

Evaluation Team Leader and 2 Associates (1 international & 1 national)

for

ACT Alliance Response to Nepal earthquake Response, NPL151 Appeal for Nepal

ACT Alliance (ACT) is seeking a 3-person Evaluation Team to carrying out the external evaluation of ACT Appeal Program NPL151 – Nepal Earthquake Response. The lead consultant should have the following competencies:

- Proven evaluator with the ability to design and apply programme evaluation methods.
- Excellent in English
- Excellent report writing and presentation skills.
- Clear task management/co-ordination and consultative decision making.
- Process facilitator with excellent interpersonal skills; diplomacy and tact in communication.
- Ability to make a context-sensitive analysis of a humanitarian assistance programme.
- Participatory style of working to ensure effective engagement with key resource people.
- High level of operational experience in humanitarian interventions; experience and respect for faith based organisations and what drives them.
- Knowledge of Nepal preferable
- Proven knowledge of gender issues in emergencies
- Sound knowledge of humanitarian principles, HAP or CHS frameworks, Red Cross/Red Crescent and NGOs Code of Conduct and humanitarian accountability mechanism.

Documenting good practice and lessons learnt will be simultaneously managed along with the evaluation process.

Application:

Qualified candidates are invited to send their application documents to recruitment@actalliance.org indicating which position they are interested in. Please include the following documents:

- Letter of motivation and writing sample (e.g. extract from a previous report)
- Curriculum Vitae
- One-page draft evaluation plan with budget indications (e.g. consultancy fees, insurance).

Deadline for applications: 15 April 2016

TERMS OF REFERENCE

External Evaluation of ACT Appeal NPL 151 – Nepal Earthquake Response

1. BACKGROUND

A massive 7.8 magnitude earthquake with an epicenter approximately 80 km north-west of the ancient Nepali capital city of Kathmandu struck central Nepal on 25 April 2015. This was the most powerful earthquake to hit the region since the Bihar earthquake of 1934, and its impact has been devastating in terms of loss of life and destruction of infrastructure. As of the 20 May, the confirmed death toll in Nepal has reached 8,600 (Government of Nepal – GON). On top of this tragic loss of life, there has been massive damage to housing and other socioeconomic infrastructure.

In addition to this first crisis, a second 7.3 magnitude earthquake struck Nepal on 12 May, with the epicenter on the border between Sindhupalchowk and Dolakha Districts, 76 km northeast of Kathmandu, exacerbating damage from the earlier quake, and expanding the geographical area of death and destruction. As one of the least developed countries, Nepal's capacity to respond to the massive humanitarian needs was limited, and the government of Nepal appealed to the international community to assist.

In the first four weeks following the earthquake, ACT Alliance members in Nepal were engaged in emergency, life sustaining activities, distributing ready-to-eat food and two week food rations to 34,207 households; NFIs to 41,541 households; tarpaulins for emergency shelter for 33,398 households; and family water treatment and personal hygiene kits to 12,021 households. At the same time, ACT Alliance members have engaged in detailed assessments necessary for focusing the on-going response both geographically and sector wise, which is reflected in this full appeal.

The magnitude and complexity of the crisis, the scale of the ACT humanitarian response and requirements from back donors, have called for an external evaluation of this appeal NPL151 which will be carried out during the first trimester of 2016.

The appeal is being revised to include the programme of ACT Nepal Forum member ICCO. This full appeal replaces the appeal issued on 2 June 2015.

2. ACT EMERGENCY RESPONSE

- **Size of the appeal:** US \$ 14,955,227.35
- **Implementation Period:** 26 April 2015 to 30 April 2016
- **Appeal goal:** The appeal aimed to assist the most vulnerable and resource poor people in the following sectors: food and non-food items, WASH, shelter, psycho-social support, education, livelihood restoration/development, cash for work, disaster risk reduction (DRR), capacity building and climate change advocacy.
- **ACT Requesting Members**

Within the ACT Appeal NPL151: DanChurchAid (DCA), Finn Church Aid (FCA), ICCO Cooperation (ICCO), Lutheran World Federation (LWF), and Lutheran World Relief (LWR)

Outside the ACT Appeal NPL151: DanChurchAid (DCA), Finn Church Aid (FCA), ICCO Cooperation (ICCO), Lutheran World Federation (LWF), Lutheran World Relief (LWR), The Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Mission (FELM), Christian Aid (CA), and Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe (DKH).

- **Objectives, main activities and locations:**

Sector of work: Food security & agriculture, non-food items (NFIs), early recovery (cash for work), livelihoods restoration, shelter, WASH, psychosocial support, education, disaster risk reduction (DRR) and capacity building

Areas of operations: Lalitpur, Bhaktapur, Dhading, Gorkha, Kathmandu, Sindhupalchowk, Makwanpur, Rasuwa, Dolakha, and Lamjung districts.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSIGNMENT

3.1 Objectives

To provide an overview of the ACT Alliance response to date with particular emphasis on work that was funded by the ACT NPL151 Appeal but acknowledging that many ACT members have been operating outside of the ACT Appeal funding; identify gaps, priority areas and unmet needs from a geographic and sectorial perspective. In many geographical areas, ACT members are implementing earthquake response projects both from inside and outside of the ACT Appeal. These projects contribute to the complementarity, synergy and impact of the earthquake response.

To improve quality and accountability by reviewing ACT members' response to the Nepal earthquake against ALNAP Quality Proforma for Humanitarian assistance which is based on DAC (excluding impact as it is too soon to assess this) but focusing on outcomes (listed below) and outputs.

To identify lessons learnt and best practices, including innovations/new systems developed which may benefit communities in their recovery and further build local capacity as well as to generate knowledge for continuous programme improvements of the ACT Nepal Forum and the ACT Alliance as a whole.

3.2 Key Questions

Achievements

- a. How relevant, in terms of relevance, appropriateness and timeliness, are the ACT members' interventions to the needs, expectations and priorities of the affected population and local partners?
- b. Were the interventions and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives and outcomes?
- c. What was the outcome (both intended & unintended, positive & negative) in saving and protecting lives, assisting people towards longer-term recovery and reducing future vulnerability?
- d. What innovations or new systems have organizations developed to enable them to assess needs and monitor the outputs and outcomes of their programs with the Nepal Earthquake?
- e. Have there been any joint initiatives by ACT members outside of NPL151 in earthquake response? What is the overall impact of such initiatives that complement NPL151?

Quality & Accountability

Did the programme comply with the principles of the Code of Conduct of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in Disaster Relief (e.g. in terms of impartiality, non-discrimination, independence, participation) and the Sphere minimum standards. Were accountability¹ issues (including Core Humanitarian Standard, (CHS)) given due consideration.

- a. To what extent have rights holders been engaged at each stage of the intervention in terms of input and feedback? How have organizations adapted their accountability practices and complaints mechanisms to the context?
- b. How are organizations that work through partners or even direct implementers ensuring that accountability and other standards are being adhered to, particularly where these are relatively new?
- c. Did ACT staff and their partners have sufficient knowledge and training to do their work efficiently and effectively?
- d. How did the duty bearer ensure that the rights holders have access to a safe and responsive mechanism to handle complaints?

Gender, protection & cross-cutting issues

- a. How successfully have ACT members' assessments enabled them to identify the most vulnerable? What processes have they employed for the selection of beneficiaries? Considerations should include specific vulnerable individuals such as the elderly; persons with disabilities; female headed households and children. Were procedures used for needs identification and targeting appropriate and transparent?
- b. **To what extent did the assistance address different protection needs and priorities of women, men, girls and boys through gender sensitive programming?**
- c. How does the ACT response support the local structures (state, local NGOs, churches) in such a way that they would be better prepared to respond should disaster strike again?
- d. What measures did the ACT Forum or ACT organizations put in place to ensure the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse?

ACT policies, coordination and capacity

- a. How effective was the ACT Secretariat in facilitating and coordinating the response efforts – within RMs and other ACT members working in Nepal for earthquake response?
- b. How did the ACT Nepal programme optimize the value of ACT Alliance's joint appeal system to create greater impact? Were appropriate synergies, institutional platforms and existing national strategy used to leverage ACT response?
- c. How are organizations addressing the issue of coordination and what leadership are they demonstrating with regards to the challenges?
- d. Assess the effectiveness of the collaboration/coordination and coordination mechanisms among ACT members/partners of ACT Alliance as well as with other stakeholders.
- e. Were the needs and priorities of the affected population, ACT donors and policy standards of ACT Alliance met?
- f. What were the strengths, weaknesses and opportunities of ACT visibility in a multi-actor ACT response?
- g. How was the coordination with UN clusters and other external mechanisms? Was it possible to utilize the ACT forum structure to better participate and influence those platforms?

¹ Refer to basic aspects of ACT Quality & Accountability Framework

3.3 Evaluation Methodology

- The evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner through a combination of methods including a document review of key project documentation (appeal, sitreps, reports), interviews with different stakeholders/counterparts, rights holder consultations and site visits to ACT members' project sites as sampled by the evaluation team in coordination with the requesting members.
- Semi-structured interviews with key informants in selected villages/urban localities
- Focus group discussions (done separately for males and females) with selected beneficiaries and/or members of the community-based/people's organizations
- Review of the procurement and distribution process
- Physical verification of warehouses
- Interview with secondary stakeholders (e.g. relevant government officials, local government unit)
- Meetings with management of implementing members, project and administrative staff, etc.
- Online survey with ACT members and staff
- Sharing and review of existing information 2 weeks prior to the field work
 - (a) Review of ACT members' documents/publications/reports
 - (b) Visual evidence (existing collection of pictures and videos, pre and post interventions of the different ACT members, e.g., repaired shelters, WASH facilities, restored livelihood materials, cleared and replanted farms and areas, trainings done, interviews with beneficiaries/groups/other stakeholders, etc.). Will complement actual field visits
 - (c) Review of case studies of the good practices and lessons learned by the different members
- The evaluation will be conducted in line with ACT Alliance Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines and PME Handbook

3.4 Expected outputs

Based on the understanding of this ToR, the evaluation team shall propose in the **inception report** the approach, design, methods and data collection strategies to be adopted for conducting the evaluation.

The team should triangulate and validate information, assess and describe data quality in a transparent manner. Data gaps and shortfall in evaluation design should also be highlighted in the **evaluation report**. ACT guidelines for evaluation report shall be used for reporting.

While the evaluation is intended to promote learning and establish our commitment to accountability, in order to benefit from the many lessons learned and positive experience of the ACT Nepal Forum in responding to the earthquake, the evaluator will have the task to specifically identify lessons and good practice for documentation and facilitate a **lessons learnt workshop**. A **briefing meeting** will be organized by the forum on day one of the evaluation and a **debriefing** on the final day.

Based on the lessons learnt discussed during the workshop, each (requesting) member will prepare an action plan outlining the actions it will implement in order to put the lessons learnt into practice, and the time

planning thereof. The results, successes and challenges will be presented and discussed in a workshop one day after the start of the action plan and/or serve as input to an external evaluation in future.

Overall, the evaluation will employ the UNOCHA cluster-based objectives in the assessment of results and ALNAP Quality Proforma to ensure coherence with assessment and reporting of humanitarian practice (copy available at ACT Secretariat).

4. KEY EVALUATION DATES/SCHEDULES

The ACT Nepal Forum shall generate the draft ToR in consultation with the ACT Secretariat to be shared with the funding members for the appeal within the month of February 2016 and shall be revised to a final ToR in the first week of March 2016. Recruitment of the external evaluation team shall follow immediately upon the approval of the ACT General Secretary.

A meeting between ACT Secretariat staff, ACT Forum representatives and the evaluation consultants prior to the field work will enable the team to articulate the ToR and discuss the inception report and lead to a full consensus on how the evaluation will be best executed. The national forum will be responsible for facilitating the administrative, logistics support and related details.

The field mission should take place within the last 2 weeks of May 2016. We expect the field mission to be a maximum of 20 days in the country. A briefing meeting shall be organized by the Forum on the first day of the evaluation and a debriefing on the final day.

A first draft of the report should be available within 10 days upon completion of the visit. Follow-on evaluation debriefing and learning workshops with partners and communities shall take place after the 1st draft of the report. ACT stakeholders will have seven days to comment on the report after which the evaluation report shall be finalized and shared with all relevant stakeholders. A final “lessons and good practice” document shall also be produced together with the final evaluation report.

The team leader will be supported by the ACT Nepal Forum representatives, staff and a member of the ACT Secretariat staff.

Main steps for the assignment & timeframe

No.	Activities	Accomplished by (Dates/months)
1	Finalising ToR	1st week of March
2	Evaluation team leader identified (international)	
3	One team member (national) identified in consultation with team leader	
4	Briefing with evaluation team in ACT Secretariat	½ day
5	Review of appeal documents – appeal NPL151, sitreps, reports and field preparation	2 days
6	Field work	20 days
7	Analysis	3 days
8	Drafting evaluation report and “lessons learned & good practice” document	2 days
9	Facilitating lessons learned workshop in Nepal & debriefing	1 day
10	Finalising evaluation report & document on “lessons learned”	2 days
11	Preparing action plans by each RM	2 days
12	Assessing results, successes and challenges of actions plans	