



TERMS OF REFERENCE

End of Project Evaluation of Integrated Emergency Response Project – World Vision Burundi

1. Introduction

The purpose of this Terms of Reference is to provide a framework for planning and conducting the Final Evaluation for the Integrated Emergency Response Project in Burundi (IERP). The Final Evaluation will use both quantitative and qualitative methods to ascertain the impact of the project. It will also assess what factors enhanced and/or limited achievement of project targets as well as documentation of the results achieved and lessons learned for future programming.

2. Background and description of the project

The Integrated Human Emergency Response Project (IERP) in Burundi funded by the Federal Foreign Office of Germany through World Vision Germany, has since April 2017 been responding to the current sociopolitical crisis as well as natural catastrophes in Burundi resulting in the low health and nutrition status of children under five years as well as pregnant and breastfeeding women.

The project is implemented by World Vision Burundi in the communes of Cankuzo, Cendajuru, Gisagara, Kigamba and Mishiha in Cankuzo province, Bugenyuzi and Gitaramuka in Karusi province and Bukemba, Giharo and Rutana in Rutana province.

The overall goal of the project is to reduce the morbidity and mortality among children under five and pregnant and lactating women. The project aims to reduce acute malnutrition. By improving food security at the household level, a healthy household environment through water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) interventions, and strengthening health and nutrition services at community level and in health centers, the immediate problems of "insufficient food supply" and "diseases" can be addressed.

The IERP is designed to meet the immediate food access and nutritional needs of 38042 most vulnerable households in the target locations. The project target HHs were identified using Community Based Targeting and Distribution (CBTD) guidelines that ensured public participation and vetting during the beneficiary selection process. Accordingly, the selection criteria includes: most food insecure and vulnerable HHS whose livelihood assets have been depleted by the drought and conflict, HHs with malnourished children under 5, HHs with pregnant and lactating women, female-headed HHs, returnees from refugee camps, HHs supporting orphans or the elderly and as defined further by the communities. The project is intended to apply SPHERE as well as Core Humanitarian Standards during the planning and implementation and evaluation phase.

IERP end of Project Evaluation Terms of Reference

Integrated Emergency Response Project Summary	
Project locations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cankuzo Province: Cankuzo, Cendajuru, Gisagara, Kigamba and Mishiha communes - Karusi Province: Bugenyuzi and Gitaramuka communes - Rutana Province: Bukemba, Giharo and Rutana communes
Primary sectors	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH), Food Security and Health & Nutrition
Target population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Men: 14,823 - Women: 23,462 - Boys: 38,815 - Girls: 40,847
Project lifespan	Eighteen months (April 1 st , 2017 – September 30, 2018)
Project goal: Improved health and nutrition status, especially of children under five and pregnant and lactating women	
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prevalence of wasting in children under five years reduced from 6.21% to 4.8% - Prevalence of underweight in children under five years of age reduced from 31.60 % to 28% - Reduction of moderate acute malnutrition up to 2% among pregnant and lactating women - Target population using an improved drinking-water source on a year-round basis. - Proportion of HH with sufficient drinking water from an improved water source - 100 % of children with fever who were timely and appropriately treated
Result 1:	Risk of outbreak of waterborne diseases in Rutana and Cankuzo communes is minimized for 12158 people
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prevalence of diarrhea among children aged 6-23 months old is reduced from 40.80% to 30% - 90% of water sources attaining WHO water quality standards - Improved sanitation facilities for more than 7500 persons - 16 hills (administrative units in Burundi) have access to improved drinking water source
Activity 1.1	Construction and rehabilitation of 3 potable water springs/schemes in targeted communities (at HH level and public institutions) to reduce the risk of outbreak of waterborne disease.
Activity 1.2	Construction of 4 latrine blocks with appropriate sanitation facilities at public institution to mitigate the risk of waterborne diseases.
Activity 1.3	Construction of improved latrines and hand-washing facilities for 21165 households via Community Led Total Sanitation and Hygiene (CLTS) approach
Activity 1.4	Distribution of kits to HHs to improve hygiene and water quality (1733 hygiene kits for HH and 4 water quality testing kits for Communal water committees)
Result 2	Improved food security for 6756 Households in Cankuzo and Rutana, who are affected by the food crisis and climate hazards.
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 90% of targeted HH with Food Consumption Score (FCS) above 21

IERP end of Project Evaluation Terms of Reference

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Percentage of children receiving a minimum meal frequency increases from 14,4% to 19% - Proportion of HH with a minimum dietary diversity increases from 63,7% to 80%
Activity 2.1:	3,378 most vulnerable farmer households are assisted with food vouchers as a mean of securing the basis of their livelihoods.
Activity 2.2	6,756 crisis-affected smallholder farmer households are supported with inputs such as small livestock, seed and tool vouchers to enable the re-establishing of primary food production.
Result 3	Health and nutritional service delivery for children and mothers at community and health facility level is improved
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 10% increase of discharged cases (children aged 6-59 months) who recovered from Stabilization Centre (SC) and/or Outpatient Therapeutic Programme (OTP). - 90% of children aged 6-59 months with severe acute malnutrition (SAM) who keep increasing weight after receiving treatment - 38% of children given appropriate feeding during illness
Activity 3.1:	13,200 moderately malnourished, 1.381 severely malnourished children and 6756 malnourished pregnant and lactating women are treated via CMAM.
Activity 3.2	300 Community-based volunteers (CHWs, Mother Support Groups, CMAM promoters) are trained on Growth Monitoring Promotion, IYCF in emergency and on food fortification
Result 4	Risk of malaria transmission/outbreak is minimized in the 3 provinces Cankuzo, Rutana and Karusi
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 500 people participating in the malaria prevention campaign - 1500 children treated against malaria during mass treatment or presumptive treatment by the malaria epidemic response m+B33+C31:C35+C30:C+C8:C35
Activity 4.1	Equip 200 CHWs with lifesaving iCCM essential kits in Cankuzo Province
Activity 4.2	Support health facilities with malaria supplies (330 000 blisters of ACT) to enhance mobile clinics activities at community level in Cankuzo, Karusi and Rutana.
Activity 4.3	Support Ministry of Health and partners to conduct 1 campaign of social mobilization to enhance uptake of services by the malaria epidemic response mobile clinics in Cankuzo, Karusi and Rutana.

3. Evaluation purpose, objective and major questions

The IERP has planned for a Final evaluation to be undertaken as part of a culture of learning and accountability. A team of independent, external consultants will be contracted to assess the performance and results of the IERP against the mandate that was set in the project's strategic frameworks, and to determine the reasons for success or lack thereof, draw lessons and recommendations for improved performance in future food security, WASH and Health & Nutrition responses. The overall purpose of the evaluation is to provide independent assessment of the effectiveness and potential of sustained impact of the IERP project.

The overall purpose of the exercise is to evaluate the IERP project with a particular emphasis on its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coverage, impact and sustainability of interventions. In addition, the evaluation will identify, and document lessons learned and make recommendations that will be used to improve the design and implementation of other related projects and programs.

The evaluation will employ the six specific evaluation criteria from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) to guide the study.¹

The first objective is to assess the project's DAC evaluation criteria and should cover the following:²

Relevance/appropriateness – the extent to which the objectives were consistent with beneficiaries' needs and priorities

- To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid?
 - a. What are relevant local context factors, which may affect the project's outcomes?
 - b. To what extent were these context factors considered in the planning and implementation of the project?
 - c. To what extent did the relevant context factors change since the beginning of the project?
- Were the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
- Were the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the intended impacts and effects?
- Were the planned interventions appropriate to achieve the outcomes and goal?
- To which extent was the project build upon the capacity of the community and state and support governance and management systems?
- To what extent does the project intervention meet the demands and priorities of the target population and other concerned stakeholders?
- Is the program logic based upon an adequate needs assessment?
- Did the project ensure participation of partners and target groups throughout the various project phases?
- To which extent did the beneficiaries know their rights and entitlements?
- To what extent were adequate feedback and complaints mechanisms in place?
- To what extent did the project target the most vulnerable?

Efficiency - how economically resources/inputs were converted into results

¹ Evaluating Humanitarian Action. An ALNAP Guidance Booklet in http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/watsan2005/annex_files/ALNAP/ALNAP1%20-%20Evaluating%20Humanitarian%20Action.pdf

² Questions listed below could be redefined with the consultant at the beginning of the evaluation

IERP end of Project Evaluation Terms of Reference

- Did project activities overlap and duplicate other similar interventions (funded nationally and/or by other donors? Are there more efficient ways and means of delivering more and better results (outputs and outcomes) with the available inputs?
- Is recipient feedback indicating widespread cases where food/seeds received were taxed or stolen?

Effectiveness: the extent to which the targeted project objectives were achieved (or are expected to be achieved) and any lessons related to this for future interventions.

- Did the activities listed in the proposal result in total achievement of the specific objectives and attainment of outputs?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- Did the Monitoring and Evaluation system provide quality information that was appropriate and reliable in measuring the intended indicators?
- To what extent services and items were delivered in a timely manner, and to what degree service provision was adequately supported to achieve objectives on schedule.
- Was timely provision of support, goods and services achieved, according to the perceptions of key stakeholders?
- Were plans for coordination with UN, other donors and NGOs in place and implemented?
- How effective was this coordination?

Coverage: extent to which IERP's work includes (or excludes) population groups from an intervention and the differential impact on these groups.

- How many people have been affected in target area?
- What efforts were made to ensure that particular populations, vulnerable groups and poorest in the areas were not overlooked?
- Were beneficiaries correctly and fairly identified and targeted?

Impact - The evaluator will assess the positive and negative changes on stakeholders produced by the IERP project interventions, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

- What direct and indirect evidence is available that the action taken contributed to the reduction of mortality, morbidity and suffering and that the affected population was assisted in maintaining or resuming basic dignity and livelihoods?
- What are the main outcomes of the project so far? How do you assess its potential for long-lasting impact?

Sustainability & connectedness- The extent to which the benefits of the IERP's work are likely to continue once the project is completed - the long-term effects produced by the project (directly, indirectly, intended and unintended). Evaluators to pay particular attention to institutional factors, specifically the existence of strong partnerships and the extent to which local capacity is supported and developed when evaluating connectedness.

- What is the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of project outcomes and benefits after completion of the project?
- How effective were the exit strategies, and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints
- How self-supporting in particular is the assisted local counterpart?

The DAC criteria coherence is explicitly excluded to reduce the scope of this evaluation and to focus the available resources on the analysis of the remaining criteria

The evaluation should assess the above in relation to two central broad questions:

- a. What changes / outcomes / achievements have taken place?
- b. How have these changes / outcomes / achievements been brought about?

4. Evaluation approach and Methodology

The evaluation should follow a collaborative and participatory mixed methods approach that draws on both existing and new quantitative and qualitative data to answer the evaluation questions.

This will include:

- Briefing by World Vision Burundi and Germany,
- Evaluators lead a kick-off workshop, train enumerators in new tools used and will submit an inception report for further discussion
- Secondary information analysis:
Desk review of relevant programme and project documents and reports such as proposals, assessments, project budgets, monitoring and assessment reports, World Vision guidelines
- Direct information:
- Field visits to selected sites; among other surveys, interviews and/or focus group discussions with local partners, beneficiaries, governmental authorities and other stakeholders by the evaluator
- Submission of a draft evaluation report to World Vision Burundi and Germany
- Debriefing workshop with World Vision Burundi and stakeholders
 - i. To present the draft findings of the draft evaluation report
 - ii. To discuss substantive issues emerging from the draft report
 - iii. To gather feedback on the findings and build consensus on recommendations
- Submission of final evaluation report draft
- Submission of individual recommendations for WV Burundi and local partners

The evaluation should combine evaluation tools based on international standards and guidelines like OECD DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation. Furthermore, comparability to baseline data needs to be ensured.

It is expected that the Consultant will assess the quality of the project's impact logic and if necessary to develop a realistic impact logic based upon on the conducted interventions.

The methodological design is proposed by the Consultant to influence the evaluation design and it is expected that the evaluator will propose further approaches to ensure accuracy and rigour. A detailed methodology and data collection methods should be included in the Consultant proposal. This will be further developed in consultation with WV B DME Team during the inception phase of the evaluation.

The choice of method must also take into account the needs and capacities of the different target groups and stakeholders (children, mothers, pregnant and lactating women, staff of World Vision and local partners, local government entities [community elders, relevant ministries, local leadership] etc.), IERP project team, WV Burundi management team, WVG Program team and other WV sectors/Area Developments working in the same geographical area.

Methodological elements will jointly provide the data and insights required to answer the review questions and will include documentation review and key informant interviews, resulting in a final report.

The evaluator will report to WVB. Modalities of communication, feedback mechanisms and contact with stakeholders will be discussed during an inception workshop.

5. Deliverables and report deadlines and requirements

5.1 Inception Report: The consultant will prepare and submit an inception report in English detailing how the evaluation will be carried out from his/her point of view. The report will outline the evaluation design, sampling methods, methodologies to be used and questions to be answered and detailed work plan for the entire exercise. Draft questionnaires, interview guides and other data collection tools will be submitted to WV for review and approval before data collection starts. As part of the inception report, the consultant must provide a data analysis plan showing the questions and analysis for each of the project indicators to be investigated. **The evaluation framework for sustainability and guidance provided by World Vision should be used to elaborate the evaluation concept.**

Deadline: Three weeks before the data collection starts. The inception report needs the approval of World Vision Burundi and Germany.

5.2 Preliminary Report: The consultant will submit draft evaluation report in English to the IERP project team through supply chain. The draft report will be reviewed and comments provided on the report within a week of submission.

Deadline: 8 August 2018

5.3 Final evaluation Report

Deadline: 16/08/2018

The consultant will submit detailed final report in English outlining the evaluation methodology, findings, lessons learned and recommendations. The report shall incorporate specific simple and achievable recommendations, including the most appropriate strategies that can be undertaken and/or incorporated by WVB and partners to attempt to address the issues identified. The final report should address the issues and questions raised in this ToR and correspond to the evaluation objectives set out above.

A final report in both hard and electronic copies shall be made available to WV Burundi not later than August, 2018.

The report should contain (but not limited to) the following:

- Executive Summary presenting the major findings and recommendations.
- Evaluation aims, objectives, and scope
- Assessment of the project's underlying impact logic.
- Description of the methodology used.
- Limitations.
- Description of the assessment context and process including its constraints and challenges.
- Detailed findings (related to the objectives and structured considering DAC criteria and questions)
- Analysis of the findings (following the key questions outlined in the ToR).
- Conclusions

- Recommendations for the IERP
- Lessons learnt
- Reports on the capitalization of good practices

The annexes of the report should contain (but not be limited to):

- The evaluation Terms of Reference.
- Maps
- List of interviewed people, with affiliation, contact details and bibliography
- The data base on SPSS, STATA, Excel as an attached file
- Tools

Criteria to ensure the quality of the evaluation report ³

- The evaluation report should represent a thoughtful, well researched and well organized effort to objectively evaluate what worked in the project, what did not and why.
- The evaluation report shall address all questions included in the scope of work.
- The evaluation report should include the scope of work as an annex. All modifications to the scope of work, whether in technical requirements, evaluation questions, evaluation team composition, methodology or timeline need to be agreed upon in writing by the technical officer?
- Evaluation methodology shall be explained in detail and all tools used in conducting the evaluation such as questionnaires, checklists and discussion guides will be included in an Annex in the final report. Evaluation findings will assess outcomes and impact on men, women and youth.
- Limitations to the evaluation shall be disclosed in the report, with particular attention to the limitations associated with the evaluation methodology (selection bias, recall bias, unobservable differences between comparator groups, etc.).
- Evaluation findings should be presented as analysed facts, evidence and data and not based on anecdotes, hearsay or the compilation of people's opinions. Findings should be specific, concise and supported by strong quantitative or qualitative evidence.
- Sources of information need to be properly identified and listed in an annex.
- Recommendations need to be supported by a specific set of findings.
- Recommendations should be action oriented, practical and specific, with defined responsibility for the action.

5.4 Individual recommendations for partners and local stakeholders

Deadline: August 2018

6. Languages

All documents are expected to be written in English and professionally edited.

7. Reporting

The evaluation team will directly report to World Vision Burundi and World Vision Germany. They will be bound by World Vision rules of confidentiality. All material collected during the evaluation process will be handed over to World Vision Burundi prior to termination of the contract. The evaluation

³ Adapted from USAID Evaluation Policy, 2012 in http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/usaid_guidelines.pdf

IERP end of Project Evaluation Terms of Reference

report and all background documentation will become property of World Vision. The report will be published accordingly by World Vision Germany.

The evaluation team will not be allowed to present any of the analytical results as its own work or to make use of the evaluation results for private publication purposes.

8. Expected timeframe

#	Activity/Task	Deliverable	Province	Proposed dates
1	Advertise, call for CVs, references and work samples of at least one recent evaluation report of a humanitarian programme including DRR (Disaster Risk Reduction) components	Qualified consultant/team selected	All	19/04 – 11/05/2018
2	Review and selection of the consultant	Qualified consultant/team selected	All	14– 16/05/2017
	Interview with consultants and final selection	Qualified consultant/team selected and signing of contract	All	17 – 23/05/2018
3	Preliminary meeting with selected consultant to discuss expectations about key deliverables and other associated responsibilities	Common understanding & agreement on the way forward, expected deliverables. and detailed planning	All	24- 25/05/2018
4	Kick-off Document review Development of the inception report including methodology, data collection tools, analysis plan and work plan for review, feedback and approval. Presentation of the inception report. Planning meeting with WVB team	Inception Report developed, presented and approved. Agreement on work plan and related logistics	All	28/5 - 20/06/2018
5	Fieldwork <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community mobilization - Enumerator training - Pre-testing data collection tools. - Data collection. 	Quantitative and Qualitative data collected in all project locations	Cankuzo	25/06 – 7/7/2018
			Karusi	9 – 14/7/2018
			Rutana	16 – 21/7/2018
6			Cankuzo	23 – 25/07/2018

IERP end of Project Evaluation Terms of Reference

#	Activity/Task	Deliverable	Province	Proposed dates
	Data management: Data Cleaning, Sorting Analysis, Interpretation Debriefing meeting with WVB	Complete and clean datasets Initial findings shared with WV team	Karusi	26 – 27/07/2018
			Rutana	30-31/7 – 1/08/18
7	Writing and submission of draft report (Submission of consolidated report for all project locations done in July). Presentation of draft report/findings	Draft/progress report/s	All	2 – 8/08/2018
8	Review of Draft Evaluation report based on feedback provided.	Draft report reviewed based on feedback provided	All	9 – 13/08/2018
9	Debriefing workshop	-	All	14/08/2018
10	Finalisation and submission of final consolidated report.	Final report	All	16/08/18

The evaluation team leader is requested to immediately inform World Vision Burundi office if serious problems or delays are encountered. Any significant changes to the evaluation timeframe must be approved by World Vision.

9. Budget

Offers should include a proposed budget for the entire evaluation, covering all consultancy fees and additional costs. The budget should present consultancy fees according to the total number of expected working days over the entire period.

It is anticipated that the evaluation will last 25 – 30 working days.

The evaluation team is responsible for its own travel itinerary. World Vision Burundi will support organizing the logistics of the data collection.

10. Qualification of Consultant/evaluation team

- Experience in multi-methodological and interdisciplinary approaches and data collection and analysis techniques in evaluation of development programmes
- Demonstrable experience (at least 5 years) in research/evaluation of complex programs related to the sectors, research and analysis
- Demonstrable experience in project management in a development cooperation context in Eastern Africa
- Ability to conduct high quality research, meet deadlines and respond to requests and feedback provided timely and appropriately
- Excellent track record in designing and conducting quantitative and qualitative research, analysis and evaluation

IERP end of Project Evaluation Terms of Reference

- Experience in undertaking research with remote and marginalized communities
- Familiarity with international quality and accountability standards applied in emergencies.
- Strong analytical and conceptual skills to clearly synthesize and present findings, draw practical conclusions, make recommendations and to prepare well-written reports in a timely manner
- Excellent facilitation skills, co-ordination, negotiation skills and oral and written communication skills in English and French (particularly report writing).
- Demonstrated excellent written and spoken communications skills in English.
- Experience in assessing organizational capacity and gaps and ability to recommend the corrective measures.
- Demonstrated capacity to work both independently and as a team
- Fluent in English and French

II. Tender

Tenders/offers will be accepted by consultants as well as from commercial companies, NGOs or academics.

- Call for up to date CVs, at least two references for all evaluators involved and work samples of at least one evaluation report of a recent evaluation (in French)
- Covering letter explaining interest and suitability for this position
- Offers should include a proposed budget covering all consultancy fees and additional costs. The budget should present consultancy fees according to the total number of expected working days over the entire period.

The final decision on tenders will be taken by World Vision.

Deadline for CVs, references and work samples:

Forward CVs, references and work samples **electronically** to Ruth Gitahi (Ruth_Gitahi@wvi.org, World Vision Burundi) and Thorsten Baer World Vision Germany (thorsten.baer@wveu.org) by **11 May 2018**