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**Introduction/Background**

SOS-Kinderdorf Österreich (SOS Children’s Villages Austria / SOS AT)) was founded in 1949. The idea of “a loving home for every child” has since spread all over the world. Today SOS Children’s Villages is present in 135 countries, organized as a federation with SOS Children’s Villages International as an umbrella body.

SOS Kinderdorf Österreich (SOS AT) is part of the federation and is implementing as well domestic as international programmes, together with the respective national SOS CV member associations (MA). SOS CV Uganda is one of the focus MA’s for SOS AT. The cooperation with SOS UG and SOS ET is defined by the following principles of strategic and bilateral cooperation (non-exhaustive list)

* Goals:
	+ Individual support of focus countries to develop their programmes and portfolio
	+ Individual support of focus countries to reach their goals within strategy 2030
	+ Generating knowledge within the organization
* Activities:
	+ Knowledge exchange depending on the specific need of the MA
	+ Partnerships between locations in Austria and in the focus countries
* Public Funding:
	+ Watching out for funding opportunities (preferred for focus countries but also for others)
	+ Joint proposal development
	+ Implementation of projects funded by institutional donors (especially Austrian Development Cooperation)

***SOS Children’s Villages believes in:***

* *Child development is best realized within a caring family environment.*
* *A child’s parents have the primary responsibility for the upbringing and the development of the child (Article 18, UNCRC).*
* *The state is the principle duty bearer in promoting and protecting child rights.*
* *The child has a right to receive special promotion and assistance from the state when deprived on his/her family environment and to be provided with alternative care (Article 20, UNCRC).*
* *Civil Society Organizations, such as SOS Children’s Villages organization, have an obligation with regard to children’s rights. Working with governments can support the state in fulfilling its responsibilities in regard to children’s rights*

ICAP is a three-year intervention representing it’s fourth phase. It is implemented through a partnership between SOS Austria, SOS Children’s Village International (CVI), the National Associations SOS Ethiopia and SOS Uganda and local Community Based Organizations in cooperation with the Governments of Ethiopia and Uganda. The themes identified are in line with the current programmatic and strategic themes and model of SOS family strengthening program (FSP) and ADA policies.

The ICAP project is the logical next step in a process lasting several years that SOS, ADA and the Governments of Ethiopia and Uganda have been jointly involved in since 2007. (1st Phase: ETH, ZIM; 2nd Phase: ETH, ZIM, UGA; 3rd phase: ETH, UGA, TZN, 4th phase: ETH, UGA) The objectives and strategy of this phase builds on the results achieved under the previous phases that have been implemented. A basic premise for this phase is the experience and expertise developed by SOS in the understanding and implementation of relevant development interventions vital in . This phase built upon these past interventions and considered a necessary response to the continuing needs of the children, their families and communities in the project’s focus locations (Hawassa, Mekelle & Bahirdar in Ethiopia; Fort Portal, Entebbe and Kakiri in Uganda). SOS has therefore continued its support to the Governments of Ethiopia and Uganda development priorities. In particular, ICAP aimed at supporting the countries’ overall development objective of “reducing poverty”.

The ICAP project, which is 80% co-financed (of total EUR 1.501.500) by the Austrian Development Agency (ADA) with EUR 1.200.000 and 20% by SOS Austria at EUR 301.500 is running from 01.01.2016 to 31.12.2018. This external evaluation of the project covers the period from 01.01.2016 through 31.12.2017.

Contributions and integration into the larger context

1. SDGs

ICAP aims at contributing towards the following **global goals for sustainable development:**

* SDG 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere
* SDG 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture
* SDG 3: Ensure good healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages
* SDG 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all
* SDG 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls
* SDG 8: Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all.
1. National Development Plans of Ethiopia and Uganda

The ICAP project has been designed inline with the national development plans of the governments of Ethiopia and Uganda and their respective policies as relevant to the ICAP topics.

1. ADC Strategy

The major ADA priorities that the framework programme 2016 - 2018 is contributing to:

* Poverty reduction:
* Democracy and Human Rights
* Gender equality and empowerment of women
* Integration of vulnerable groups

Further details on ADA’s strategic focus can be found here: <http://www.entwicklung.at/en/ada/>

1. SOS CV Strategy 2020 and new SOS CV Strategy 2030

The overall objective of ICAP is to contribute to SOS Children's Villages global strategic objective 2020 (one child, one friend, one movement) to respond to the needs and rights of 1,000,000 most vulnerable boys and girls and enable them to grow in a caring and responsive family and community environment.

While the strategy 2020 was the guiding element for SOS Children’s Villages by the time of designing the ICAP project, a new strategy has since been developed and was adopted in 2017. The new Strategy 2030 is henceforth the guiding document for strategic program development and needs therefore be taken into account for this evaluation in order to produce relevant information that can be used for new program and project designs.

1. ICAP Objectives and results

The project’s strategy is based on a process oriented approach, which is highly participatory, involving all stakeholders in defining needs and responses and which provides opportunity for communities to develop more detailed action programs based on stronger knowledge and understanding of what is possible, what addresses needs most appropriately and what will work. The main outcomes anticipated from this approach are:

1. an increased capacity of the target communities to organize, articulate their needs, negotiate interests and entitlements, plan and support their child care, protection and development initiatives;
2. the strengthening and/or creation of self-managed local institutions/community structures that support community-based child care and development initiatives;
3. the emergence of community-level extension agents or volunteers able to advocate for the rights of children and to mobilize resources to support their communities’ development priorities.

(please refer to Annex 1 Project Logframe for more information)

Partnership and cooperation

SOS Austria is cooperating with the three project implementing partners: SOS Ethiopia, SOS Uganda and the Regional Office for Eastern and Southern Africa (IOR ESAF): IOR ESAF is located in Addis Ababa / Ethiopia and has a branch office in Nairobi / Kenya where the financial coordination of the ICAP project is located. The role of the SOS International Office Region (IOR) Eastern and Southern Africa (ESAF) in this project is to provide program, financial management and organizational support to National Offices / Member Associations (SOS Ethiopia and SOS Uganda) and strengthen measures for child protection, gender, transparency/accountability and anti-corruption. The IOR has also the role of monitoring and controlling the Member Associations operations and ensures compliance with federation policies and standards through advice, guidance, information, knowledge sharing and capacity development.

Target group

All the project interventions of ICAP aim to reach the main target group of SOS Children’s Villages, directly or indirectly. The main targets of this intervention are vulnerable boys and girls especially those who have lost or are at risk of losing parental care. These include orphans, those children living with chronically-ill parents/caregivers (living with AIDS or under other life threatening conditions), children living in orphan-headed households (sheltering one or more orphans), and children separated from parents or living with elderly caregivers. Other target groups include care givers, key implementing partners, community support structures and SOS member associations; namely SOS Ethiopia, Uganda and member associations in ESAF and IOR ESAF. The project will therefore focus on the two categories of beneficiaries as follows:

Direct target group:

* Approximately 4,359 most vulnerable children and their families (2,359 in Ethiopia and 2,000 in Uganda) who will get support through family strengthening programmes components, either through SOS or the partner CBOs;
* The community based partners of FS Wakiro and FS Kabarole in Uganda and FS Bahir Dar, FS Hawassa and FS Mekelle in Ethiopia; who will be strengthened to respond to the needs of the most vulnerable children in their communities in a sustainable way;
* 2 national partners: SOS-Uganda and SOS-Ethiopia

Indirect target group:

* In Uganda, the 15,000 indirect beneficiaries comprise of boys, girls, women and men from target communities who will be reached through dialogue meetings, referrals, village savings and loans associations among others.
* In Ethiopia the 7,000 indirect beneficiaries include community members, community based partners, government offices and other civic society organizations in the intervention areas.
1. **The Partners**
2. Name of Organization in Austria

SOS-Kinderdorf Österreich, Stafflerstraße 10a, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria

1. The Implementing Partners

SOS Children’s Village of Uganda Trust, P.O. Box 27510, Kampala, Uganda

SOS Children’s Villages Ethiopia, Bole Sub City, Kebele 03/05, House No 2/229, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

SOS Children’s Villages International, Regional Office for East and Southern Africa (ESAF) P.O.Box-2491, 1000 Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

1. Austrian Development Agency (http://www.entwicklung.at/)

The Austrian Development Agency (ADA) is the Operational Unit of the Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC). It is in charge of implementing all bilateral programmes and projects in ADC's partner countries and administers the budget earmarked for this. Another focus of ADA’s operations is education and information in Austria to convey the issue of development cooperation to a broader public.

The Austrian Development Agency cooperates with non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and combines official development assistance with numerous civil-society initiatives. This way, government and civil society make a joint contribution to poverty reduction and improving the conditions of life in developing countries.

The framework programme for Austrian NGOs is one of the various co-financing instruments in the collaboration with NGOs. The projects are based on the NGO’s own initiatives and are directed at meeting the actual needs of the target groups in developing countries. Per definition, an ADA framework programme consists of coherent and interactive programme interventions with a common strategic and development objective.

1. **Purpose**

The overall purpose of this evaluation is to determine the results achieved during phase 4 of the project at outcome and output level. Furthermore the evaluation should be formative, improvement and learning oriented to inform the design of the next fifth project phase, in order to build on the learnings during the design of the next phase. In that sense the evaluation is part of the design process and will bring about some key inputs to ensure adequate responses to the needs of the target group.

An external evaluation, assessing the outcomes and outputs at the three locations in each country participating in the ICAP project is foreseen. Hawassa, Bahirdar and Mekelle are the project locations in Ethiopia, Fort Portal, Kakiri and Entebbe in Uganda. The project evaluation is to be carried out in the third year of the project by an external consultant (with his team) in order to be able to **feed findings and recommendations into the planning** of the Strategic Partnership Programme 2019+. The overall topic for the new action will be “**Socio-economic empowerment of families and youth, with a special focus on green economy**.“ Therefore, during the inception phase and field phase of the review process, the evaluator needs to gauge needs of and opportunities for the target group in that particular field.

In that context a cooperation with a university, specialized in innovative solutions for green economy, could be envisaged.

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

The evaluation is specifically intended to contribute to:

* **Learning**: insights and knowledge gained through the evaluation will contribute to planning and steering of the ongoing project implementation and development of the new 5-year strategic partnership program on “**Socio-economic empowerment of families and youth, with a special focus on green economy”** which is currently under development. This is the most important focus of the evaluation and needs therefore appropriate attention by the consultant.

To a lesser extent, however not to be left out entirely, the following elements also need to be considered:

* **Exchange** of best practices between stakeholders
* **Improvement** of policies of the implementing organisations, processes and methods of ongoing and eventually future projects, such as the above mentioned
* **Recommendations** for Austrian NGO and local partner/s as well as the ADA concerning future programming and cooperation
* **Accountability** towards the stakeholders
1. **Objective**

The main objective of the evaluation is to assess and present results (output, outcome), conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations.

The evaluation is taking place at the beginning of the last year of implementation. The reason for his timing is twofold:

1. It allows for steering measures well before closure of the project as well as
2. for gaining essential insights and inputs that should feed into the design of the new upcoming project starting in 2019.

Stakeholders:

The evaluation needs to involve all relevant stakeholders at all levels (international, regional, national, local) including project participants and final beneficiaries, implementing local partners (SOS and CBO’s), local government, relevant institutions, etc. Everyone involved should be able to benefit from the process and its findings. The donor agency, as well as government authorities should get relevant information about outcomes and outputs and key learnings. In addition to this, the implementing agencies need to get input for future programming, in particular in regards to green economy (opportunities and needs of the target group).

The results need to give relevant information for the design of the next phase. Insights are expected on what should be continued, done better or should not be done anymore. In addition, the process should bring about answers to questions around opportunities for the target group in regards to green economy and how this could serve as a lever to improve their lives.

Furthermore the report and the final evaluation workshop, where the findings will be presented and discussed, need to be suitably packed for the beneficiaries.

As the evaluation results are supposed to inform the planning of the next phase, and this being an important purpose of the evaluation, the OECD DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability) need to be given weighted attention. **Effectiveness and sustainability are the top priorities**, followed by efficiency, relevance and impact. In the light of this, the evaluation team has to analyse the following points:

1. The design and coherence of the project including the design of the log frame matrix/programme theory and its assumptions.
2. The extent to which the project has already achieved its outcomes and outputs or is likely to achieve them, including the extent to which the lives of the project beneficiaries (women, men, girls, boys) have already been improved. Also the extent to which supported institutions have already benefitted people.
3. The strengths and weaknesses in terms of planning, management, implementation and monitoring
4. The extent to which cross-cutting issues (gender and environment mainstreaming) were applied. It is to be noted that this project contains a strong gender equality component. The evaluation team, who is expected to have sound knowledge about **gender programming**, needs to give this aspect due emphasis. Furthermore, in view of the thematic focus of the new project, the evaluator is also expected to have sound knowledge about **green economy** in the context of the geographic intervention areas, in order to give relevant input for the design.
5. The efficiency of the project in relation to beneficiaries, cost and timeframe of the project.
6. The logframe and verifiable indicators found in the original proposal and provide post-project figures along with a narrative explaining the reasons for under/over performance achievement.
7. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt for future strategy and improvements in implementation of the project.
8. The current political, social and cultural factors impacting the implementation of the project.
9. The communities’ attitude towards the project
10. **Subjects and Focus**

Topic of the evaluation:

Learning and inform the planning and design of next phase

Scope of the evaluation:

The evaluation looks at the current project (year 1 and 2). It is supposed to assess all three components (Ethiopia, Uganda including all 3 respective locations and Umbrella/Learning component). While the weight regarding the OECD DAC criteria for the components in Uganda and Ethiopia are as described above, the emphasis for the umbrella component, which is being implemented by the regional office IOR ESAF, needs to be different. **Priority is to be given to effectiveness and efficiency**, followed by relevance, sustainability and impact.

Geographical area:

All locations in both countries and umbrella component (IOR level)

Group of beneficiaries and/or institutions selected for being interviewed: (see also section 7 for more detail)

It is in principle left to the evaluator to select the interviewees according to the applied methodology. However there are some key groups that need to be considered in order to get a relevant picture:

* CBO’s who participated in the current and any of the previous frameworks
* Caregivers
* Children
* service providers
* local government administration
* a sample of other community structures as they seem relevant

… the evaluator may wish to choose additional interviewees that are not on the above mentioned list.

In addition, regarding the evaluation of the **umbrella** component, it is desirable to include the following interviewees:

* program coordinator SOS AT
* program coordinator IOR ESAF
* key staff leading the 3 virtual learning groups

… the evaluator may wish to choose additional interviewees that are not on the above mentioned list.

* OECD DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact):

As already mentioned above: the evaluation results are supposed to inform the planning of the next phase, namely the project to be developed under the ADA instrument of strategic partnership program, which will focus on “**Socio-economic empowerment of families and youth, with a special focus on green economy”**. Therefore winning insights into the topic is an important purpose of the evaluation, regarding the two country components in **Uganda and Ethiopia**. The OECD DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability) need to be given weighted attention in the following order (starting with the most important):

1. Effectiveness and sustainability
2. Efficiency
3. Relevance
4. Impact (the focus being on outcomes and outputs, rather than on impact, as an impact evaluation of all four program phases may take place during the inception phase of the new project)

While the weight regarding the OECD DAC criteria for the components in Uganda and Ethiopia are as described above, the emphasis for the **umbrella component**, which is being implemented by the regional office IOR ESAF, needs to be different. The implementation of the umbrella component, which basically forms the learning and knowledge management of the ICAP project, needs to be evaluated in order to define the organisational, strategic and methodological approach to learning and knowledge management in the next phase. Therefore the priorities are the following:

1. effectiveness and efficiency
2. relevance
3. sustainability
4. impact.
5. **Bid Format**

The bid has to be submitted until 23:59 (CET) on February 28th 2018 including a company / consultants profile, experience and references. The bid has to be in EURO, showing all taxes (Mwst/VAT) and travel or other expenses. It has to include a suggestion of the methodology, time and action plan and if necessary, suggestions and recommendations to the Terms of References.

1. **Specific Evaluation Questions**

As outlined under chapters 2, 3 and 4 above it is expected to focus on the 5 evaluation criteria in a weighted manner. The below are some guiding questions, however the particular weight given to the different criteria must be observed.

***Relevance***

* To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid for the partner country, the partner organization and its direct and indirect beneficiaries?
* Are the expected results/outcomes/outputs of the project 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)?
* How is the project addressing the needs of targeted 4,359 most vulnerable children family strengthening programmes in Ethiopia and Uganda? How are the objectives and achievements of the project consistent with the needs and priorities of the stakeholders and beneficiaries?

***Effectiveness***

* To what extent has the project already achieved its expected results/outcomes/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)
* hat was the most effective way in which the project addressed the problem identified?
* Was the project managed as planned? If not, what issues occurred and why?
* To what extent have all project stakeholders collaborated as planned?
* Did the project contribute to capacity building as planned? If not, what were the reasons?
* To what extent was gender mainstreaming included in the project and to what extent were recommendations from the ADA gender-assessment considered and implemented?
* To what extent was environmental mainstreaming included in the project and to what extent were recommendations from the ADA environment-assessment considered and implemented?
* To what extent were the social standards monitored by relevant partners? Have any issues emerged, if so which ones and why?
* To what extent was the SOS organizational structure (IOR ESAF, PSA, MA’s) helpful or hindering the effectiveness of the implementation of the project?

***Efficiency***

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

***Impact***

For this evaluation it is envisaged to focus more on outcomes and outputs than on impact, which is planned to be looked at later at inception phase during an impact evaluation covering all 4 project phases since 2007.

* How many women, men, girls, boys and people in total have already benefited from the project?
* What exactly has already changed in the lives of women, men, girls, boys?
* Which positive and/or negative effects in terms of gender and environment can be possibly be attributed to the project?
* Which institutions have already benefitted from the project and how? What has changed for whom ?
* Are there any other important aspects regarding impact?

***Sustainability***

* What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?
* What needs to be done and/or improved to ensure sustainability?
* Which are the learnings that could be replicated?
1. **Approach and Methods**

The evaluation consists of several phases:

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

Desk Study: The evaluation/review team studies all necessary project 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.

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 interviews 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.

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

Presentation: Presentation of key findings (feedback workshop) at the end of the field trip.

Final Draft Report: Submission and presentation of final draft report, inclusion of comments from partners and contractor.

Final Report: Submission of final report, **see reporting requirements under point 10.**

For the different phases it is expected that data and information will be obtained through different methods such as: analysis of documents, structured interviews, semi-structured interviews face-to face or by phone, group discussions, online-survey, others.

All data collected needs to be disaggregated by sex.

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 and can be downloaded here:

<http://www.entwicklung.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Dokumente/Evaluierung/Evaluierungs_Leitfaeden/EN_Leitfaden_Evaluierung.pdf>

1. Methodology

The evaluation will be based on the secondary analysis of available documents as well as on primary data collection among key partners. The evaluation is expected to deploy a mix of (qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis, e.g. income improvement) methods and (primary and secondary data) sources. Different data need to be triangulated to enhance the validity of results. Consultants are expected to suggest the detailed methodology and action plan as part of the proposal.

Some suggestions are:

* Review of the available documentation and reports (compare Annex 1)
* Interviews with key project-staff such as
* Desk officer of SOS-Kinderdorf Österreich
* SOS Children's Villages Regional Offices in Addis Ababa and Nairobi:
	+ Regional Program Development Advisor
	+ Regional Quality Management Coordinator
	+ Head of Institutional Partnership Development IOR ESAF
	+ Regional Grants Advisor IOR ESAF
	+ Regional Director of Programs
* Project partners of SOS Children’s Village in Uganda and Ethiopia
* SOS Children’s Villages Uganda:
	+ National Director
	+ National Family Strengthening Coordinator
	+ National Program Development Advisor
	+ Family Strengthening Coordinators in Fort Portal, Entebbe and Kakiri
* SOS Childrens Villages Ethiopia:
	+ National Director
	+ National Family Strengthening Coordinator:
	+ National Programme Development Advisor
	+ Family Strengthening Coordinators in Bahir Dar, Hawassa and Mekele
* Interviews, workshops, case studies and/or focus group discussions with relevant key stakeholders in Uganda and Ethiopia such as:
* Community Based Organizations
* Other Partners: Representatives of Local, Regional and Central Governments, Youth Leaders, NGOs, etc.
* Beneficiaries: children and their care givers, youth
* Interview with the NGO-desk and the relevant coordination office of the Austrian Development Agency in Uganda and Ethiopia
1. **Process**
2. **Timeline**

A maximum of 38 working days is currently estimated for this assignment.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Responsible | Date |
| Submission of bid (electronically) | Contractor | 28 Feb 2018 |
| Contract signed and documents provided  | Contract signed between SOS Austria and consultant  | 16 Mar 2018 |
| Kick-Off meeting  | Meeting between contractor and consultant | 19 Mar 2018 |
| Desk Study  | Consultant | 20 Mar–25 MAR 2018 |
| First interviews  | Consultant | 26-30 Mar 2018 |
| Submission of draft inception report | Consultant | 09 Apr 2018 |
| Comments on the inception report | Relevant SOS staff | 13-18 Apr 2018 |
| Inclusion of comments in inception report | Consultant | 19-22 Apr 2018 |
| Submission of final inception report | Consultant | 23 Apr 2018 |
| Field Visit, interviews etc. and feedback workshop | Consultant | 25 Apr -06 May 2018 |
| Submission of final draft report  | Consultant | 14 May 2018 |
| Presentation of final draft report  | Consultant | 21 May 2018 |
| Inclusion of feedback in final draft report | Contractor | 25-28 May 2018 |
| Submission of final evaluation report (hard copy and electronic copy) to contractor | Consultant  | 1 June 2018 |

1. **Budget / Payment**

The consultant shall elaborate a working plan with the number of estimated working days to fulfil the contract of services and daily fee. Upon preliminary selection of one bid the price will be negotiated between the consultant and SOS-Kinderdorf Österreich.

1. **Support services**

SOS Children’s Village and the Austrian Development Agency will provide support (information/interviews; providing relevant documents, feedback to draft of the draft review, participation at presentation of draft findings). The interviews will be arranged and supported after agreeing on the action & time plan.

1. **The Evaluation Team**

The ideal evaluation team will consist of

* one international consultant (team leader), ideally originating from either Uganda or Ethiopia
* plus one national consultant per country (in case the international consultant is from neither of those two countries, one from Ethiopia and one from Uganda). The aim is to have good knowledge of the national context within the team of consultants.
* In addition the consultants will be supported by the national M&E advisors in order to facilitate their orientation and way through the organization of SOS CV

Key qualifications in the team should be:

* Relevant academic degree (master level) in one or more of the following fields: Development Studies, Monitoring & Evaluation or a relevant, directly related discipline
* A minimum of five years’ experience and expertise in geographically and thematically closely-related projects
Geographically: Ethiopia, Uganda, Eastern African Countries;
Thematically: Community development, gender programming, **green economy**, socio-economic strengthening, etc.) (written testimonials of such need to be submitted with the application; one of the most sought after requirements for shortlisting)
* Team leader and member (s) have conducted at least three evaluations in the last five years, ideally in a relevant field (written testimonials of such need to be submitted with the application, this is also one of the most sought after requirements for shortlisting) and ideally as team leader in at least 1 evaluation (applicable to the team leader)
* Knowledge of Ethiopia and Uganda with focus on topics such as Community development, gender programming, **green economy**, socio-economic strengthening, etc.
* Working experience in Ethiopia and Uganda
* Experience in project cycle management
* Experience and expertise in evaluating cross-cutting issues
* Experience in social science methods
* Excellent oral and written English skills
* Sound MS Office and IT skills
* Experience preparing and analyzing a theory of change is an asset
* Proven track record in proposal writing is an asset

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

1. **Reports**

The consultants will submit the following reports:

* an inception report (10-15 pages without annexes),
* a draft evaluation report (about 25-30 pages without annexes), includinga draft executive summary **and the results-assessment form (see Annex 2) as part of the reporting requirements**
* and the final evaluation report (25-30 pages without annexes), the final executive summary **and the results-assessment form (Annex 2) as part of the reporting requirements**

All reports need to be written in English.

The executive summary should summarize key findings and 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 to the relevant stakeholders as described in the ToR’s?
1. **Co-Ordination/Responsibility**

Valerie Neuhold-Maurer will be the contact person for this evaluation/review.

Contact details:

**Valerie Neuhold-Maurer, M.A.**  I  International Programmes

SOS-Kinderdorf

Vivenotgasse 3

1120 Wien

Mobil +43 (0) 676 881-44-281

Tel +43 (0) 1 3683135 73

Fax    +43 (0) 1  3683135 66

valerie.neuhold-maurer@sos-kinderdorf.at

[**www.sos-kinderdorf.at**](http://www.sos-kinderdorf.at/)

Zerihun Endale will support the coordination for this evaluation/review.

Contact details:

Zerihun Endale, SOS CVI

Regional Grants Advisor

International Office, East & Southern Africa (IOR ESAF)

T: +251 (0) 116 639 010 Ext 257

M: +251 (0) 913 240 976

Email: Zerihun.Endale@sos-kd.org

1. **Annexes:**
* Annex 1 Project Logframe (short version)
* Annex 2: Results-Assessment Form for Mid-Term and Final Project Evaluations/Reviews
* Annex 3: Available documents

**Annex 1 Project Logframe**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Reason for intervention** | **Indicators** | **Verification sources** | **Assumptions/risks** |
| **Main objective** | To contribute to SOS Children's Villages global strategic objective 2020 (one child, one friend, one movement) to respond to the needs and rights of 1,000,000 most vulnerable boys and girls and enable them to grow in a caring and responsive family and community environment.  |   |   | *No assumptions or risks should be formulated for the main objective* |
| **Project objective** | Strengthening the capacity [1] of Key Implementing partners (KIPs) and civil-society organizations for effective management and sustainability of gender sensitive child care and protection programmes in Ethiopia and Uganda.       | * 60 % of project participants’ children have met their development needs and are living in a caring and protective community and family environment by 2018
* 50 % of key implementing partners have reached level 1 or 2[2] functional and financial sustainability by the end of 2018
* 50 % of target children and families are benefitting from the services provided by community structures.
* 70 % of KIPs[3] with at least 50% female representation in community leadership by 2018 from the baseline (i.e. in its governance and management structures)
* % increase in active participation of community members (especially women and children) at all levels of decision making
* Gender issues in the target areas have been addressed by joint initiatives implemented with partners
 | * Project progress reports compared to baseline
* Programme Database
* Case studies produced
* Dialogue with community key informants
* KIP Empowerment Plan and KIP Audit report
* Self-evaluation reports
* External review report
 | Assumptions:* Host governments and target communities support and participate in project activities
* Existing macro-economic and political factors remain stable nationally and regionally
* Social calm prevails
* Communities are able to mobilize resources to support the project
 |
| **Expected results** | **Result 1: Organizational capacity for knowledge management and learning practice improved** | * SOS and partners KIPs have effective organizational, monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning (knowledge management) systems and practice in place by the end of 2018
* 3 programme plans clearly reflect assessment data, secondary data, learning from previous programmes and sector-wide best practice and learning
* Lessons learned and promising practice is documented in each programme/operation and shared across the organization
* The performance of at least 5 KIP programmes is improved [4]
* At least 2 resource management practices documented, shared and applied
* Effective follow-up systems for experience sharing in place[5]
 | * KM strategy and guidelines
* Knowledge sharing / promising practice document
* Follow up action plans and implementation reports
* M&E schedule
* Beneficiary satisfaction surveys
* Minutes of community meetings
* Progress reports
* External review report
* Completed tool to cross check planning decisions are made based on assessments
* Workshops reports and minutes
* MEAL guidelines/framework
 | Assumptions:* Technical and financial resources are available
* Partners willingness and participation in the project
 |
|  | **Result 2: Economic[6] capacity of KIPs and target families improved in meeting the needs of vulnerable boys and girls in Ethiopia and Uganda by the end of 2018** | * At least 50% of male and female caregivers have acquired relevant technical, vocational and entrepreneurial skills and utilize loans from their groups to invest towards productive or sustainable income generating activities for their families
* 60% of caregivers’ real income increased by 50 % from the base line value by 2018
* At least 60% of target caregivers are able to provide the basic needs of their children demonstrated by % of household income spent on school fees/food/clothing/medical treatment
* All KIPs engage in at least one sustainable social business by 2018
* % of partner CBO’s income[7] increased by 60% from the baseline until 2018
* 20 % of target children and families supported by KIPs with the income generated from social business
 | * External review report
* Self-evaluation reports
* Government review report
* Progress reports
* Savings & loan books
* Loan repayment receipts
* KIPs Audit report
* FDP (Family Development Plan) review reports)
 | Assumptions:* Existing macro-economic factors remain stable
* Political and social calm prevails
* Government willingness and commitment to support KIPs
* Policies and legislations that support the project are in placeRisks:
* Unclear legal background over engagement of CBOs in social business
* Low level of literacy among some KIPs leaders
* Fraud
* Delay of budget approval
* Price inflation
* High expectations from project participants
* Limited knowledge and trust of CBOs in social business
 |
|  | **Result 3: Community driven social support systems, networks and structures are strengthened and sustained to advocate for and respond to the needs and rights of vulnerable boys and girls in Ethiopia and Uganda** | * # of child care and protection systems and networks are in place and have improved their response to the OVCs cases according to minimum government standards in Ethiopia and Uganda
* Communities are able to handle 80% of the reported child rights violations in coordination/ partnership with local justice mechanisms
* 50% of community members are aware of social support systems and structures which actively address the situation of most vulnerable children and their families
* Overall improvements in the level of community engagement and relationships with power holders and influence on policy and practice
* # or % of boys and girls supported through community driven child care and protection responses
* # of children that believe they are safe within their own households (in the areas of abuse, exploitation and violence)
 | * External review report
* Programme Database
* FDP reports
* Baseline survey report
* National OVC impact study reports
* Self-evaluation reports
* KIPs records and reports
* KIPs Audit
* Minutes of community meetings
 | Assumptions:* Government policies, laws and budgets are improved to support OVC
* Communities are responsive to the needs and rights of OVC and are willing to contribute towards programmes for OVC
* Communities are able to establish effective networks
* Resources are available (from donors and communities) to implement the actionsRisks- Transfer of responsibility to partners might compromise end results.
 |
|  | **Result 4: Transformation of social relations started to improve participation of girls, boys, women and men to care and protect most vulnerable children in Uganda and Ethiopia** | At individual level:* % of men in our target group engaged in child care, growth and developmentAt community level:
* 100% of reported incidents on violence against children and gender based violence receive or are referred to necessary support (medical, psychosocial, legal, or any other form of support)
* # of communities where a community based initiative has been undertaken to respond to gender based violations (as per relevant issues identified at local level, e.g. forced marriages, girls withdrawal from school, teenage pregnancies and sexual abuse and sexual exploitation)
* % of girls, and women participating in decision making structures at different levels; private and public increased by 2018At organizational level:
* 75 % of key implementation partners mainstream gender by 2018
* Internal capacities are strengthened (experienced gender team/gender experts/staff)
* At least 50% of project staff are conscious of gender issues in programmingAt policy level:
* 20% of sub-county, district and national plans, budget, programmes in Uganda include girls and boys issues
 | * Guidelines on gender & advocacy
* Attendance lists of trainings, etc.
* Training reports
* Focal point for gender at national level
* MoUs/ToRs for research activities
* Research documents/ reports
* Number of girls and boys who have lost or are at risk of losing parental care and KIPs linked to different forums/networks (category of networks)
* Number of engagements with
* the media
* Number of people by category aware of the gender policies
* Time-Use Survey Report
 | Assumptions:* Commitment and readiness of KIPs and SOS management to gender mainstreaming
* Governments and target communities support and participate in project activities
* Political stability (2016 election in Uganda)
* NGO law favors civil society space.
* Public order management bill/Act/ law do not hinder community meetings.
* Community is willing to partner with the project
* Resources are available (financial, human and non-capital assets).
* Gender laws are amended and enacted. Risks:
* Inflation
* Resistance of some community members to gender equality
 |

[1] Capacity development includes functional, financial and institutional capacity of partners and CBOs

[2] There are four levels 1,2,3 and 4 where 1 is the most advanced: “the Key implementation partner carries full responsibility for implementation of project interventions and is able to manage and further develop these interventions; on-going contact is maintained with SOS children’s villages through local networks”

[3] Key Implementing Partner

[4] Time, cost and quality wise and KIPs are SOS CVE, SOS CVU and CBOs

[5] Outputs of the experience sharing platforms

[6] Economic: Refers to financial and livelihoods development within partner CBOs and participating families

[7] Income earned through social business, fund-raising and local resource mobilization

[8] Economic: Refers to financial and livelihoods development within partner CBOs and participating families

**Annex 2: Results-Assessment Form for Mid-Term and Final Project Evaluations/Reviews**

**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 beginning of the evaluation/review report.**

|  |
| --- |
| Title of project (please, spell out):  |
| Contract Period of project: |
| ADC number of project: |
| Name of project partner:  |
| Country and Region of project: |
| Budget of this project:  |
| Name of evaluation company (spell out) and names of evaluators: |
| Date of completion of evaluation/review:  |
| Please tick appropriate box:1. Evaluation/review managed by ADA/ADC Coordination Office
2. Evaluation managed by project partner:
 |
| Please tick appropriate box:a) Mid-Term Evaluation b) Final Evaluation c) Mid-Term Review d) Final Review Others: please, specify: |
| **Project Outcome *(Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):***  |
| **For Final Evaluation/Review[[1]](#footnote-2): Project Outcome: To what extent has the project already achieved its outcome(s) according to the Logframe Matrix? Please, tick appropriate box** Outcome(s) was/were:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fully achieved: | Almost achieved: | Partially achieved: | Not achieved: |

**Please, also explain your assessment: What exactly was achieved and why? If not achieved, why not?** (Please, consider description of outcome and relevant indicators) |
| **For Mid-Term Evaluation/Review[[2]](#footnote-3): Project Outcome: To what extent do you think the project will most likely achieve its outcome(s) according to the Logframe Matrix Please, tick appropriate box**Outcome(s) will most likely be:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fully achieved: | Almost achieved: | Partially achieved: | Not achieved: |

**Please, also explain your assessment:** (Please, consider description of outcome and relevant indicators) |
| **Project Outputs: To what extent has the project already achieved its outputs[[3]](#footnote-4) according to the Logframe Matrix ? Please, tick appropriate boxes****Output 1 *(Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):*** 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, explainWhat 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 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:** |

**Annex 3: Available documents**

The following documents will be availed to the review team:

Framework Programme Documents

 Framework Programme Application / Contract including logframe

 Yearly Reports

 Workshop documentation

 Learning group documentation

Internal documents & manuals

 Previous project review, Management response (from previous review)

 SOS Children´s Villages International Strategic Plan 2030

 Working towards sustainability- Continental Policy Support Document

Country specific documents

 Child Rights Situation Analysis of Uganda and Ethiopia

 Strategic Plans of SOS Children’s Village Uganda and Ethiopia

Documents of the Austrian Development Agency

 NGO Framework Programme Guidelines

 ADA Evaluation Guidelines

1. Please, only fill in in case this is a final project evaluation/review. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Please, only fill in in case this is a mid-term evaluation/review. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. In case there are more than three outputs, please, add them. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)