Terms of Reference for Mid-Term Evaluation

Project/Programme Title: "Sustaining Economic Recovery for Peace" (SERP)

Country: Ukraine, (implemented in: Odessa, Bilhorod-Dnistrovsky and Izmail)

Duration of project: 01.12.2016 – 30.11.2019

Name of Partner Organisation: International Charitable Foundation (ICF) Caritas Ukraine

1. Introduction/Background

The International Charitable Foundation "Caritas Ukraine" calls for tender bids to conduct an external evaluation of the Project **Sustaining Economic Recovery for Peace** (SERP) which has been implemented in three cities within Ukraine: Odessa, Bilhorod-Dnistrovsky and Izmail.
The project is being executed by ICF Caritas Ukraine. To realize the main project activities related to business education the implementing agency has cooperated with selected business schools and business experts.
The project with the budget volume of EUR 550000 is funded by Austrian Development Cooperation (ADA: EUR 500.000) and Caritas Austria (EUR 50000).
The selected company or group of experts will be contracted by ICF Caritas Ukraine, under the legislation of Ukraine.

Project goals:
The project's aim is to contribute to the regional prosperity of Odesa oblast by providing equitable access to employment opportunities for 2040 job-seekers and increased capacity for entrepreneurial skills for 525 potential entrepreneurs to achieve sustainable income and improve community cohesion. The project targets both Internally Displaced People (IDP) and local population and has geographic focus on the cities of Odesa, Bilhorod-Dnistrovskyi and Izmail.
The expected outcome of the programme is:
IDPs and local population in Odesa oblast have increased equitable access to employment opportunities and increased capacity for entrepreneurial skills to achieve sustainable incomes and improved community cohesion.
In order to achieve this outcome <u>the following outputs</u> delivered by the programme:
Result 1.   User-friendly portal is created and functional to provide unemployed local and displaced population with information about employment trends, and employment services by government departments and NGOs.
Result 2.   Individual counselling services (Case management) are provided to 2040 unemployed local and displaced job-seekers in Odesa, Bilhorod-Dnistrovskyi and Izmail cities.

AUSTRIAN
DEVELOPMENT
COOPERATION

Result 3.   7 Business incubation and 7 acceleration programs are organised for potential entrepreneurs in the cities of Odesa, Bilhorod-Dnistrovskyi and Izmail
Result 4.   88 financial grants are awarded through a competitive selection process to first time and existing entrepreneurs that successfully attended incubation and acceleration sessions.

Project activities:
The project combines the expertise and knowledge of the two project partners (Caritas Ukraine, Caritas Odesa) and offers a perspective to future employees and self-employers. The project offers a combination of individual services of case-management for job-seekers drawing on the successful experience of Caritas Odesa in the sector, and, based on the best practices of Caritas Ukraine in business development, involving local and national experts. It provides tailored incubation and acceleration programmes for potential entrepreneurs with a special focus on four business sectors (IT/E-commerce, Agriculture, Tourism, Social business), coupled by grants awarded on a competitive basis and activities that encourage IDPs and local communities to work together.

Context of intervention:
The main challenge that the project addressed is related to integration of internally displaced persons from the conflict affected areas in the Donbas and from Crimea. Integration challenges are mostly linked to economic integration: Given the increasing levels of unemployment and economic recession, local communities fear competition of IDPs for same resources and opportunities. The experience of the applicant and local partners in working both with local and IDPs communities leads to undertaking an approach towards fostering integration that will target both IDPs and local population and will pass through improving employability of unemployed job-seekers as well as increasing the capacities of entrepreneurs to generate income and become sustainable.

The beneficiaries of the project are unemployed IDPs and local citizens with an average ratio of 60% being IDPs and 40% members of host communities. A total of 2040 job-seekers will be selected for Expected Output 2 (case management) and 525 potential and existing entrepreneurs will be selected for Expected Output 3 (incubation and acceleration programmes). The general amount is 2040, including 525, which are for studying projects.

2. __Purpose__

The external mid-term project evaluation is expected to provide a base for an informed follow-up planning of the project activities for the remaining months. By taking into account projects' best practices and lessons learned the evaluation will support the successful finalization of the three years intervention.

Beyond that the evaluation and its related recommendations are important measures to feed into the internal learning process of the organization as such. In case similar interventions will be planned in other projects the experiences from the evaluation will be available for improved activities.

Finally the evaluation serves as an important step not only for learning but also for accountability towards donors and projects' participants.

3. __Objective__

The objective of the evaluation is to assess:

a) the extent to which the project/programme has already achieved its objectives and results or is likely to achieve them, including the extent to which the lives of the project/programme beneficiaries (women, men) has already been improved. Also the extent to which supported institutions have already benefitted people.

b) the extent to which cross-cutting issues (gender equality, social inclusion and environmental protection) were applied.

c) the best practices and lessons learned from the almost three years project experience

The evaluation will be conducted based on the three OECD evaluation criteria and standards relevance, efficiency and effectiveness.

4. __Subject and Focus__

The evaluation supports to assess the design and coherence of the project/programme including the design of the log frame matrix/programme theory and present the underlying theory of change and its assumptions.

The evaluation will encompass a ten days field visit to all three project locations Odesa, Izmail and Bilhorod-Dnistrovsky finalized by a feedback workshop.

It is a time-engagement of 33 days per expert foreseen in a time period from July to end of September.

Key informants for the evaluation must include as a minimum theproject beneficiaries from the main project activities of job-referral and business education with a special regard to cover both IDPs and local citizens; the Caritas project teams, as well as representatives from the local employment centres, business trainers and other project consultants (gender disaggregated).

5. <u>Specific Evaluation Questions</u>[1]

Relevance
- To what extent are the objectives and results of the project/programme still valid for the partner country, the partner organization and the beneficiaries?
- Are the expected results/outputs of the project/programme consistent with the outcome, immediate impact and overall goal/impact (as part of the analysis of the logframe matrix/programme theory and the presentation of the theory of change and its underlying assumptions)?

Effectiveness
- To what extent has the project/programme already achieved its outcome(s) or will be likely to achieve it/them?
- To what extent has the project/programme already achieved its expected results/outputs or will be likely to achieve them?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the outcome(s)/expected results/outputs? (Also consider any which were possibly beyond the control of the project). If not what are the recommendations for the remaining project time or a potential continuation?
- Was the project/programme managed as planned? If not, what issues occurred and why? Which mitigation and/or steering measures have been taken by the programme management?
- To what extent have all project/programme stakeholders collaborated as planned?
- To what extent was gender mainstreaming included in the project/programme and to what extent were recommendations from the ADA gender-assessment considered and implemented?
- To what extent was environmental mainstreaming included in the project/programme and to what extent were recommendations from the ADA environment-assessment considered and implemented?
- To what extent were social standards included in the project/programme and to what extent were recommendations from the ADA social standards assessment considered and implemented?

Efficiency
- If applicable, to what extent were all items/equipment purchased and used as planned under this project/programme?
- Was the project/programme implemented in the most efficient way (time, personnel resources)? Have any issues emerged, if so which ones and why?

---

[1] For a review, please, focus your questions, also see the definition.

6. Approach and Methods

The evaluation consists of the following phases:

(a) Contract and Kick-off meeting: Contract is signed and a discussion of the assignment takes place. First documents, including available project data (project proposal, Logframe, progress reports), are provided to the evaluation team.

(b) Desk Study: The evaluation team studies all necessary project/programme documents; re-construct and analyse the intervention logic/programme theory and theory of change and its assumptions. Existing data needs to be analysed and interpreted.

(c) Inception-Phase: In the inception report the evaluators will describe the design of the evaluation and will elaborate on how data will be obtained and analysed. The use of a data collection planning worksheet or a similar tool is required. First key informant interviews can take place.

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

The field trip will only take place upon official approval of the inception report by the contractor.

(d) Field-phase: Data needs to be gathered in the field, analysed and interpreted. It is expected that the evaluation will include quantitative and qualitative data disaggregated by sex.

(e) Presentation: Presentation of key findings (feedback workshop) to key project staff at the end of the field trip.

(f) Final Draft Report: Submission of final draft report, incorporating feedback from partners and contractor.

(g) Final Report: Submission of final report, see reporting requirements under point 9).

The evaluation must be conducted using quantitative and qualitative methods.
Possible methods include questionnaires, focus group discussions, key informant interviews, structured interviews with individual and households etc.
The interviewees should be selected with consideration of gender, age, beneficiaries/non-beneficiaries and geographical spread in the project region.
Methods should be proposed by the evaluator in the offer and finalized in the inception report after approval of the contractor.
It is expected that the evaluation team will present concrete recommendations which are addressed to the specific stakeholders.

The Guidelines for Project and Programme Evaluations developed by the Austrian Development Agency need to be considered throughout the entire evaluation process

(http://www.entwicklung.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Dokumente/Evaluierung/Evaluierungs_Leitfaeden/EN_Leitfaden_Evaluierung.pdf)

7. Timetable

A total of 33 working days for a team of two experts are currently estimated for this assignment.

Action	Responsible	Date	# Working d Days	Deadlines
Preparatory Phase				
Submission of bid (electronically)	Contractor	05.07 -21.07.2019	11	21.07.2019
Contract signed and documents provided	**Contract signed between Caritas Ukraine and expert team**	**July 23 2019**	**1**	**23.07.19**
Kick-Off meeting	Meeting between contractor and expert team (possibly via Skype)	23. – 26. July 2019	0,5	26.07.2019
Inception Phase				
Desk Study & preparation of inception report	Consultant Additional remote exchange with contractor can be organized upon request	26. July – 09. August.	10	
First interviews	Consultant	26. July – 09. August		
Submission of draft inception report	**Consultant**	**09. August 2019**		**09.08.2019**
Feedback to inception report	Caritas Ukraine	13. August 2019		13.08.2019

Inclusion of comments in inception report	Expert team	14. – 16. August 2019	1	
Submission of final inception report	Expert team	**16. August 2019**		**16.08.2019**
Field Phase				
Field Visit, interviews etc. in Odesa	Expert team	19. -21. August		
Field Visit, interviews etc. in Izmail WEEKEND		22. – 23. August	10	
Field Visit, interviews etc. in Bilhorod -Dnistrovsky	Expert team	26. August		
preparation of feedback workshop, in Odesa	Expert team	27. August		
feedback workshop in Odesa	Expert team	28. August		
Finalization Phase				
Submission of final draft report	Expert team	**13. September**	**10**	**13.09.2019**
Feedback by contractor and ADA	**Contractor & ADA**	**25. September**		**25.09.2019**
Inclusion of feedback (contractor and ADA) in final draft report	Expert team	26. – 30. September	1,5	30.09.2019
Submission of final evaluation report (hard copy and electronic copy) to contractor	Expert team	**02nd of October**		02.10.2019
		TOTAL working days	**33/ person**	

8. The Evaluation Team

Key Qualifications to the expert team should be:

- Relevant academic degree
- A minimum of three years' experience and expertise in the field/sector of Business analysis and incomer-generating projects for vulnerable grozps
- Team leader (if applicable) has led or conducted at least three evaluations in the last five years. in this or a related field
- Team member has conducted at least three evaluations in this or a related field
- Proven experience with reconstructing and testing Theories of Change as well as quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods.
- Relevant experience and understanding of local economic and political development context
- Experience in project cycle management
- Knowledge of OECD/DAC criteria
- Experience in evaluation development and /or humanitarian projects, especially in the sphere of Livelihoods/ Business development
- International experience, especially in the other post-soviet countries will be an asset
- Ability to conduct meetings with senior government, UN and NGO level personnel
- Experience and expertise in evaluating cross-cutting issues
- Excellent oral and written English & Ukrainian (or Russian) skills
- Sound MS Office and IT skills

The consultants must not have been involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of this project.

9. Reports

The consultants will submit the following reports:

- an inception report (10-15 pages without annexes),
- a final draft evaluation report (about 25-30 pages without annexes), including a draft executive summary (5 pages max.) **and the results-assessment form (part of the reporting requirement)**
- and the final evaluation report (25-30 pages without annexes), the final executive summary **and the results-assessment form (part of the reporting requirement)**

All reports need to be written in English and Ukrainian.

The **executive summary** should summarize key findings and key recommendations (three to five pages) and needs to be submitted as part of the final draft report.

The findings and recommendations of the draft final report and final report have to be structured according to the evaluation questions. An outline of the report's structure needs to be agreed upon during the inception phase.

The quality of the reports will be judged according to the following criteria:

- Is the results-matrix format part of the report?
- Does the report contain a comprehensive and clear executive summary?
- Were the Terms of Reference fulfilled and is this reflected in the report?
- Is the report structured according to the OECD/DAC criteria?
- Are all evaluation questions answered?
- Are the methods and processes of the evaluation sufficiently documented in the evaluation report?
- Does the report describe and assess the intervention logic (e.g. logframe, program theory) and present/analyze a theory of change and its underlying assumptions?
- Are cross-cutting issues analyzed in the report?
- Are the conclusions and recommendations based on findings and are they clearly stated in the report?
- Does the report clearly differentiate between conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations?
- Are the recommendations realistic and is it clearly expressed to whom the recommendations are addressed to?
- Were the most significant stakeholders involved consulted?
- Does the report present the information contained in a presentable and clearly arranged form?
- Is the report free from spelling mistakes and unclear linguistic formulations?
- Can the report be distributed in the delivered form?

The results-assessment form attached to these TOR needs to be filled in by the evaluator as part of the reporting requirement.

10. Co-Ordination/Responsibility
The evaluator team will be supported by the national project manager and by the international delegate of Caritas Austria.
They will provide support in logistics of organizing the field trip, provide needed background information and organizing key interviews as well as focus group discussions.

The contact person is: Ms. Valentyna Butkovska, Project Manager
Contact details:
Phone: +380 67 519 4050
E-mail: Valentyna Butkovska vbutkovska@caritas.ua

11. Submission of Offer
The offer should be submitted within the indicated submission date July 19 18PM Ukrainian time and should provide the following details in English:

- Experts' Proposal indicating time-wise engagement of expert team, description of experts' qualification, first outlook on suggested evaluation methods, time-wise availability in the period of July to October 2019
- Information about professional background:
  - o experts' curriculum vitae
  - o at least three reference evaluation conducted in a relevant sphere
  - o at least three reference contacts
- Budget indicating daily fees per expert, envisaged travel costs, material costs if applicable, other costs. Please prepare the budget in Hryvnia (UAH) and EUR.

12. Appraisal of Evaluation Offers
The offers will be assessed according to the following criteria:
- Quality and price of offer
- Availability of experts in the suggested time period
- Requested professional and regional expertise

➔ **Please note that only offers will be respected that have been submitted timely and with the full set of requested documents**

13. Annexes:

- Results-Assessment Form, to be filled in by the evaluation team
- ADA Guidelines for Project and Programme Evaluations, including format of inception report

Annex 1: Results-Assessment Form for Mid-Term and Final Project Evaluations/Reviews

<mark>This form has to be filled in electronically by the evaluator/reviewer. No evaluation report will be accepted without this form. The form has to be included at the <u>beginning</u> of the evaluation/review report.</mark>

Title of project/programme (please, spell out):
Contract Period of project/programme:
ADC number of project/programme:
Name of project/programme partner:
Country and Region of project/programme :
Budget of this project/programme:
Name of evaluation company (spell out) and names of evaluators:
Date of completion of evaluation/review:

<mark>Please tick appropriate box:</mark>
 	
   a) Evaluation/review managed by ADA/ADC Coordination Office ☐
 	
   b) Evaluation managed by project partner: ☐

<mark>Please tick appropriate box:</mark> a) Mid-Term Evaluation   b) Final Evaluation   c) Mid-Term Review   d) Final Review   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   Others: please, specify:
Project Outcome <mark>*(Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):*</mark>

<mark>For Final Evaluation/Review[2]:</mark> Project Outcome: To what extent has the project already achieved its outcome(s) according to the Logframe Matrix? <u>Please, tick appropriate box</u>

Outcome(s) was/were:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:

<u>Please, also explain your assessment: What exactly was achieved and why? If not achieved, why not?</u> (Please, consider description of outcome and relevant indicators)

<mark>For Mid-Term Evaluation/Review[3]:</mark> Project Outcome: To what extent do you think the project will most likely achieve its outcome(s) according to the Logframe Matrix <u>Please, tick appropriate box</u>

Outcome(s) will most likely be:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:

<u>Please, also explain your assessment:</u> (Please, consider description of outcome and relevant indicators)

Project Outputs: To what extent has the project already achieved its outputs[4] according to the Logframe Matrix ? <u>Please, tick appropriate boxes</u>

Output 1 <mark>*(Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix)*</mark>:

---

[2] Please, only fill in in case this is a final project evaluation/review.

[3] Please, only fill in in case this is a mid-term evaluation/review.

[4] In case there are more than three outputs, please, add them.

Output was:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:

Please, explain your assessment: (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

Output 2 *(Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix)*:

Output 2 was:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:

Please, explain your assessment: (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

Output 3 *(Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):*

Output 3 was:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:

Please, explain your assessment: (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

In case there are more than three Outputs please, state as above.

Impact/Beneficiaries:

How many women, men, girls, boys and people in total have already benefited from this project directly and indirectly? Please, explain

What exactly has already changed in the lives of women, men, girls, boys and/or institutions from this project? Please, explain:

Which positive and/or negative effects/impacts in terms of gender can be possibly be attributed to the project? Please, explain:

If applicable, which institutions have benefitted from this project/programme and how?

Mainstreaming cross-cutting issues:

Gender: To what extent was gender mainstreaming included in the project? To what extent were the recommendations - if any- from the ADA internal gender-assessment considered and implemented?

Environment: To what extent was environmental mainstreaming included in the project? To what extent were the recommendations - if any- from the ADA internal environment-assessment considered and implemented?

Which positive and/or negative effects/impacts in terms of environment can be possibly be attributed to the project? Please, explain

Social Standards: To what extent were the social standards monitored by relevant partners? Have any issues emerged? Please, explain

Overall/Other Comments: