Terms of Reference
Evaluation of ReBuild II Project
Implemented in Ethiopia and Uganda

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations

ADA – Austrian Development Agency

ADC – Austrian Development Cooperation

AU – African Union

CBO – Community-based organization

CDO – Community Development Officer

CRC – UN Convention on the Rights of the Child

FCDP - Family and Community Development Programs

FDP – Family development plan

FGD – Focus group discussion

FSP – Family strengthening program

GBV - Gender-based violence

ICAP - Institutional Capacity Development for Quality Child Care and Protection project

IGA – Income generating activities

ILO – International Labour Organization

IOR ESAF – International Office – Eastern and Southern Africa Region

KIP – Key implementing partner

LRRD – Linking Relief Rehabilitation Development

M&E – Monitoring and Evaluation

MA – Member associations

NO – National office

OHCHR – United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights

OVC – Orphans and Vulnerable Children

PL – Project/Programme Locations

PWD – Persons with disabilities

RBM – Results-based Management

SACCO – Savings and credit cooperative

SDGs – Sustainable Development Goals

SOS CV Ethiopia - SOS Children's Villages Ethiopia

SOS CV Uganda – SOS Children's Villages Uganda

SOS CVI – SOS Children's Villages International

SRHR – Sexual and reproductive health rights

VSLA – Village saving and loan association

1 Context and Background

1.1 About SOS Children's Villages

1.1.1 SOS Children's Villages International

SOS Children's Villages is a global federation present in 136 countries and territories via national SOS Children's Villages associations, working in more than 2000 programme locations worldwide. For more detailed information see https://www.sos-childrensvillages.org/

SOS CVI is represented in the Eastern and Southern African region by the regional office IOR ESAF, located in Addis Abeba, Ethiopia. Currently, SOS CVI is implementing a number of emergency projects in the ESAF region in Somalia, Uganda, Mozambique, Nigeria, South Sudan, Somaliland and Ethiopia. Experiences from these projects has helped the region in factoring in emergency response in its priorities.

The knowledge management and learning component (called "Umbrella") of the ReBuild II project is jointly implemented by SOS CV Austria and SOS CV IOR ESAF.

1.1.2 SOS Children's Villages Austria (SOS-Kinderdorf)

SOS-Kinderdorf (SOS Children's Villages Austria, SOS CV Austria) is a member of the SOS CVI federation and has established long-term working relationships with both SOS CV Ethiopia and SOS CV Uganda. The collaboration with SOS CV Uganda dates back to 1991, while the support to SOS CV Ethiopia started over 12 years ago. Specifically, since 2010, SOS CV Austria has partnered with SOS CV Ethiopia and SOS CV Uganda to introduce and promote the Family Strengthening Program (FSP) approach since 2007 and 2010, respectively, with co-funding from the Austrian Development Agency (ADA). Several Emergency response projects have been implemented in partnership with SOS CV Ethiopia in the recent past, in particular in the Somali region.

For the ReBuild II project, SOS CV Austria is the contract holder with the donor agency, ADA. In the implementation of this project, SOS CV Austria partners with the two Member Associations (MA) "SOS CV Ethiopia" and "SOS CV Uganda". All of them are part of the international federation SOS CVI, which has a regional representation, the International Office Regional Eastern and Southern Africa (IOR/ESAF), located in Addis Ababa.

The knowledge management and learning component (called "Umbrella") of the ReBuild II project is jointly implemented by SOS CV Austria and SOS CV IOR ESAF.

SOS CV Austria, as the contract holder with the donor agency ADA, is commissioning this evaluation in its role as evaluation manager.

1.1.3 SOS Children's Villages Uganda

Founded in 1991, SOS Children's Villages Uganda Trust (SOS CV Uganda) is an independent, locally registered non-governmental organisation existing to provide quality care and protection for children and their families who have lost parental care or those at risk of losing parental care. It provides direct services through the Alternative Care Model, capacity empowerment for the families and communities to care and protect their children through the Family Strengthening model. SOS CV Uganda is governed by a Regional Director at regional level in the board and a National Director at national level. At national level, it's constituted of functions including Finance, program development, Human resources and internal audit function. These report directly to the National Director and below them are the staffs including accountants, programme Directors at locational level, specialists for Children and Youths, Family Strengthening, Monitoring and Evaluation, Institutional Partnership Development and Advocacy and Gender.

For the last 10 years, SOS CV Uganda has been involved in community development interventions targeting vulnerable families, children, women, and youth in western Ugandan districts of Kabalore, Ntoroko, Bundibugyo, Kamwenge, and Kyenjojo. The organisation has key competencies in building the economic and livelihood capacities of the families to respond positively to child care and protection, and wellbeing of the children. The organisation to date has worked with vulnerable families and children including child headed families, orphaned children and youth, those affected by HIV/AIDS and conflicts,

and internally displaced people. To date SOS CV Uganda has touched the lives of over 60,000 children, youth, and caregivers directly or indirectly. SOS CV implements a unique model called Family Strengthening Program (FSP) that builds the capacities of the families to sustainably prioritize provision of care, health, education, life skills for the children and youth. The organisation complements the Government of Uganda efforts towards development especially in addressing issues of migration through strengthening the capacities of refugees and the host communities.

Through its work in western Uganda SOS CV Uganda has collaborated strongly with the local government and the civil society organisations in policy dialogues, implementation, planning and monitoring of interventions for improving wellbeing of children and youth.

SOS CV Uganda is implementing the ReBuild II project in the Rwamwanja refugee camp in Western Uganda.

1.1.4   SOS Children's Villages Ethiopia

SOS Children's Villages started to work in Ethiopia in 1974 with the opening of the first SOS Children's Village in Mekelle. For nearly 40 years, SOS Children's Villages Ethiopia (SOS CV Ethiopia) has supported the most vulnerable children and families in Ethiopia. In almost all programme locations, SOS Children's Villages Ethiopia has alternative care, family strengthening, education and training, as well as health programme units. SOS Ethiopia is particularly proud of its strong and active relationship with the federal and regional governments, which view SOS CV Ethiopia as an exemplary childcare organization. The government based their own guidelines for the care of orphaned and abandoned children on the principles and model of SOS CV.

SOS CV Ethiopia is highly committed to supporting vulnerable families and communities. This approach to sustainable development is two-fold – increasing the capacity of caregivers to prevent crises that lead to child abandonment and strengthening the network of social service providers. A large number of families supported through Family Strengthening Programs nationwide received advice on feasible income generating activity ideas, have become members of Savings and Credit Cooperatives, and gained access to micro-financing courtesy of SOS Ethiopia. As a result, our program partner SACCOs are becoming powerful financial institutions and their capital has showed rapid growth. On the other hand, trainings for CBOs that serve as key implementation partners are showing impressive gains over the years. These partner organizations are assuming increased responsibility for children participating in Family Strengthening Programs, independently providing supports for nearly one-fourth of participating children.

SOS CV Ethiopia is implementing the ReBuild II project in and around Gode, Somali region of Ethiopia.

1.2   About the ReBuild Project

Resilience Building for refugees and Internally Displaced Persons and Host Communities (ReBuild) is a two-year project implemented in Uganda's Rwamwanja refugee camp and Ethiopia's Somali region. The project's first phase, which was also a two-year intervention, came to a close in 2019 with substantial results. ReBuild Phase I contributed in helping IDPs in Ethiopia and refugees in Uganda withstand socio economic shocks. In January 2020 both member associations began ReBuild Phase II with funds from ADA. Phase II was based on Phase I's lessons learned and best practices. In Ethiopia, the project targets 526 direct beneficiaries with 326 are children & Youth. In Uganda the project aims to help 500 vulnerable families with 1,000 children and 350 youth.

The project was designed to contribute to improved resilience of internally displaced People, refugees and host communities in Ethiopia and Uganda through improved livelihood with special focus on environmentally friendly IGAs. This was supported by promoting awareness and responsive capacity on gender equality and child protection and to effectively enhance capacity in LRRD programming in SOS member associations.

The project's goal is to support internally displaced people, refugees, and host communities in Ethiopia and Uganda to become more resilient. In the past two decades there were attempts in the humanitarian field to bridge from emergency response to development programmes which make the link of relief and rehabilitation. The need to link relief to rehabilitation and development (LRRD), is one of the key agendas for SOS Children's Villages as it helps deliver better response to crisis-affected populations and vulnerable groups in a sustainable way. The basic idea of LRRD is to link short-term relief measures

with longer-term development programmes in order to create synergies and provide a more sustainable response to crisis situations. In this regard, it is commendable to engage IDPs, refugees and host communities in LRRD programmes, capacitate them to exploit available resources, apply local coping strategies and prevent aid dependency. This helps the communities to re-build their livelihoods and return to productive activities and eventually lead to sustainable livelihoods.

This was aided by improving gender equality and child protection awareness and response capability, as well as efficiently enhancing capacity in LRRD programming in SOS member organisations.

1.3   Description of programme location and context

Ethiopia

In Ethiopia, ReBuild project is implemented in Gode programme location in the Somali region. Gode town, the capital city of Shabelle zone, is a hub for humanitarian assistance and at the same time a business centre. The region experiences multiple overlapping humanitarian crises, resulting from consecutive years of severe drought conditions, as well as unprecedented inter-communal conflict, floods and disease outbreaks.

Shabelle zone in Somali region has largely "climate induced" displacements, showing multi-pronged nature of the disaster in the zone. The majority of IDPs identified in the Somali region were displaced to locations near their areas of origin. 62.36% of IDPs in the region are internally displaced from the region, within the region. Of the IDPs displaced within the region, 58.17% were displaced within their zone of origin. In general, in Ethiopia the majority of displacement sites are host communities and families and only the second type are spontaneous camps/sites.

Uganda

In Uganda, the ReBuild project is implemented in Port Fortal programme location in Kamwenge District (Western Region of Uganda). Rwamwanja refugee settlement was established in 1964 to host refugees from Rwanda, but closed in 1995 when many repatriated. The settlement was reopened in 2012 to host refugees fleeing insecurity in the Democratic Republic of Congo due to violence in North and South Kivu. The settlement, currently hosting over 78,000 refugees, is at full capacity and no longer receives new arrivals, however further refugees from Kivu have settled among local communities. With 429,236 nationals and 78,102 refugees in Kamwenge District, refugees in Rwamanja account for 15% of the district population.

Refugees at Rwamwanja Refugee Settlement supplement on-farm labor with a range of income-generating activities. Most households (96%) have at least one income earner. Refugees are mainly engaged in livelihood activities associated with low incomes and no job. A small percentage of households reported hawking/vending (3%), animal husbandry/livestock sale (2%), owning a small shop (2%), or any of several dozen other income generating activities.

2 Purpose and Objectives

2.1 Purpose

Why this evaluation is needed:

- The LRRD / Nexus approach is largely unchartered water. We need to know whether our concept has succeeded and if it is **fit to be replicated and scaled up** beyond the project, beyond SOS CV Uganda and SOS CV Ethiopia and potentially beyond the ESAF region. Subsequently, we wish to document the learnings from the approach to be able to identify its potential for replication or scaling-up.
- We need a thorough analysis of the past implementation regarding the most sustainable interventions that should be integrated in the **planning of the next phase**, which is going to be the final and consolidating phase (only in Uganda) and in the planning of other future projects.
- And of course this evaluation is also an instrument of showing **accountability** towards the donor as to what extent the expected results (outcomes and outputs) have been achieved.

All across the above mentioned functions of this evaluation (learnings for planning of next phase, and for replication and scaling-up, and accountability) it is crucial to keep a lens on the core thematic interests of ReBuild, which are (1) **resilience**, (2) **gender** (GBV) and (3) **child protection** (VAC). Each of these three areas have been central elements in the design of ReBuild I and ReBuild II and will continue to do so in ReBuild III and in potential other initiatives replicating or scaling up the ReBuild approach. They are also of high importance to the donor, hence should be evaluated also for accountability reasons. (find more details in chapter 4. evaluation questions).

Who is going to use this evaluation?

- The ReBuild project team in Uganda, as valuable input for the project design of the next phase, and the project team in Ethiopia, due to the closure of ReBuild.
- The donor agency, as a means for accountability and communication
- The stakeholders (UNHCR, OPM, other relevant local government bodies, local partner CBO's) as a reference document for knowledge sharing and learning

The evaluation is supposed to establish the level of achievement of specific objective, results and outcomes / outputs as per Logframe, Project Document, Workplan and Budget, taking into account the specific purpose, objectives, core thematic areas and prioritized OECD/DAC criteria, including the specific evaluation questions described in these Terms of Reference.

The task includes identifying successes and challenges, identifying gaps and good practices and draw lessons that can inform quality improvement and scale up.

2.2   Objectives

While the project needs to be evaluated to a certain extent along all the 6 OECD/DAC criteria

https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm

at least giving an overall impression, there are some criteria that are of specific importance to meaningfully feed into the purpose and objectives (see chapter 2.1) of this evaluation. More or less time and resources may be devoted to the evaluative analysis for each criterion depending on the evaluation purpose in the specific country/component context.

Note: this is specified - and may be different - for each component (Uganda, Ethiopia and the Umbrella component respectively) in the below table.

Ranking of importance of OECD/DAC criteria for this evaluation process:

1 – essential, 2 – moderately important, 3 – marginal

	relevance	coherence	effectiveness	efficiency	impact	sustainability
Ethiopia	2	3	1	2	1	1
Reason for ranking			essential for future programming		project closing	essential for future programming
Uganda	2	3	1	2	3	1
Reason for ranking			essential for design of phase III		will be essential for next evaluation after phase III	essential for design of phase III
Umbrella	1	3	1	2	3	1
Reason for ranking	essential for phase III	n/a	essential for capacity development approach in phase III		will be essential for next evaluation after phase III	essential for capacity development approach in phase III

The objectives of the evaluation are summarized below as per the table above:

- Primary objectives (give maximum focus, time and effort)
  - ✓ **Effectiveness** and sustainability of **all 3 project components** (Uganda, Ethiopia, Umbrella)
  - ✓ **Impact** of the **Ethiopia component**
  - ✓ **Relevance** of the **Umbrella component**
- Secondary objectives (give medium time and effort)
  - ✓ Efficiency of all 3 project components in relation to participants, cost and timeframe
  - ✓ Relevance of the Uganda and Ethiopia component
- All remaining as per the above table are still relevant but should only be evaluated in a broader sense to give an overview without going into deeper detail. This is to ensure the evaluation is keeping the focus on the most relevant questions without completely neglecting those that are rated less important.

In general, the evaluation will assess the changes, the project has made on children, their families and communities at large and it should also evaluate whether or not the project interventions were designed and implemented in a way that allows meaningful, and equal access participation for all beneficiaries, irrespective of their gender, age, disability status or origin.

The evaluation is supposed to analyse the achievements regarding the Learning and Capacity Development component of the project. Besides respective cross cutting questions that are integrated in the 3 thematic areas (chapter 4), there is also a separate set of questions to ensure sufficient focus on this aspect.

IMPORTANT! All across the evaluation and all across the specific evaluation questions in particular (see chapter 4), data collection and data analysis have to be **disaggregated at least by gender, disability status, age and target population** (e.g. refugees, IDPs, host communities). The question, whether girls and boys, female and male youth, women and men, host communities and IDPs/refugees have benefitted differently from the project interventions is an important aspect of this evaluation.

3   Scope

3.1   Involvement of stakeholders / key informants:

- Beneficiaries
- Project team
- Settlement and district leadership
- SOS staff involved in the project (UG, ET, IOR, AT) especially MEAL, IPD, PD
- Donor

3.2   Geographic:

Ethiopia – samples from all intervention Kebeles of Gode town

Uganda – samples from all 3 intervention zones, plus 1 or 2 selected zones which were part of the initial assessment but not chosen as intervention zone (to serve as control groups)

3.3   Time:

The evaluation needs to cover the 2 years implementation period of ReBuild II. There is a comprehensive evaluation available on the first phase, ReBuild I, which can and should be used as a reference document.

However, due to the extraordinary circumstances (COVID-19 pandemic outbreak) the situation of many beneficiaries changed dramatically. As far as beneficiaries from ReBuild I were taken on board as participants in ReBuild II, the evaluator should also take into account the developments of the last year of ReBuild I, to give a more comprehensive picture of the progress or potential fall backs of those beneficiaries in this specific context. In that regard, the evaluation may expand its time scope to 3 years (year 2 of ReBuild I and year 1 and 2 of ReBuild II). This should help to get valuable information as to how future programs should be designed to effectively and sustainably support participants in the ongoing pandemic situation. (Also refer to specific evaluation questions in chapter 4)

3.4   Thematic / Structural:

As mentioned in Chapter 2.1 the thematic areas of resilience, gender equality and child protection are the pillars of the design of ReBuild II and as such clearly within the thematic scope of the evaluation. Two further areas, which are equally important are youth empowerment and capacity development, which are cutting across the before mentioned 3 thematic areas. Respective evaluation questions are integrated accordingly. (Also refer to specific evaluation questions in chapter 4)

The evaluation has to be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by ADA as reflected in the Guidelines for programme and project evaluations. Failure in respecting those will result in termination of contract and suspension of payment. More information can be found on the donor website in the evaluation section: https://www.entwicklung.at/en/ada/evaluation

4 Evaluation questions

In order to help the evaluator to focus on the specific interests of conducting this evaluation, regarding purpose and specific objectives, a set of key questions is provided that have to be addressed in full by the evaluators. The questions are clustered around the core thematic areas of the project and need to be seen in reference to the respective OECD/DAC criteria that apply to them. Learning and capacity development, while being cross cutting the thematic areas, has an additional set of specific questions to ensure that sufficient focus is given to it. The evaluation questions need to be addressed by giving evidence-based answers, taking into account the data that will be collected during the evaluation process.

Disaggregation by gender, disability status, age and origin: see note "IMPORTANT!" at the end of chapter 2.

4.1 Resilience

Psychosocial support, economic empowerment, youth empowerment, environmental protection

Note: In the context of ReBuild, resilience is defined as the ability to absorb psychosocial and socio-economic shocks at the individual, family and community level. Therefore, the project addressed on the one hand psychosocial issues by providing context specific needs based psychosocial support. On the other hand, in order to absorb economic shocks, the project worked extensively on economic empowerment of the target group.

Environmental issues are becoming of increasing importance when we talk about resilience, as environmental degradation and climate change are posing serious threats to communities. Therefore, the evaluation is expected to take also a number of evaluation questions in that regard into account. In particular in the view of the purpose of this evaluation, the evaluator is expected to look into the respective questions to provide input for potential replication/scale-up and for the planning of the next phase in Uganda.

- Overall question: What is the participants view on what impact will be still visible in 5 years after the project has ended? To what extent did the respective activities (as per logframe and workplan) contribute to improved resilience of the participants?

- To what extent have participants benefitted from provision of essential services?
- To what extent has the project effectively contributed to socio-economic empowerment of young women and young men?
- To what extent has the project enabled project participants and targeted communities to respond to and withstand current and future psycho-social shocks?
- To what extent has the project enabled project participants and targeted communities to respond to and withstand current and future socio-economic shocks?
- To what extent have the selected activities been relevant to that target group (clearly differentiating between women and men) and their (also gender specific) socio-economic environment?

- How far did youth and caregivers engage in environmentally friendly agricultural skills or IGAs?
- To what extent has the project influenced the environmental degradation in the intervention area positively or negatively? What should be done in future programmes in that regard?

- Bearing in mind that the COVID-19 pandemic is not over and might not be the only pandemic ever: How should future programs be designed to effectively and sustainably support participants in the ongoing pandemic situation (see also time scope chapter 3).

- To what extent have capacity building efforts of the project contributed to a better service provision and subsequently to an improved resilience of the beneficiaries?
- To what extend did target youth and women benefit from capacity building and trainings on entrepreneurship, social and business skills?
- What are the lessons learned: Which best practices can be drawn from the project? And which approaches should be avoided in future?

- How should future programs be designed to effectively and sustainably support participants in the ongoing pandemic situation (see also time scope chapter 3).

4.2   Gender and GBV

In spite of several interventions to combat GBV and child marriage, and seemingly well-functioning partner CBO's, the available data shows that the prevalence is still high.

- How has the prevalence of GBV, teenage pregnancies and child marriage changed in the different intervention zones, and what is the conclusion to draw from that?
- To what extent has the project been able to integrate aspects of gender equality and protection against GBV in their activities effectively?
- What should be done in future programs to combat GBV and child marriage effectively?
- How well did the project integrate concrete measures to strengthen gender equality?
- How effective was the referral system and referral feedback within the programme?
- How far did the life skills and psychosocial services support children, young people and caregivers?

- What role has the (still ongoing) COVID-19 outbreak played and what should be done in that regard to mitigate those effects?

4.3   Child protection and VAC

- How has the prevalence of child abuse changed in the different intervention zones, and what is the conclusion to draw from that?
- To what extent has the intervention contributed to protect children and their rights? Are there discernible changes?
- How do those changes look like and which interventions in particular have produced those changes?
- What should be continued, done differently, or stopped?
- How effective was the referral system and referral feedback within the programme?
- How far did the life skills and psychosocial services support children, young people and caregivers?

- What role has the (still ongoing) COVID-19 outbreak played and what should be done in that regard to mitigate those effects?

4.4   Learning and Capacity development

- To what extent have the recommendations from the evaluation of phase 1 been implemented in the phase 2 of ReBuild?
- How did the recommendations for ReBuild I contribute to the realization of the current project achievements?

- To what extent have the capacity development initiatives under ReBuild II brought about discernible knowledge increase and better practices among staff and local partner organizations regarding Nexus / LRRD programming?

13

- Was there a good gender balance in the accessibility to and participation in those capacity development initiatives?
- How did the exchange and learning workshops in LRRD approach benefit staff and relevant stakeholders (including Government, CBOs, I/NGOs etc.) in understanding the concept?

- In the view of a potential roll out in the wider ESAF region:
  How is the LRRD handbook received and used by staff, local partners and stakeholders?
  To what degree is it perceived as relevant to their daily work and programming?
  What are their recommendations or from the evaluators on how to improve the document in terms of usability, accessibility, structure, methodology, etc.?

Below is a general overview on the 6 OECD/DAC criteria and their meaning. This is meant as an overview for better orientation. It does not replace the specific evaluation questions above, but should help creating a common understanding on those criteria. The ranking as per chapter 2.2 still applies.

OECD/DAC Criteria for evaluating development assistance	
Relevance	
Is the intervention doing the right things?	o How well does the programme address a real need of the target group? o To what extent are the outcomes of the programme still valid in view of identified needs? o How well does the programme match national and partners/institutions policies? o To what extent can the programme react to changes in context by adapting the intervention to remain relevant?
Coherence	
How well does the intervention fit? Internal and external coherence	o To what extent does the programmes support or undermine other interventions (particularly policies), and vice versa? o Is the programme internally coherent? (i.e. synergies and interlinkages between the programme and other interventions carried out by SOS, including consistency with internal standards and norms) o Is the programme externally coherent? (i.e. consistent with other actors' interventions in the same context, including complementary, harmonization and co-ordination with others)
Effectiveness	
Is the intervention achieving its desired results?	o To what extent were the outcomes achieved / are likely to be achieved? o What were the major factors influencing achievement or non-achievement of the outcomes? o Was the programme altered due to unexpected negative effects? How were negative effects minimised and positive effects maximised?
Efficiency	
Are resources being used wisely?	o Were activities cost-effective? o Were outcomes achieved on time and on budget?

		Was the programme implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
Impact		
What difference does the intervention make?	o	What happened – positive and/or negative – as a result of the programme?
	o	What difference has the programme made for beneficiaries on a 5-7 year perspective?
	o	Are there any enduring changes in systems, norms or environment that unfolded transformative effect?
Sustainability		
Will the benefits last?	o	To what extent did the benefits continue after the programme ended?
	o	What were the major factors that influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme?
	o	How were cross-cutting topics considered in sustainability actions?

5

6   Design and Approach

The technical proposals should be very explicit in terms of articulating how the evaluation is conducted to deliver the stipulated deliverables. The approach, methodology and work plan should be premised on core principles of quality assurance in the execution of all milestones and deliverables. The proposed approaches will employ a mixed research approach; quantitative and qualitative methods to provide strong evidence of achievement against the key evaluation questions, craft the applicable methodology (how and what we shall do) and identify problems and opportunities in the ReBuild project in Uganda and Ethiopia and the Umbrella component.

The different methods shall include the following: analysis of documents, structured interviews, semi-structured interviews face-to face or by phone, focus group discussions, online-survey (if relevant) and any other methods relevant to evaluation objectives and scope.

Data triangulation and quality control are very important and need to be discussed in the inception report.

Disaggregated data collection and analysis including gender, disability status, age, origin (host community or IDP/refugee) wherever possible is mandatory and constitutes a central quality criterion for all deliverables. This includes that the applied methodology has to ensure that male and female, and all respondents in all their diversity get equal opportunity to voice their views and that the settings need to be designed in such a way that they allow for sufficiently safe spaces to encourage women, men, boys and girls, PWD, and of all origins equally to respond freely.

The use of modern technology in the process (mobile devices for documentation, videography, etc.) is welcome but not mandatory.

The technical proposal should adequately respond to the needs of the ReBuild project in terms of addressing relevant indicators and key expectations. The following are the key project indicators that are defined to measure how close the project is to its desired path and outcomes. They will be largely available through the projects monitoring system. However, in some key areas, it is the evaluators' task to establish those figures independently to ensure unbiased evaluation of the achievements. (See also ranking of OECD/DAC criteria in chapter 2, evaluation questions in chapter 4 and deliverables in chapter 6.)

Specific Objectives: Improved resilience of 700 families of IDPs, refugees and host communities in Gode in Ethiopia and in Rwamwanja refugee settlement in Uganda by 2021

1. Percent of families with at least one new or improved livelihood to sustain themselves for at least 6 months in case of an economic shock

Outcome 1: Improved livelihood with special focus on environmentally friendly

1.1 Target IDPs, refugees and host communities have increased income by an average of 50%
1.2 Target families or groups of IDPs, refugees and host communities improved their basic livelihood assets (such as small ruminants)
1.3 # of target youth, women and families of IDPs, refugees and host communities with environmentally friendly IGAs (including start-ups)
1.4 % increase of target groups (youth, women from targeted families of IDP, refugees and host community) who use loan and/or saving services

Outcome 2: Improved awareness and responsive capacity on Gender equality SDG: 4.7, 5.1, 5.2, 5.5 GAP II: 7, 9, 19

  2.1 Proportion of women reported improved participation in decision making
  2.2 Proportion of women with improved participation in economic opportunities
  2.3 Target community members increased knowledge on gender equality
  2.4 Average monthly reported GBV cases by community structures.
    (% of decrease of GBV reported cases in community structures.)
  2.5 % increase of male engagement in child care and HH chores.

Outcome 3: Improved awareness and responsive capacity on child protection SDG: 4.7, 5.1, 5.2 GAP II: 7, 9, 19

3.1. # of children with birth certificate

3.2. # of community structures who can identify and respond to child protection risks

3.3. # of child abuse cases reported to community structures.

3.4. % increase of children reported their environment (like home, school, neighbourhood) is safe

3.5. % increase of children and young people that report participating in decision making at household level.

3.6. % increase of children accessing strategic social services (education, food support, health care).

3.7. # children with special needs enrolled in and attend school.

Outcome 4: Increased capacity in LRRD programming of SOS Members in the ESAF region and relevant stakeholders in Ethiopia and Uganda SDG: 4.2 GAP II: -

4.1. # of staff and relevant stakeholders with increased knowledge and skills on LRRD

4.2. # of participants in two or more learning and experience sharing LRRD workshops

4.3. # of documented and shared models on LRRD approaches (target min 1)

4.4. # of relevant networks / platforms SOS is participating in

7 Work plan

The evaluation will be conducted in February 2022 and final report prepared over a period of 4 weeks after the evaluation. The final report should be submitted by End of March 2022.

Activities	Dates	Responsible
Submission of bid (electronically)	20.01.2022	Candidates
Contract signed and documents provided	28.01.2022	Contractor
Kick-off meeting	01.02.2022	Meeting between contractor and consultant
Conduct desk research (general)	1.2.-5.02.2022	Consultant
Prepare evaluation and submit suggested data collection methods and interview partners to the contracting body (inception report)	06.02.2022	Consultant
Comments on the inception report	06.-10.02.2022	Contractor
Inclusion of comments in inception report and submission of final inception report	11.02. 2022	Consultant
Field visit, conduct data collection (interviews etc.)	12.02 - 02.03. 2022	Consultant
Analyse data and prepare draft report (see report structure in ADA Evaluation guidelines)	03.03 – 06.03. 2022	Consultant
Submission of draft report	07.03.2022	Consultant
Comments on the draft report	11.03.2022	Contractor
Collection and inclusion of feedback in final draft report	Until 18.03.2022	Consultant
Submission of final evaluation report to contractor (hard and electronic copy)	25.03.2022	Consultant

The evaluation will be carried out in 3 stages. All steps that lead to deliverables are marked in bold.

Stage 1: Prepare

Undertake all required preparations for the field evaluation: propose detailed methodology, conduct desk research, identify key informants, plan data collection process, organisation & logistics, and prepare field visit schedule. Submit and secure approval for the refined evaluation design and methodology in an inception report: document (i) proposed methodological set-up, (ii) locally adapted and proposed data collection tools. Preparation of checklists, participant lists and other management/organisational information for data collection.

Stage 2: Conduct

- Facilitate learning during the data collection exercise.
- Collection of data as per the agreed methodology and tools.
- Analysis of the data.

Stage 3: Submit findings

- Preparation of a draft report in English
- Presentation of the findings to the programme staff / national office staff / international team (face-to-face).

- After having received feedback from the various stakeholders – finalise the report and submit it in English.

Deliverables:

The consultants will submit the following reports:

- An inception report
- A draft evaluation report including an executive summary, and
- The final evaluation report with an executive summary.

All reports need to be written in English.

The executive summary should summarize key findings and recommendations (two-to-three pages).

The findings and recommendations of the draft final report and final report have to be structured according to the evaluation questions, the weighted OECD/DAC criteria and the 3 project components. The identified lessons learned and best practices as well as recommendations need to be given in a way that allows for practical implementation in the third phase of the project, starting in 2022. An outline of the report's structure needs to be agreed upon during the inception phase.

8 Evaluation Management Arrangements

When at the programme location, accommodation and transport to the field will be organized by the member association, including the **full coverage of costs** during the entire stay of the researcher(s) (not to be included into price proposal).

SOS Children's Village and the Austrian Development Agency will provide support (information/interviews; providing relevant documents, feedback to draft of the draft review, participation at presentation of draft findings). The interviews will be arranged and supported after agreeing on the action & time plan. National or location level staff (SOS) will be available at site to help organizing the interviews including contacting SOS, announcement and local preparation of evaluation, linking to community duty bearers and national authorities if required.

9 Requirements for the evaluator(s)

The international consultant, if he/she is neither Ethiopian nor Ugandan, is expected to team up with local enumerators from these countries. Furthermore, the team of consultants will work closely with the respective national M&E coordinators of SOS Uganda, SOS Ethiopia and the SOS CV Austria and regional office IOR ESAF in order to facilitate a comprehensive understanding of the organization and easy access to information and contact persons.

The evaluator(s) must not have been involved in the design or implementation of the ReBuild II project.

Diverse evaluation teams (gender, PWD, origin, age, etc.) will have a competitive advantage in the selection process.

Sound understanding of the **current discourse in the area of gender equality programming** is crucial for this assignment.

Key qualifications of the researcher / team should be:
- proven competency (record of previous experiences) in project/programme evaluations, including terminal or end line evaluations
- Relevant academic degree (master level) in one or more of the following fields: Development Studies, Monitoring & Evaluation or a relevant, directly related discipline.
- Knowledge of Ethiopia and Uganda with focus on topics such as community development, gender programming, LRRD, socio-economic strengthening, etc.
- a good understanding of child rights and issues affecting vulnerable children and their families
- working experience in Ethiopia and Uganda
- good facilitation, organizational and interpersonal skills

- proven experience in participatory processes and data collection methods (including age appropriate data collection methods)
- strong analytical and conceptual skills
- excellent writing and communication skills in English
- sound MS Office and IT skills

10 Specifications for the submission of offers

The bidders are welcome to submit their proposal for the evaluation in the location of Rwamwanja in Uganda and Gode in Ethiopia. This bid is open to all national and international suppliers (independent consultants or companies) who are legally constituted and can provide the requested services. The bidder shall bear all costs of the bid; costs of a proposal cannot be included as a direct cost of the assignment. The proposal and all supplementary documents have to be submitted in English language. Financial bid needs to be stated in euro.

IMPORTANT NOTE: The evaluation has to be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by ADA as reflected in the [Guidelines for programme and project evaluations](). Failure in respecting those will result in termination of contract and suspension of payment. More information can be found on the donor website in the evaluation section: https://www.entwicklung.at/en/ada/evaluation

Should there be any indications in these ToRs, that seem contradictory to the ADA guidelines, or seem ambiguous, the content of the ADA guidelines prevails!

10.1   Submission of Bids

The submission duly stamped and signed should be done electronically in PDF format and sent to Valerie Neuhold-Maurer (valerie.neuhold-maurer@sos-kinderdorf.at) and Abraham Tesfatsion (Tesfatsion.Abrham@sos-kd.org)

10.2   Documents to submit

- Bid submission / identification form
- Previous experience format
- Price schedule form (including taxes)
- Technical proposal
- CVs of the research team member(s) including current geographical location(s)
- Three references (at least two of them must be familiar with your work)
- An example of a recent/relevant evaluation report (if available for public use)

10.3   Deadline for submission

The proposal has to be received at the latest on January 20, 2022. Proposals received after the deadline will be not be considered.

10.4   Modification and withdrawal of bids

Proposals may be withdrawn on written request prior to the closing date of this invitation. Any corrections or changes must be received prior to the closing date. Changes must be clearly stated in comparison with the original proposal. Failure to do so will be at bidder's own risk and disadvantage.

10.5   Signing of the contract

SOS Children's Villages will inform the successful bidder electronically and will send the contract form within 2 weeks after closure of the bid submission deadline. The successful bidder shall sign and date the contract, and return it to SOS CV Austria within seven calendar days of receipt of the contract. After the contract is signed by two parties, the successful bidder shall deliver the services in accordance with the delivery schedule outlined in the bid.

10.6 Rights of SOS Children's Villages

- contact any or all references supplied by the bidder(s);
- request additional supporting or supplementary data (from the bidder(s));
- arrange interviews with the bidder(s);
- reject any or all proposals submitted;
- accept any proposals in whole or in part;
- negotiate with the service provider(s) who has/have attained the best rating/ranking, i.e. the one(s) providing the overall best value proposal(s);
- contract any number of candidates as required to achieve the overall evaluation objectives

10.7 Evaluation of proposals

Each proposal will be assessed first on its technical quality and compliance and subsequently on its price. The proposal with the best overall value, composed of technical merit and price, will be considered for approval. The technical proposal is evaluated on the basis of its responsiveness to the Terms of Reference (TOR). Bidders may additionally be requested to provide additional information (virtual presentation or phone interview) to SOS Children's Villages on the proposed services.

The criteria for selection are:

Method: The proposed method for evaluating the programme is suitable

Timetable/work plan: The timetable/work plan is realistic and meet the needs of the project

Cost: The cost of the proposal is reasonable and feasible, given the other aspects of the proposal

Experience: The training and experience of the consultants in evaluations and recommendations from organisations for which the consultant(s) has previously worked

10.8 Duration of the contract and terms of payment

Payment will be made only upon SOS Children's Villages acceptance of the work performed in accordance with the above described deliverables. Financial proposals should include proposed stage payments. Payment will be effected by bank transfer in the currency of billing and is due 30 days after receipt of invoice and acceptance of work.

Funding and Payment: The consultant will be paid by SOS Children's Villages as follows:

25% on the submission and approval of inception report

25% on completion of the draft report

50% on completion of final report

Duration of contract: the contract is effective from the moment it was signed until the acceptance of work by the international project team.

10.9 Notice of delay

Shall the successful bidder encounter delay in the performance of the contract which may be excusable under unavoidable circumstances; the contractor shall notify SOS Children's Villages in writing about the causes of any such delays within one (1) week from the beginning of the delay.

After receipt of the Contractor's notice of delay, SOS Children's Villages shall analyse the facts and extent of delay, and extend time for performance when in its judgment the facts justify such an extension.

10.10 Copyright and other proprietary rights

SOS Children's Villages shall be entitled to all intellectual property and other proprietary rights including, but not limited to, copyrights, and trademarks, with regard to products, processes, inventions, ideas, know-how, or documents and other materials which the Contractor has developed for SOS Children's Villages under the Contract and which bear a direct relation to or are produced or prepared or collected in consequence of, or during the course of, the performance of the Contract. The Contractor

acknowledges and agrees that such products, documents and other materials constitute works made for hire for SOS Children's Villages.

All materials: plans, reports, estimates, recommendations, documents, and all other data compiled by or received by the Contractor under the Contract shall be the property of SOS Children's Villages and shall be treated as confidential, and shall be delivered only to SOS Children's Villages authorized officials on completion of work under the Contract. The external consultant is obliged to hand over all raw data collected during the assessment to SOS Children's Villages.

10.11 Termination

SOS Children's Villages reserves the right to terminate without cause this Contract at any time upon forty-five (45) days prior written notice to the Contractor, in which case SOS Children's Villages shall reimburse the Contractor for all reasonable costs incurred by the Contractor prior to receipt of the notice of termination.

SOS Children's Villages reserves the right to terminate the contract without any financial obligations in case if the contractor is not meeting its obligations without any prior notice:

- agreed time schedule
- withdrawal or replacement of key personal without obtaining written consent from SOS Children's Villages
- the deliverables do not comply with requirements of ToR

11 Annexes

11.1 SOS Children's Villages child protection policy and code of conduct

SOS Children's Villages International has a child protection policy and code of conduct that all consultants will be expected to comply with and will be required to sign a statement of commitment to the policy. This will happen upon signing of contract, together with an orientation of consultants on internal child safeguarding processes and data protection regulations.

Before the actual start of data collection, a police check is to be provided, in case any direct contact with programme participants and/or any sensitive data is planned.

In addition to the above mentioned, the following key areas for ethical consideration need to be taken into account: http://childethics.com/ethical%20guidance/

The successful bidder is requested to obtain written consent from all participants of the evaluation process and/or their official guardians/representatives (when applicable).

11.2 Bid submission / identification form

This bid form must be completed, signed and returned to SOS Children's Villages. Bids have to reflect the instructions described in the Request for Proposal and Terms of Reference.

Any requests for information regarding this Request for Proposal shall be send to Valerie Neuhold-Maurer (valerie.neuhold-maurer@sos-kinderdorf.at) and Abraham Tesfatsion (Tesfatsion.Abrham@sos-kd.org)

The Undersigned, having read the complete Request for Proposals including all attachments, hereby offers to supply the services specified in the schedule at the price indicated in the Price Schedule Form, in accordance with the Terms of Reference included in this document.

Offering service for: [insert organization and name].

Company/Institution Name/Individual's Name_____

2. Address, Country: _____

3. Telephone: _____ Fax _____ Website_____

4. Date of establishment (for companies): _____

5. Name of Legal Representative (if applicable): _____

6. Contact Person: _____ Email: _____

7. Type of Company: Ltd. Other _____

Validity of Offer: valid until:_____

Date

Signature and stamp

11.3 Previous experience form

Description (services and products provided to the clients relevant to the current RFP)	Client	Contact person/phone, e-mail address	Date of assignment (from/to)

11.4 Price schedule form

The financial proposal needs to include all taxes.

	Activity	Staff involved (indicate profile)	Number of people	Number of days	Daily rate	Total price per row	% of total price
			A	B	C	D=AxBxC	E=D/F
1	Preparation of data collection						
2	Data collection						
4	First draft of the final report						
5	Final report						
	Total Price (F)						100%

Accommodation and local transportation to be covered by Member Association, not to be included into price proposal.

11.5 Technical proposal (guideline)

Name of Organisation/Firm/Independent Consultant	
Name of contact person for this proposal (for organisation/firm)	
Address:	
Phone/Fax:	
E-mail:	

The technical bid should be concisely presented and structured in the following order to include, but not necessarily be limited to the following information listed below.

1. Quality and Relevance of Technical Proposal

- Describe understanding of the task (in own words) and highlight areas that need further clarification.
- Describe all actions related to defining data collection methodology and conducting the evaluation
- Realistic work plan with time lines in accordance with ToR
- Detailed quality assurance process for data collection and analysis

2. Qualification and expertise of or organisation/team of consultants/consultant submitting proposal

- Reputation of firm/organisation and staff and individual consultant/s (competence and reliability) in carrying out evaluations
- Relevance of:

- Specialized knowledge

- Proven expertise in carrying out formative evaluations in comparable fields

- CVs for key staff

11.6   Report criteria

11.6.1   Inception report criteria

See ADA Guidelines for programme and project evaluations. In particular Annex 4.

The inception report in English with a maximum length of about 10 pages. The inception report should be provided electronically.

The inception report structure is to be found in the before mentioned guidelines and must be strictly adhered to

11.6.2   Evaluation Report criteria

See ADA Guidelines for programme and project evaluations. In particular Annex 5.

The evaluation will result in the concise ReBuild II evaluation report, in English with an approximate length of 30 pages including an Executive Summary, covering all 3 project components (Ethiopia, Uganda, Umbrella). Additional separate reports on those components are possible but not mandatory. However, it is important that the findings, conclusions and recommendations clearly indicate to which of the components they are referring to, if not to all three.

All confidential information should be kept in a separate annex to protect participants. The final report should be provided electronically and in hard copy.

The evaluation report structure is to be found in the before mentioned guidelines and must be strictly adhered to.

The evaluation report needs to be submitted with a completed Results Assessment Form (RAF), which captures the degree of results achievement of the project at different (output, outcome and possibly impact) levels.