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***Plan International***

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR:**

***Final Evaluation of Plan International’s Ukraine Humanitarian Response, funded by BMZ, Building, Back, Better (BBB) - Project for the Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of Child-focused Infrastructure in Ukraine***

**Summary table**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Country covered*** | **Ukraine** |
| ***Dates*** | **23/09/2022 – 30/04/2024** |
| ***Type of contract*** | **Payment by milestone consultancy contract** |
| ***Overall objective of evaluation*** | **The purpose of the final evaluation is to assess the effectiveness and impact of the BMZ funded project, and to determine its sustainability. The Evaluation will help to identify areas for improvement and make necessary adjustments to ensure success in the second phase of the project whilst ensuring that key lessons are taken into account to further maximise the impacts of the project.** |

**1. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE**

Plan International has been entrusted with the responsibility to commission and publish an independent final evaluation report for the Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development Phase One project in Ukraine (BMZ Phase One). The externally delivered summative evaluation will provide an assessment of Plan International’s BMZ Phase One programming and operational delivery. The external evaluation will aim to provide an objective and impartial assessment on the project due to it’s independence form the implementing organisation and implementing local partner. Recognizing the importance of transparency and accountability, the Terms of Reference (ToR) for this evaluation has undergone a rigorous review process and has been approved by BMZ. Plan International values this collaborative approach, reinforcing our dedication to learning and enhancing the impact of our interventions in times of crisis.

### 1.1. About Plan International

We strive to advance children’s rights and equality for girls all over the world. As an independent development and humanitarian organisation, we work alongside children, young people, our supporters and partners to tackle the root causes of the challenges facing girls and all vulnerable children. We support children’s rights from birth until they reach adulthood and enable children to prepare for and respond to crises and adversity. We drive changes in practice and policy at local, national and global levels using our reach, experience and knowledge. For over 80 years we have been building powerful partnerships for children, and we are active in over 75 countries.

**1.2. About the Commissioning Office**

Plan International Ukraine (PIU) has been operating in Ukraine since August 2022 and focuses on supporting children and adolescents affected by the humanitarian crisis inside of Ukraine, especially (internally displaced) girls and young women in their protection (incl. protection from gender-based violence (GBV), sexual and reproductive health rights (SRHR), access to education and learning as well as access to mental health and psycho-social support (MHPSS).

PIU focuses on six strategic sectors as part of its response to the Humanitarian Crisis in Ukraine:

1. to provide direct life-saving humanitarian assistance;
2. to enhance child protection systems;
3. to expand availability of MHPSS services;
4. to ensure continued formal and alternative quality education and learning;
5. scaling up the response to GBV; and
6. to protect and promote sexual and reproductive health rights.

**1.3. About the Partner**

Ruki Druziv *(“Hands of Friends”)* was established in 2016. Ruki Druziv implements projects focused on providing direct assistance to marginalised and vulnerable group in the conditions of war and humanitarian disaster – focusing on families with children, persons with disabilities, elderly, and IDPs. Their main expertise lays in the monitoring of needs, procurement, logistics and transfer of humanitarian goods.

### 1.4. Project Background

Plan International Ukraine is working in partnership with Ruki Druziv to deliver a project which is aimed at equipping, rehabilitating and/or reconstructing of at least 75 educational and physical infrastructures relevant for children (including schools, kindergartens, youth and temporary IDP centres as well as libraries). Effective reconstruction and rehabilitation activities aim to contribute the immediate well-being of war-affected children and their families and are indispensable public institutions and services that contribute to the protection and mental health of children during the ongoing war of aggression. The project, intended as Phase 1 of a larger long-term program in the framework of Ukraine's reconstruction (including an envisaged nexus chapeau with potential GFFO (AA) funded activities) and also a second phase of the ongoing project; “Building Back Better 2”, has benefited Ukrainian children in the catchment areas of the project sites in the 4 oblasts of Khmelnytskyi, Kirovohrad, Cherkassy, and Vinnytsia. Moreover, the initiative focuses on assisting various groups affected by displacement in the targeted Oblasts, specifically targeting Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), children in host communities, and those returning to their homes. Thus, the project applied a programming approach towards conflict transformation as it has indirectly contributed to the social cohesion of the people coming together in the communities by equally benefiting these three groups. The approach "Building Back Better" will be decisive in the measures under Outcome 1 and Outcome 2 of the project deliverables. The overall objective is to benefit at least 33,838 children and their families.

Plan International also collaborated with Ruki Druziv under this project by providing technical support, advice and guidance for the delivery of activities. Ruki Druziv remained directly responsible for the rehabilitation, equipping, and reconstruction of the child-focused physical infrastructure in the four Oblasts of Ukraine, reconstructed child friendly educational infrastructures, and provided equipped shelter to IDPs in the four oblasts.

|  |
| --- |
| 1.4. Project Outcomes |
| **Outcome 1:** The situation of children with and without refugee background is improved through the rehabilitation, equipment, and reconstruction of child-focused physical infrastructure in four Oblasts of Ukraine. |
| **Outcome 2:** The capacities of public and private child protection, mental health and psycho-social support actors are strengthened age- and gender-sensitive in four Oblasts of Ukraine. |

**2. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND USE**

### 2.1. Purpose and Focus of the Evaluation

### 

The purpose for this evaluation is to assess the effectiveness and Operational Excellence: the performance of the project and capture project achievements, challenges, lessons learned for continuous improvement and promising practises to inform future implementation. The evaluation will ensure accountabilitytowards Plan International Germany, BMZ as a Donor of the project, stakeholders, as well as the beneficiaries of the project. On the other hand, it offers a learning opportunityfor all stakeholders involved in the project, including PIU. The evaluation will also identify key lessons learned, recommendations and challenges and assess the flexibility of the programme to adapt and respond to the changes and sustainability of the project.

**3. EVALUATION PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY**

### 3.1. Evaluation Criteria

In order to analyse the achievements and changes brought about by the action in relation to the project objectives, the evaluation will have the following areas of interest:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Evaluation questions** |
| **Relevance** | To what extent did the program suit the needs and priorities of the target group?  How were the different needs of the stakeholders taken into consideration in the design and delivery of activities?  Were the activities and outputs of the program consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objective?  Were the activities and outputs of the program consistent with the intended impacts and effects? |
| **Efficiency** | Were the program activities delivered on time, to the right people, of the right quality as set out in the program documents and as reported?  Were activities cost-efficient?  Was the program or project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives? |
| **Effectiveness** | What has contributed to the successful/unsuccessful implementation of program activities? What are the lessons learned? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objective?  To what extent was the project’s objectives achieved?  *Please note – the project did not have outcome level indicators and so these questions are the sole method of measuring effectiveness.* |
| **Impact** | What real difference/changes have the activities made to the target group? How do the adolescents, caregivers and other beneficiaries see the impact themselves and how do they describe the changes?    What potential positive or negative unintended consequences the program might be generating? |
| **Sustainability** | To what extent are the benefits of the program going to continue, or are likely to continue?  Were any innovative approaches or practices introduced which contributed to improved sustainability?  What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the program? |
| **Cross cutting issues** | To what extent did the project incorporate gender-sensitive approaches in its design and delivery?  How do participants from different gender groups perceive the impact of the rehabilitation works and MHPSS services?  How effectively did the project identify and address the specific needs of minority groups and persons with disabilities?  To what extent were individuals in remote areas provided with support and actively included in the project?  What consultation as well as specific feedback mechanisms were considered and implemented for this project and how effectively did they work (CHS 5)?  How effective were safeguarding approaches implemented under this project? |
| **Coordination and coherence** | To what extent was the relationship between PIU and implementing partners equitable Were plans for coordination with clusters and local NGOs, government services in place, and followed?  How did the organisations harmonise and coordinate their interventions with other partners?  How effective were the communication and coordination processes between the PIU and Ruki Driziv?  What lessons were learned from the partnership coordination, and how might these inform future collaborative efforts? |

### 3.2 Beneficiary assessment

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Evaluation questions** |
| **Relevance and coherence** | Whether/how the program is consulting stakeholders including beneficiaries to understand their needs (at the start before design and during program implementation)? |
| **Efficiency** | What are the beneficiaries’ perspectives on the quality and usefulness of interventions and whether these meet their needs (particularly women & girls /marginalized groups, such as people with disabilities)? |
| **Effectiveness** | What inputs/benefits beneficiaries are gaining from the programs (reflecting on the intended results in the log frame)?  Do all the targeted groups benefit from the program in the intended way and to understand any differences in the inputs, and benefits, that different groups of recipients receive? |
| **Impact** | How did the program respond to the needs and interests of different beneficiary groups?  How did different beneficiary groups participate in program activities and what was the level and type of engagement (particularly women & girls, marginalized groups, such as people with disabilities)? |
| **Sustainability** | To what extent are the benefits of the program going to continue, or are likely to continue? |

### 3.2. Users of the Evaluation

### 

### Plan International has identified four primary areas, in which the end of project evaluation can by utilised by end users:

### Programme planning: The development and dissemination of the product on Plan International websites to inform humanitarian knowledge and contribute to the humanitarian response knowledge base; including partner stakeholders working in the region.

* **Inform phase 2:** PUI and Ruki Druziv programme and operations teams will use the insights gained from the summative evaluation to guide strategic changes for Phase 2 of the project delivery. This process aims to enhance service delivery, ensuring the response is evidence - informed, and changed are.
* **Global advocacy:** The evaluation is intended to be used for advocacy by the Ukraine Crisis Response team It will be used by GNO and PiU for highlighting the issues facing the vulnerable population in the Ukraine Crisis Response and raising funds to action the gaps identified by the evaluation.
* **Business development:** The evaluation will provide an opportunity to reflection on the strategy and assumption guiding the project recommendations to inform the design and development of future project. The final product will help identify contextual challenge, and priorities to strengthen the design of future proposal developments.

### 3.3. Methods for Data Collection and Analysis

### 

The data collection approach will use a mixed method design, integrating both quantitative and qualitative data collection, which will aim to incorporate child friendly, age-appropriate approaches where relevant. It is further expected that the consultant(s) will develop a detailed methodology for data collection, data management and analysis methods of data collection in order to inform project indicators. The summative evaluation process shall be conducted by an independent consultant(s) who shall develop appropriate tools for data collection with different stakeholders as outlined in this TOR.

The final data collection methods will be discussed and agreed with PIU and the successful consultant, but may include:

**Interview with delivery partners**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Partner** | **Who** | **No. interviews** | **Days required** |
| Ruki Druziv | Managerial and project implementation employees | 2 | 0.5 days |
| Ruki Druziv | Shelter managers/support | 2 | 0.5 days |
| Ruki Druziv | Teachers/principals/educational support workers. | 2 | 0.5 days |
| Ruki Druziv | Psychologists and mental health workers | 2 | 0.5 days |

**Interview with institution heads**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Partner** | **Who** | **No. interviews** | **Days required** |
| Ruki Druziv | Management of institutions constructed/rehabilitated | 5 | 2 days # |

## **Focus group discussions with beneficiaries – 5 days**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Partner** | **Beneficiaries** | **No. of FGDs** | **No. of people** | **Days required** |
| Ruki Druziv | Girls (6-11) | 1 | 6-8 | 0.5 days |
| Ruki Druziv | Boys (6-11) | 1 | 6-8 | 0.5 days |
| Ruki Druziv | Girls (12-17) | 1 | 6-8 | 0.5 days |
| Ruki Druziv | Boys (12-17) | 1 | 6-8 | 0.5 days |
| Ruki Druziv | Adolescents - girls | 1 | 6-8 | 0.5 days |
| Ruki Druziv | Adolescents - boys | 1 | 6-8 | 0.5 days |
| Ruki Druziv | Adults - men | 1 | 6-8 | 0.5 days |
| Ruki Druziv | Adults - women | 1 | 6-8 | 0.5 days |

All data collection will be arranged and agreed together with Plan International Ukraine and partners. These arrangements will be pre-agreed before starting the fieldwork.

### 3.4. Sample

### 

The consultant will outline the intended sampling strategy for the proposed primary data collection method, that includes a description of:

* Necessary respondent disaggregation (minimum age and gender, disability strongly preferred);
* Number and type of locations;
* Sampling approach.

### 3.5. Participant selection and recruitment

### 

The End of Project Evaluation participants will be recruited from the target beneficiary population at each evaluation site, identified in collaboration with relevant local authorities, implementing partners and community leadership. Ruki Druziv and Plan International Ukraine will play a key role in recruiting evaluation participants and the selection process for the external evaluation. Their responsibilities will include identifying potential participants from the diverse range of participants impacted by the project. Ensuring the recruitment process is inclusive and including participants from marginalised groups.

**4. TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES**

### 4.1. Key Deliverables

### 

Key deliverables and services will include:

1. Desk research
2. Methodology and data collection tools (including ethical considerations)
3. Inception report
4. Data assurance and verification
5. Development of preliminary findings for discussion with Plan and partners
6. First draft report
7. Second draft report
8. Final report to be submitted at the end of the evaluation
9. Presentation of findings and recommendations for dissemination workshop

### 4.2. Timeline

This work should be completed by the 30th of April 2024 in line with BMZ’s timeframe.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Workplan** | **Number of days** |
| Desk research, design data collection tools and methodology and develop an inception report (Including a detailed methodology, ethical considerations, data collection tools, data collection plan, timeline, and logistics) | 5 days |
| Internal ethical approval | 1-2 weeks |
| Meet with Plan and partners to discuss inception report & briefing meeting | 1 day |
| Data collection | 7 days |
| Transcription and data analysis | 7 days |
| Report writing - a final report will be submitted to BMZ which will include an executive summary, methodology, main findings (disaggregated), recommendations and lessons learned, conclusion. | 1. days |

### 4.3. Budget

### 

The external consultant(s) shall lead the field data gathering process and is expected to propose budget that covers all related costs for End-line study (including VAT, taxes, travel cost, insurance, visa cost, per diems as well as translation cost) together with the proposed methodology in the research proposal for this consultancy work.

The budget will be agreed between the consultant(s) and Plan International. Payments will however be made in phases at the completion of the following phases:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Phase** | **Deliverable** | **Payment** |
| 1. Inception Phase including Data Collection Tools and Consent/Assent Forms Development Phase | Inception Report, Data Collection Tools and Consent/Assent Forms approved by Plan International | 30% of total budget |
| 1. Data Collection, Data Analysis, Report Writing and Review of First Draft Report | Reviewed Draft Evaluation Report | 20% of total budget |
| 1. Final review of Draft Evaluation Report | Approved Final Evaluation Report incorporating all recommendations and comments | 50% of total budget |

### 4.4. Report Dissemination

Plan International is pleased to announce that the executive summary of the comprehensive final evaluation report as well as our management response will be made publicly accessible on both Plan International's official website and [Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP)](https://ukraineresponse.alnap.org/). We are committed to ensuring transparency and sharing insights gained from the evaluation process.

**5. SAFEGUARDING AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

### Ethics and Child Protection

### 

In accordance with Ethical MERL Framework and our Child and Youth Safeguarding Policy, this evaluation will commit to actively safeguard children from harm and ensuring children’s rights to protection are fully realized. Plan takes seriously the commitment to promote child safe practices and protect children from harm, abuse, neglect and any form of exploitation as they come into contact with Plan supported interventions. In addition, Plan will take positive action to prevent child abusers from becoming involved with Plan in any way and take stringent measures against any Plan Staff and/or Associate who abuses a child. Our decisions and actions in response to child protection concerns will be guided by the principle of ‘the best interests of the child’. The evaluation team shall provide a statement within their proposal on how they will ensure ethics and child protection in the process of data collection and visits. *This must also include consideration of any risks related to the study and how these will be mitigated*. The consultant(s) shall comply with Plan International Global Safeguarding Children and Young People Policy and other required policies.

Plan international’s safeguarding risk assessment must be conducted prior to any data collection taking place.

### Disclosure of information/child protection

It is understood and agreed that the consultant shall, during and after the effective period of the contract, treat as confidential and not divulge, unless authorized in writing by Plan, any information obtained in the course of the performance of the Contract. Information will be made available for the evaluation team on a need-to-know basis. Any necessary field visits will be facilitated by Plan’s staff. The selected consultant will commit to respect Safeguarding Policy and its guidelines to safeguard children and young people from harm and violations as well as Plan International’s Code of Conduct.

**6. CONSULTANT PROFILE AND ADVERTISEMENT**

### Expected Qualifications

### 

The consultant or the consulting firm must have a varied mix of skills and competencies and they must have undertaken similar works in Ukraine in the last two years. The following competencies are mandatory.

* Minimum 5-7 years proven experience in emergency project evaluation.
* Demonstrable approach to assuring quality of data collected.
* Demonstrable experience in leading evaluations of humanitarian programs responding to major disasters, with specific emphasis on construction, child protection and MHPSS in emergencies.
* Strong analytical skills and ability to synthesize and present findings, draw practical conclusions, make recommendations and prepare well-written reports on time.
* Demonstrated experience in quantitative and qualitative data collection and data analysis techniques, especially in emergency operations.
* Access and outreach in several Oblasts in Ukraine.
* Experience working with young people in evaluations and research as key stakeholders.
* Demonstrated experience completing similar assignments.
* Experience working in the Ukraine Response preferred.
* Knowledge of Ukrainian and English languages.

### Contact

Contact details for Plan Ukraine either for submission of application or for any enquiries [lesia.tsipkun@plan-international.org](mailto:lesia.tsipkun@plan-international.org)

### Applications

The application should detail the number of days it will take to complete the assignment, based on the above scope of work, including fee rates. It should also indicate the total budget.

Interested consulting firms should submit the following:

* 5-7 years' experience Project Lead CV, highlighting relevant experience and qualifications or examples of similar work.
* Team Leader CV: at least experienced in final Evaluation and Moldova/Ukraine context or emergency context.
* Data Analyst CV: at least 3 years of experience in data analysis for external evaluations.
* Narrative Proposal: including the data collection plan and methodology.
* Financial Proposal: Approximate budget which includes an approximate number of days required, and all relevant consultancy costs, and approximate proposed timeline.
* Three INGO references from previous external evaluations.
* Two examples of technical evaluations done by the consultancy firm.

### Annex 1 Final evaluation report structure

**Table of contents**

**Acronyms**

**Executive summary (2-3 pages)**

* Overview of the project
* Evaluation objectives and intended users
* Methodology
* Most important findings and conclusions
* Main recommendations

1. **Introduction (1- 2 pages)** 
   * Scope and purpose of the evaluation, intended users, team composition and structure of the report
   * Evaluation questions and criteria
   * Eventual changes to the initial request (objectives and questions)
2. **Methodology (2 pages)** 
   * Description of methods used and rationale
   * Limitations and constraints, potential bias and mitigations measures
   * International standards used as reference for the evaluation
3. **Context (1 -2 pages)**
   * Analysis of the context
4. **Core sections (10-15 pages)** 
   * Analysis of data by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation Development - Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) and Core Humanitarian Standards (CHS) criteria
   * Presentation of the evidence gathered
   * Triangulation and findings
5. **V. Conclusions (2-3 pages)**
6. **VI. Recommendations (2-3 pages)**

* Clear, specific and relevant implementable, linked with conclusions and reflect consultations with stakeholders' recommendations.

1. **Annexes**

* ToR
* List of groups of people interviewed (anonymized), site visited.
* List of documents consulted, and secondary data used (please provide the sources through WeTransfer or Google docs)
* Data collection instruments
* Evaluation matrix
* PowerPoint presentation of the main findings and recommendations

### Annex 2 Checklist for Completenes

### Annex 3: Global Policy: Safeguarding Children and Young People

### Annex 4: Project Details (logframe etc)

### Annex 5: Ethical MERL Framework