficient?
- Were appropriate human resources (skills, experience and seniority) available to the programme in key areas of management, coordination, technical programme design and implementation?

4. Impact

- What is the impact of the project at community and neighbourhood levels, what real difference has the project made to the beneficiaries?
- What is the impact of the project within the CRM (Branch and HQ), and specifically in the area of urban institutional preparedness/readiness?
- To what extend did the project activities contribute to creating structures and systems within the organization to improve CRM's overall response capacities?

5. Gender, People with Disabilities and Community Engagement & Accountability (CEA)

- What has been done to ensure gender equality within the project? Were adequate measures taken to ensure equitable contribution by all genders to programme design and implementation?
- Did men and women participate in project activities to the same extent?
- Were people with disabilities and other vulnerable groups participating in the project and are their needs met adequately?
- Were communities engaged through this project using appropriate and trust mutual communication channels? Were they involved in the design, implementation, and any revisions of the programme? Was there a mechanism in place (e.g., CEA system) to receive, follow-up on and process complaints and feedback received by the targeted communities?

6. Sustainability:

- To what extent will the benefits of this project to CRM structures and capacities (both branches and HQ) continue after project end?
- Which measures were so far implemented to achieve sustainability?
- To what extent are the "differences made" for communities self-supporting and sustainable?

7. <u>Coherence and Coordination</u>

- How well is the project integrated into the wider National Society strategies and priorities?
- In how far are activities coordinated with other (humanitarian) actors and stakeholders in the project region and the same area of intervention?
- On which synergies (and/or gaps) within the RCRC Movement as well as with other stakeholders could the project build on in a follow up phase?

4 Evaluation design and methodology

4.1 Evaluation team

The evaluation team will be composed of one (1) external evaluator (consultant), with excellent command of French and English. Knowledge of Malagasy is an advantage.

The evaluator may or may not work with a (local) team under his/her entire responsibility (recruitment, management, indenisation etc.).

For detail of qualifications needed, see document "Request for proposal".

4.2 Evaluation design and methodology

The evaluator/evaluation team should use the available secondary data for analysis.

For the collection of primary data, participatory methods should be applied including opinions of the target group with special attention to ensure equal representation of youth, women, elderly, people with disabilities and other vulnerable community groups identified.

The evaluation methodology will include the following (but is not restricted to):

- Briefing with the project team of GRC and CRM
- Desk review of project documentation (project proposal, reports etc.)
- Interviews with relevant GRC Madagascar and HQ staff
- Interviews with key CRM personnel (staff and volunteers)
- Interviews with relevant local government stakeholders such as the Municipalities, chefs *fokontany* (quarter chefs) and BNGRC
- Interviews with project beneficiaries in all eight project neighbourhoods (ANOSIPATRANA oust, MANDRANGOBATO I, ANOSIBE OUEST II, IIIG HANGAR, ANKASINA, ANTETEZANAFOVONY, ANDAVAMAMBA ANJEZIKA I, area)
- Interviews with other relevant stakeholders such as INGOs/NGOs and other members the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement in Madagascar.

The choice of methods will have to be presented and described by the evaluator/evaluation team and will be approved by GRC and CRM. The IFRC standards for evaluation[1] should be respected and are the framework and basis for any evaluation activity executed by a consultant under GRC contract.

4.3   Sources

The evaluator (team) will have access to all relevant project documents like projects proposals, projects management documents (Log frames, activity plans, and budgets), monitoring tools, projects reports (narrative and financial) etc. The decision about the publication is the right of GRC.

5   Timetable and reporting

5.1   Reporting: Consultant Deliverables

Different deliverables are expected, as outlined below:

5.1.1   Inception report (max. 5 pages), including

- Tentative list of persons/stakeholders to be interviewed
- Feedback/amendment of the ToR – suggestions for ToR amendment if and where necessary
- Status of the evaluation preparation: timetable, team, distribution of tasks, reporting
- Evaluation design: chosen methods, approach, steps for their implementation
- Tools for the implementation (questionnaires, data processing and analysis etc.)
- Draft implementation plan for the evaluation

The inception report will be discussed with GRC and the evaluator(s). Any changes of the ToR need an agreement of both parties because they might change the conditions and thereby the contract between GRC and the evaluators.

5.1.2   Evaluation and validation workshop/ lessons learnt workshop

Representatives of stakeholders and the evaluators will come together in the validation workshop. The workshop will be organized to discuss and validate findings, lessons learnt, and recommendations proposed by the evaluator. Stakeholders might formulate additional recommendations if necessary. Possible content of an evaluation workshop:

- Presentation and discussion of the preliminary evaluation report

---

[1] **The IFRC Evaluation Standards** *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 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.

- Validation of lessons learnt, recommendations, identification of needs by all stakeholders
- Validation of lessons learnt and recommendations by all stakeholders, including recommendations for a follow-up project
- Collection of additional observations or recommendations/ needs mapping

It is expected that the evaluators present a structure for the workshop as part of their preliminary report. GRC/CRM are responsible for the workshop preparation and all related logistics.

5.1.3   Final report:

The final evaluation report should consider the validation of the stakeholders during the final evaluation and lessons learned workshop and must be delivered latest 10 days after the workshop. All evaluation works, inception-, preliminary- and final reports must be delivered in English language. The executive summary needs to be in English and French language.

The evaluator will give his/her recommendation but should incorporate the validation process during the workshop in the final report, including additional recommendations from the workshop participants. The report will have to be approved by German Red Cross (GRC Delegation in Madagascar and Country Manager at GRC HQ Germany).

The final report should, as a minimum, include the following elements:

- Key data of the evaluation (from the inception report)
- Executive summary – a tightly drafted, to-the-point, free standing document (5 pages max), with the following, fixed structure:
  1. Short project description
  2. Key questions of the evaluation
  3. Key findings: Structured (if applicable) along the OECD DAC criteria: Relevance / Effectiveness / Efficiency / Sustainability / Impact
  4. Lessons learned
  5. Major project-specific recommendations, including recommendations for a follow-up project
- Introduction – incl. purpose of the evaluation, scope, key questions
- Evaluation design and methodology
- Key findings with regards to the questions pointed out in the ToR
- Conclusions based on evidence and analysis
- Recommendations as expected in the ToR, which are relevant, feasible and targeted to the respective audience
- Lessons learnt and detailed recommendations for further project implementation and a follow-up project
- Annexes (ToR, list of consulted persons/organisations, consulted documentation, literature, etc.)

Key findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a clear and transparent way, possibly put next to each other in a table to demonstrate the logic.

The report can be extended by the evaluator by additional points if necessary.

The length of the final report should not exceed 20 pages, excluding annexes and executive summary.

5.2   Timeline and contract duration

Overall, 21 consultant working days (excluding travel days) are considered for this evaluation, tentatively starting at the beginning of October 2022 and to be completed before mid of November 2022.

Proposed Timeframe: 21 days *

Day n°	Task	Responsible person	Subtotal days/person
1-2	- Introductory Meeting with Consultant (virtually) - Analysis of relevant documents - Work on inception report	Consultant and GRC HQ/Madagascar	2
3	- In person kick off meeting with GRC Madagascar and CRM and preparation of project neighbourhood visits - Work on inception report	Consultant and GRC Madagascar/CRM	1
4	Delivery of inception report	Consultant	1
5 - 6	Review of inception report	GRC/consultants	2
7 - 14	Qualitative and quantitative data collection and preliminary analysis (field activity)	Consultant	8
15 - 16	- Data analysis - Work on draft report	Consultant	2
17	- Presentation and discussion of preliminary findings with GRC Madagascar/HQ and CRM - Work on draft report	Consultant and GRC HQ/Madagascar and CRM	1
18	Delivery of draft report	Consultant	1
19	Workshop with GRC Madagascar, CRM and other relevant stakeholders (local authorities, BNGRC) on findings and draft report	Consultant and GRC Madagascar and CRM	1
20	- Including workshop feedback and preparation of final report - Delivery of final report	Consultant	1
21	Final report discussion and feedback	Consultant and GRC HQ/Madagascar and CRM	1
	Total		**21 days**
	Travel days (international) – if needed **		2

* The proposed timetable may be subject to modification linked to potential new Covid-19 restrictions.

** In case of international travel and depending on the current Covid-19 situation, GRC regulations might require 2 – 5 days of quarantine to be taken.

6 Responsibilities and tasks

6.1 GRC

- Will be responsible for organizing and covering transportation within Antananarivo and accommodation during the evaluation.
- Will support the consultant with the necessary working material for workshops.
- Will facilitate the organization of the workshop or other activities depending on the proposed methodology.
- Will give a security briefing to the consultant.
- Will sign the contract with the consultant and cover the consultancy fees as per the contract
- Maintain coordination with the CRM Project Team in Madagascar

6.2 Evaluator

- Will conduct the evaluation as outlined in the TORs / inception report.
- Will specify arrangements required to organize the lessons learned workshop or any other activity in close collaboration with CRM and GRC
- Will follow the timeframe agreed, and shall communicate any unforeseeable change as soon as possible
- Will submit all deliverables (inception report, preliminary and final evaluation) to GRC as per the agreed timeline
- Will revise the draft, based on the comments from CRM and GRC.
- Will organise the travel to Madagascar

For information about the tender process, application details and material, award of contract, terms of delivery and payment see the document "Request for proposal".