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**Final Project Evaluation TOR**

* **Organization:** DKH - Diakonie-Katastrophenhilfe
* **Location:** Aden, Yemen
* **Grade:** Consultancy Agreement
* **Occupational Groups:** DKH Quality Team
* **Project:** Multi-sectoral Emergency Response to support IDPs and other vulnerable groups in Marib, Ad Dali’ and Shabwah Governorates, Yemen.
* **DKH Project Nr.**: K-YEM-2023-9007
* **GFFO Project Nr.**: YEM/YEM/Diakonie/2023/01
* **Closing Date: 12 April 2025**

**Organizational and Program Background**

Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe (DKH) is part of the Evangelisches Werk für Diakonie und Entwicklung e.V. (EWDE), one of the biggest welfare institutions in Germany. The organisation supports people affected by natural disasters, war and displacement in 36 countries across the world. This is delivered through a global network of partner organisations.

DKH provides technical and other backstopping support to all partner organisations by building their capacities and strengthening relations.

DKH has been supporting partnerships in the delivery of emergency responses and resilience building initiatives in Yemen since June 2019. It current operates from its office in Aden.

**Project Background**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title:** | Multi-sectoral Emergency Response to support IDPs and other vulnerable groups in Marib, Ad Dali’ and Shabwah Governorates, Yemen. |
| **Partner Organization:** | Yemen Family Care Association (YFCA) [www.yfca.org](http://www.yfca.org)  Build Foundation for Development (BFD) [www.bfdyemen.org](http://www.bfdyemen.org) |
| **Project Location:** | Yemen/ Middle East  Shabwah, Ad Dali’ and Marib governorates  Districts:  Shabwah governorate: Districts Ar Rawdah and Mayfa’ah  Ad Dali’ governorate: Districts Ad Dali’, Ash Shu'ayb, and Al Azariq  Marib Governorate: Districts Marib Al Wadi and Marib City |
| **Project implementation**  **Period:** | From 1st August 2023 to 30th April, 2025 |
| **Target Group:** | IDPs, host communities, returnees, marginalized groups |

**Brief description of the interventions to be evaluated**

DKH Yemen received a grant from German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO) to support YFCA and BFD to deliver humanitarian assistance to vulnerable communities in Marib and Shabwa governorates. The project aimed to improve access to safe drinking water (output 1), enhance target communities’ knowledge and practices related to hygiene (output 2), improve the target group’ ability to meet basic food needs through various cash modalities (output 3) and finally provide free of charge basic health (output 4) and protection (output 5) services to the most vulnerable communities in the target governorates.

**Project Objectives and Outcomes**

**Overall Objective:**

Contribute to improved food security and well-being of targeted vulnerable populations, improved functioning of public water facilities, access to primary health care services, and capacity of the local partner to rapidly respond to future emergencies.

## Specific Objective:

Targeted vulnerable communities can meet their basic food needs and have improved access to basic communal assets, safe drinking water, sanitation, and primary health care services.

**Project outcome:** 214,871 most vulnerable individuals in targeted districts of Marib, Shabwa and Ad Dali' Governorates can meet their basic needs and have improved access to food, safe drinking water, improved sanitation and hygiene, health and protection services.

**Outcome indicator:**

Outcome Indicator 1: 100% of targeted HH with access to safe drinking water.

Outcome Indicator 2: 100% of HHs (men, women, boys, and girls) with access to improved sanitation services.

Outcome Indicator 3: 75% of participants of hygiene promotion activities who improve their handwashing practices.

Outcome Indicator 4: 90% of HHs (men, women, boys, and girls) in targeted communities are able to meet their basic food needs through unconditional and conditional cash assistance.

Outcome Indicator 5: 100% of people receiving free of charge health services in the targeted districts.

Outcome Indicator 6: 80 % of beneficiaries who reported feeling safer and more secure after accessing protection services in the project target areas

**Purpose and Objective of the Evaluation**

The evaluation is intended principally for learning and accountability purposes. It is expected to generate relevant findings, lessons, and recommendations that will be shared with key stakeholders of DKH and used to guide future programming, according to its 2021-2025 strategic plans.

**Objectives**

The objectives of the evaluation include, but are not limited to, the following:

The main objective of this evaluation is to provide DKH and the GFFO with an assessment of the project, its design, implementation, and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of the project. The evaluation should provide evidence-based, credible, and useful information, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the future decision-making processes of DKH and its partners.

**The evaluation will specifically:**

1. Assess the extent to which the project met its planned outcomes.
2. Assess the extent to which the partners met key CHS commitments during the implementation of the project.
3. Highlight lessons learned, best practices, and recommendations for improvements to feed back into the current and future DKH programming in the same sectoral areas and use similar approaches to meet their objectives.

**Research Criteria and Questions**

The evaluation shall use all six of the following OECD[[1]](#footnote-1) DAC[[2]](#footnote-2) criteria and corresponding questions (Relevance, Coherence, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact, and Sustainability). The consultant will be able to review and revise the questions (not the criteria) in consultation with the DKH country office quality team, as part of the inception phase of the evaluation, and as relevant.

1. **RELEVANCE**  
   The appropriateness of project objectives to the problems that it was supposed to address, and to the physical and policy environment within which it operated. It should include an assessment of the quality of project preparation and design – i.e., the logic and completeness of the project planning process, and the internal logic and coherence of the project design.

The following questions should be answered:  
1.1 Was the action adequately designed to respond to the needs of the direct beneficiaries?  
1.2 Were the project methodologies and activities relevant to achieve the project objectives?

* 1. To what extent have the gender, special needs and vulnerability considerations been mainstreamed into activities?
  2. What was the specific added value of this GFFO funded project? What is the counterfactual? (What would be the situation without the GFFO funding)?

1. **COHERENCE**

The compatibility of the partners’ intervention with other interventions in a country, sector, or institution.

The extent to which other interventions (particularly policies) support or undermine the intervention and vice versa. This includes internal coherence and external coherence. Internal coherence addresses the synergies and interlinkages between the intervention and other interventions carried out by the same institution/government, as well as the consistency of the intervention with the relevant international norms and standards to which that institution/government adheres. External coherence considers the consistency of the intervention with other actors’ interventions in the same context. This includes complementarity, harmonization, and coordination with others and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort.

The following questions should be answered:

2.1 To what extent is this intervention coherent with other interventions which have similar objectives?

2.2 To what extent is the intervention coherent with the country policy?

2.3 To what extent is the intervention coherent with GFFO policy?

2.4 To what extent is the intervention coherent with international obligations (e.g. CHS, Sphere ,,etc.)?

2.5 Where gaps or overlaps found between other interventions in the area and this project?

1. **EFFICIENCY**  
   The fact that the project results have been achieved at a reasonable cost, i.e. how well inputs/means have been converted into activities, in terms of quality, quantity, and time, and the quality of the results achieved. This requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same results, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted.

The following questions should be answered:

3.1 Was the project managed in a cost-efficient manner in terms of (human, financial, and other resources) versus the results?  
3.2 Were synergies capitalized on with other actors (local and international) involved in similar projects?

3.3 Were the objectives appropriately operationalized by the local partners in terms of capacity and capability?

3.4 Was the geographical and activity scope of the project appropriate for the available funding?

3.5 Was coordination between implementing partners efficient? Did all project partners play their envisaged role in an efficient manner?

3.6 Were participatory processes used? How efficient and inclusive were these processes?

3.7 What is the quality of the project outputs?

The consultant shall analyze the efficiency of project management arrangements and duly justify any issue. Factual statements on the quality and quantity of inputs shall be provided, delays should be measured by means of comparison with the latest update of the planning. Any significant deviations shall be analyzed. Conclusions on the cost efficiency of outputs shall be drawn.

1. **EFFECTIVENESS**  
   An assessment of the contribution made by results to the achievement of the project purpose, and how  
   assumptions have affected project achievements. This should include a specific assessment of the benefits  
   accruing to target groups.

4.1 Were the expected results realized?  
4.2 Did the achievement of the results addressed the achievement of the project-specific objectives?  
4.3 What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the set objectives?  
4.4 If there is a gap between the benefits brought by the activities and the objective of the project, how can it be explained?  
4.5 During the project, how well did the partners provide information to communities and people affected by the crisis about the organization, the principles it adheres to, how it expects its staff to behave, the project, and what they intend to deliver?

4.6 Was the implemented monitoring appropriate to address political or contextual changes as well as arising risks and was it effective in adjusting the program-activities in a timely manner?

The consultant’s focus should be on outputs and outcomes’ delivery and quality (not activities); he/she  
is expected to explain any causes of deviations and the implications thereof. The level of achievement of  
results should be assessed as reflected by indicators covering the specific objective (outcome), providing  
a transparent chain of arguments.

1. **IMPACT**  
   The effect of the project on its wider environment, and its contribution to the wider policy or sector objectives (as summarized in the project’s overall objective).

The following questions should be answered:  
5.1 What evidence is there that the project contributed to the achievement of its overall objective?  
5.2 What, if any, were the unintended impacts of the project intervention, both positive and negative?

5.3 Was the project able to monitor, mitigate and respond to any unintended negative effects?

5.4 What recommendations for future programs can be made based on the “lessons learnt” and “good practices?”

1. **SUSTAINABILITY**  
   An assessment of the likelihood of benefits produced by the project to continue to flow after external funding has ended (probability of continued long-term benefits).

The following questions should be answered:

1. What positive or negative impact had the project activities to peaceful and inclusive coexistence?
2. What positive or negative impact had the project activities to the environment?
3. To what extend is the project connecting to sustainable cooperation with local partners, authorities and/or to development aid?
4. Which are the main risks for sustainability and connectivity of the project?

6.1 What evidence is there to suggest the project’s interventions and/or results will be sustained after the project ends?  
6.2 What are the possibilities for replication and extension of the project’s outcomes?

Human, organizational (including policies and institutions), and financial factors, as well as environmental  
and gender viability, are the main sustainability factors.

**Evaluation Methodology**

While DKH suggests consideration of the following mixed-methods methodology in order to collect the relevant data, the consultant is expected to determine the final methodological approach for presentation and approval during the inception phase. Final approval will be made by the DKH quality team. The evaluation is expected to be based on the findings and factual statements identified from a review of relevant documents including the project document, ad-hoc, monthly, quarterly and interim reports to the donor.

DKH will provide the external evaluator with all available project documentation at the beginning of the consultancy. Project-specific context shall also be taken into account. The consultant will also undertake field visits and interview the stakeholders including the target beneficiaries, government officials, respective Clusters, etc. Participation of stakeholders in the evaluation should be maintained at all times, reflecting opinions, expectations, and vision about the contribution of the project towards the achievement of its objectives.

The methodology must consider participants’ safety throughout the evaluation (including data collection/analysis and report writing) as well as research ethics (confidentiality of data and information collected) and quality assurance (tools piloting, data cleaning). The above-described methodology is indicative, the consultant is expected to provide a detailed methodology and work plan. He/she will also be free to collect additional data in order to reply to all the research questions.

**Schedule**

This assignment is expected to be completed in five weeks during the period from 16th March 2025to 27th April 2025. Bidders should provide an evaluation work plan detailing the number of working days required per  
evaluation activity (see below table).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Review of program activities, implementation policies, and reporting mechanisms, based on available documentation | To be filled by bidders |
| Development of an Inception Report, outlining the methodology for data collection and analysis | To be filled by bidders |
| Data collection | To be filled by bidders |
| Analysis of program performance based on the Six DAC criteria and the corresponding research questions listed above | To be filled by bidders |
| Drafting of the Final Evaluation Report | To be filled by bidders |
| Finalization of the Final Evaluation Report, taking into account DKH comments on its quality and accuracy. | 10 days |

The consultant will be expected to meet weekly with DKH management staff to provide updates on the evaluation timeframe. This can be done either by phone, email, or in person.

**Deliverables**

The following deliverables should be provided to the DKH Country office in Yemen which will then circulate them to the Head Office for feedback.  
All deliverables should be in electronic version, Word/Windows compatible format, and in English.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverables** | **Deadline** |
| Inception Report | First week |
| Draft Final Evaluation Report | Fourth week |
| The final version of the Final Evaluation Report | Fifth week |

For all deliverables, the external evaluator is expected to underline factual statements using evidence, and  
to comment on any deviation.

**Inception Report**

The inception report shall include the following elements:

* Detailed description of the methodology for the evaluation
  + Data collection methods
  + Data collection tools
  + Sampling of the FGDs and KIIs
  + Approach to quality control
* Data analysis methods
* Justification for revising the Evaluation Questions (if relevant)
* Detailed workplan
* Analysis of anticipated limitations and mitigation measures

**Final Evaluation Report**

The final evaluation report should be including the following elements:

|  |
| --- |
| The project synopsis serves as an introduction and provides background information. It, therefore, includes a short text on the objectives of the project and issues to be addressed by it, a description of the target groups, and a summary of its intervention logic, including the indicators at the three levels of the intervention logic: overall objective/impact, specific. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Executive summary**  *(2 pages max)* | Should be tightly drafted, and usable as a free-standing document. It should be short, not more than two pages. It should focus on the main analytical points, and indicate the main conclusions, lessons learned, and specific recommendations. |
| **Project synopsis**  *(This section should not exceed 1 page in length)* | The project synopsis serves as an introduction and provides background information. It, therefore, includes a short text on the objectives of the project and issues to be addressed by it, a description of the target groups, and a summary of its intervention logic, including the indicators at the three levels of the intervention logic: overall objective/impact, specific objective/outcome, outputs. The synopsis does not include an appreciation and observations on issues related to the project implementation. |
| **Methodology**  *(This section should not exceed 1 page in length)* | The methodology section should detail the tools used in the evaluation; locations, sample sizes, sampling methodology, tools used, dates, limitations faced, and other pertinent facts. |
| **Findings**  *(max. 2 pages per DAC criteria)* | The findings section should present the results of the evaluation in an objective and non-judgmental way that gives an honest portrayal of the project.  Included in the findings should be a discussion of how well the project achieved each of the six DAC criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability), and the Core Humanitarian Standards commitments.  The consultant shall highlight the most important findings relating to the performance of the project and elaborate on them in detail while also pointing out any critical issues and/or serious deficiencies. Findings shall be accurate, concise, and direct. They must be based on and coherent with their answers to the evaluation questions.  The consultant is expected to provide a self-sustaining explanation of their assessment which must be understandable by any person unfamiliar with the project while at the same time providing useful elements of information to the stakeholders. The consultant should avoid the following weaknesses: not evidence-based, lack of technical content (e.g. experts provide an analysis that does not take into account the state of the art of knowledge in a given sector or topic).  Full source details (including file name, and page numbers…) are always to be  included. |
| **Conclusions, Lessons Learned, Best Practices, and Recommendations**  *(max.3 pages)* | These should be presented as a separate final chapter. Wherever possible and relevant, for each key conclusion there should be a corresponding recommendation. The consultant shall set out the main conclusions and recommendations based on the answers given to the evaluation questions and which are summarized in the findings section.  Recommendations should be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible and drafted in a way that the stakeholders to whom they relate are clearly identified. Recommendations are derived from the conclusions and address issues of major importance to the performance of the project. They must take in consideration applicable rules and other constraints, related for example to the context in which the project is implemented. They must not be phrased in general terms but constitute clear proposals for solutions and they target the most important issues rather than minor or less relevant aspects of a project.  Through conclusions, lessons learned, best practices, and recommendations, the evaluation will generate knowledge and support accountability to beneficiaries, the DKH, Partners, and the overall humanitarian community. It will provide information on the processes or activities that partners implemented to develop insights, knowledge, and lessons from past experiences so as to improve current and future performance. |
| **Annexes** | * Terms of Reference of the evaluation * Assessment tools used (questionnaires, checklists, scoring grids, etc.) * List of persons (job titles only, no names)/organizations consulted * List of literature and documentation consulted   Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses and other pertinent elements, graphs, etc.) |

**Experience Requirement**The consultant should have the following background:

* Post-graduate qualifications in development/humanitarian studies or relevant areas.
* At least 7 years of experience in Monitoring and evaluation, including all relevant humanitarian sectors.
* Strong knowledge and/or demonstrated experience in conducting similar evaluation activities in insecure contexts is required.
* Strong knowledge of Core Humanitarian Standards.
* Strong analytical skills and ability to clearly synthesize and present findings.

Excellent written and oral English essential.  
Proven expertise in:

* + - Qualitative and quantitative data collection, instrument development, and data analysis
    - Gender and protection mainstreaming
    - Food security, WASH, Health and Protection.
    - Familiarity with OECD-DAC evaluation criteria

**Technical and Financial Proposal:**

Candidates are required to submit both a technical and financial proposal to DKH. The technical proposal should clearly demonstrate an understanding of the Terms of Reference (ToR), outlining the proposed methodology, approach, and work plan. It should address aspects such as relevance, logic, rigor, practicality, creativity, and realism. Additionally, it must show clarity and relevance to the local context and the deliverables outlined in the ToR. The work plan should be realistic and comprehensive, reflecting a thorough understanding of the scope of work. Furthermore, it should detail the quality assurance processes that will be implemented for this assignment.

The financial proposal must include a detailed budget that outlines all anticipated costs for evaluation, including expenses related to travel, accommodation, personnel, and any other relevant items.

**Assessment and Weighting Criteria of the Proposals**

Required mentioned documents to be included when submitting the Proposal: Interested individuals /firm must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications and interest: (i) Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability; (ii) Most updated detailed CVs of the team including past experience in similar assignment, samples of similar assignments, Clear copy of the identity card /passport, and at least 3 references; (iii) A detailed Methodology and work plan on how the individuals/firm will approach and conduct the work.

Legal documents are required if the applicant is a firm:

* Company profile
* Valid VAT and TAX ID certificate
* Valid Trade/Business License

(**Note**: both individuals and firms will be evaluated through the personal CV’s who will do the assignment)

The received proposals will be weighed according to the technical assessment criteria (**70%** weightage) and financial assessment criteria (**30%** weightage). The proposals will be assessed using Cumulative Analysis Method. Technical proposals should obtain a minimum of 70 points to qualify and to be considered. Financial proposals will be opened only for those application that secured 70 points or above. Below are the criteria and points for assessing both technical and financial proposals:

1. **Technical proposals (total score: 70 points)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Maximum obtainable points** | **Weighting (%)** |
| General adherence to the Term of Reference (ToR) | 5 | 7% |
| Proposed methodology, approach, and workplan (relevance, logic, rigor, practicality,  creativity, realism of work plan etc).   * Clarity and relevance of the proposed methodology, to the local context and to achieve the deliverables of the ToR. * Realistic and complete work plan which reflects clear and comprehensive understanding of the scope of work in the ToR. * Clarity on the quality assurance process that will be in place for this assignment. | 25 | 36% |
| * Previous relevant experience in program evaluation using DAC criteria including the ability to assess innovative FSL projects. * Company profile / If the applicant is firm * Sample of related previous work. | 15 | 21% |
| Technical capacity of the applicants: qualifications, competencies, experience and skills  as per the ToR. | 25 | 36% |
| **Total** | **70** | **100%** |

1. **Financial Proposal (total score: 30 points)**

The payment structure will be divided into three milestones based on the delivered outputs:

* 30% of the total payment will be provided upon submission and acceptance of the inception report
* 50% will be paid after delivering the draft report and conducting the validation workshop

The remaining 20% will be released once the final report has been approved by DKH after all comments and necessary revisions have been completed

This phased payment approach is designed to align the disbursement of funds with the successful completion of key deliverables throughout the evaluation process.

The Financial Proposal should provide a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems) is to be provided by the offer.

Financial proposal will be assessed based on the completeness, clarity and appropriateness, using the formula:

Marks Obtained = Lowest Priced Offer (Amount) / Offer being considered (Amount) X 30 (Full Marks)

1. **Submission of Proposals**

Interested consultants or firms are invited to submit their proposals, including technical and financial proposals, CVs of the evaluation team members, and examples of previous evaluations conducted at [procurement.yem@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.de](mailto:procurement.yem@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.de) **. Please provide a maximum of 30 pages.**

Deadline for Submission: **Saturday 12th April 2025@ 12:00 pm Yemen time**

For technical questions please reach Eng. Ahmed Bin Azoon ‘ahmed.binazoon@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.de’

**Contact Information :** procurement.yem@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.de

1. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Development Assistance Committee [↑](#footnote-ref-2)