# Tender Notice

**Reference: PR 11322 ECHO External Evaluation**

**Item number and title:** External Evaluation Consultancy, Darfur States, Sudan **Contracting Authority: Norwegian Church Aid Sudan**

**Deadline for submission of offer: 30th July 2019**

**Request for Proposal**

NCA Sudan is planning to conduct an external final evaluation of an ECHO funded project titled:

**Emergency and Early Recovery Water, Sanitation, Hygiene, Health and Nutrition response for Internally Displaced People, Returnees, Host Communities and South Sudanese Refugees in Central and South Darfur.**

The project is implemented in four IDP camps in Central and South Darfur states (Hassa Hissa, Hamedia, Khamsadageig, Rokero, Al Radom and Bilel camps). The project will end by 31st July 2019 and the evaluation is expected to commence within one month of completion of the project. NCA expects to receive proposals from interested consultants by 30th July by the latest.

1. The services are for a humanitarian project in Sudan an intervention supported by ECHO.
2. The offered prices shall be quoted in US Dollars only.
3. The full Tender Dossier and Terms of Reference will be shared with interested candidates upon request.
4. All offers, in English language only, must be delivered to the office mentioned below by 16:00 hrs local time, 30th July 2019.  Late bids will be rejected.
5. Tenders will be opened at the address mentioned below at the time stated in the Tender Dossier. Tenderers or their authorized representative can be present at the opening of tenders.
6. **Tender documents will be available from 15 July 2019.** Interested tenderers may obtain the Tender Dossier in English at no cost from the Contracting Authority mentioned below.

Norwegian Church Aid, Sudan

Amarat 3, Khartoum, Sudan

Email: [bakhit.ahmed@nca.no](mailto:bakhit.ahmed@nca.no) and [getachew.amsalu@nca.no](mailto:getachew.amsalu@nca.no)

**I. Introduction**

**I.A. Background**

NCA Darfur Program (NCA DP) is part of the international relief programme launched by international community in 2004. The program is supported by Action by Churches Together International (ACT) and Caritas Internationalis (Caritas). ACT International is the network of Protestant and Orthodox Aid and development agencies worldwide. Caritas Internationalis is the international confederation of Roman Catholic relief and development agencies. ACT and Caritas networks work together in a joint response to the Darfur crisis through Norwegian Church Aid (NCA) which implements the programme on behalf of the two networks. Norwegian Church Aid (NCA) is a member of ACT and provides the legal basis for the operation in Sudan. The term “NCA Darfur Program” (NCA DP) is used to describe all activities supported by the joint ACT/Caritas network under the auspices of NCA. NCA DP program is therefore a multi-sector operation managed by NCA working jointly with national implementing and contractual partners.

NCA DP has implemented activities in South and Central Darfur targeting IDPs and conflict affected host communities since July 2004. The program covers sectors such as; Water and Sanitation, Health and Nutrition, School Support, food security and livelihood, Emergency Preparedness / Response and Organizational Development and Capacity Building.

**II. Sector Goal and Objectives**

In 2018/2019 the WASH, Health and Nutrition sectors through ECHO funding implemented projects in four IDP camps in Central and South Darfur states (Hassa Hissa, Hamedia, Khamsadageig, Rokero, Al Radom and Bilel camps). The sectors continued to work towards the achievement of the NCA Darfur Program outcome of Conflict affected communities of Darfur have enhanced resilience to the recurrent crises in South and Central Darfur States. The achievement of this ultimate outcome is through a phased approach of working in four intermediate outcomes namely

1. Increased access to safe potable water for the vulnerable communities
2. Increased access to basic sanitation services for the target beneficiaries and
3. Improved hygiene promotion status among target groups in the operation areas
4. Improved access to Primary health care services in Bilel IDPs
5. Increased capacity of Darfur Programme, communities and their leaders to manage and operate WASH facilities and services improved in areas of operation.
6. Improved access to Emergency Shelter and None food items for people affected by disasters

**The Project:**

The project primarily targeted IDPs camps, South Sudanese refuges and host communities in four camps of South and Central Darfur under six results:

* IDPs, refugees and host communities have access to clean and adequate water supply
* Sanitation facilities and services are established and rehabilitated in schools, health centers and vulnerable households
* Beneficiaries in targeted areas are provided with appropriate and effective information on safe hygiene practices and are mobilized to adopt measures to prevent the deterioration in hygienic conditions and to use and maintain the facilities provided.
* Community WASH management structures are established and equipped to function
* South Sudanese refuges, IDPs and Host communities have better access to quality PHC services
* South Sudanese refuges, IDPs and Host communities have better access to nutrition services

The project aims to reach a total of 166,928 people (78,457M, 88,471F) in the four IDP camps of Hassa Hisa, Hamedia, khamsadegiga and Bilel. The project mainly focuses on WASH in the three Central Darfur Camps while in addition to WASH, the project implements health and nutrition activities in the Bilel IDP camp.

**The sector is now looking to evaluate and find out**

1. To what extent has the ECHO 2018 project achieved the planned outputs and outcomes within agreed timeframe and budget? What key factors have been important in supporting and/or limiting achievement of outcomes?
2. What were the advantages and drawbacks of working through the national partners?
3. To what extent have the programme activities delivered outputs and outcomes? (Effectiveness)
4. What unintended results, both positive and negative, did the programme produce? How did these occur?
5. How well was the programme implemented, delivered and adapted in response to feedback / changing need? (Relevance)
6. To what extent has gender been considered in programme design and implementation? How the programme demonstrated good practice in ensuring issues around gender has have been fully considered in programme design and implementation? How did the intervention affect women differently from men? (Effectiveness)
7. To what extent has the programme design and implementation considered, reached and supported the most vulnerable? How has the programme demonstrated good practice in ensuring support to the most vulnerable has been fully considered in programme design and implementation? (Effectiveness)
8. To what extent has the programme reflected priority concerns of targeted communities? How have communities been actively engaged in the programme to help shape the overall priorities and design of the programme? How successful have these approaches been? (Relevance)
9. To what extent has the programme reflected policies and strategies of national and state governments? How have local governments been actively engaged in the programme to help shape the overall priorities, design and implementation of the programme? How successful have these approaches been? (Relevance/Efficiency)
10. To what extent can the project be considered good value for money in the operating context, using the 4Es framework outlined below:

**Economy**: extent to which programme has used best practice procurement and compliance with internationally recognized standards (bulk purchasing, local procurement to reduce transportation costs, timing procurement to reduce costs / ensure timely delivery etc.)

**Efficiency**: extent to which programme delivery options and models have ensured efficient use of funds and added value, including: management structures; use of different consortia (local / international partners); integration of and synergy between programme activities; delivery at scale.

**Effectiveness**: extent to which programme is delivering benefits to intended beneficiaries (target population and communities) and achieving outcomes.

**Equity**: extent to which programme identifies, targets and meets the needs of specific vulnerable individuals and communities, given budget available.

1. How has the working relationship with the donor facilitated programme delivery? Are there areas that have worked well, or areas and practices that could work better? (Efficiency).
2. How the project sustainability was, and how the project can consider the elements of resilience and sustainability in future as the project context continuously changing from practical view?
3. What are the best approach can be followed by project to contributing in overcome the environmental challenges
4. To what extent can the outputs be expected to be sustainable over the longer (5 years) term?
5. What characteristics make the outputs sustainable or unsustainable?
6. Do the local government authorities / leaders fully support the initiatives taken by the project?
7. To what extent has the project strengthened the capacities of local government and local leadership structures?
8. To what extent are the beneficiaries’ themselves contributing to the sustainability of the initiatives?
9. To what extent has the private sector become involved in the development of the area as a result of the project?
10. To what extent has there been integration of WASH, Health and Nutrition sectors? And how effective was the integration?

**III. Evaluation Methodology**

**Evaluation Design and Approach**

The evaluation will employ industry standard mixed-methods of both quantitative and qualitative data collection and include as a minimum the following approaches:

* A clear evaluation approach and rigorous design to examine programme performance and delivery process, including justification of why the chosen approach is appropriate.
* Examination of the programme theory of change as an overarching framework for the evaluation, including anticipated outputs and outcomes, and linkages and assumptions between them.
* A clear evaluation framework, setting out the data collection methods and data sources that will be used to answer each of the evaluation questions.
* Triangulation of different data sources, perspectives (including beneficiaries and other stakeholders) and time points when addressing each of the questions.
* Consideration of how beneficiary populations and communities will be involved, including how their perspectives will be captured, and how feedback on outcomes / findings will be provided to them.

**Sources of Data and Data Collection Methods**

The following broader methods are suggested which could be revised and finalized with the selected external evaluator in line with the design and approach recommended above.

1. Quantitative beneficiary household survey to estimate outcome and output performance indicators and to compare with baseline benchmarks
2. Document review: Programme proposal; work plans; baseline and interim survey reports; quarterly and annual donor reports; mid-term evaluation and operations research reports; reports of assessments and studies manuals or standard operating guidelines; routine monitoring system tools; and updated Log frame which presents achievements against milestones targets of sector performance indicators of impact, outcome and outputs.
3. Key informant Interviews, focus group discussions and post-evaluation workshop: with stakeholders including ECHO and implementing partners staff; national and state government (WES, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Social Affairs and Humanitarian Aid Commission)
4. Field Observations: WASH Facility sites, project formed/facilitated WASH committees, Bilel PHC clinic

**Stakeholders Involved in the Survey:** In coordination and collaboration with NCA, the consultant shall work with the stakeholders their respective geographic areas of implementation. In addition, government line ministries particularly WES will have significant contribution to the project implementation and the consultant would be expected to have discussions and consider as part of the project stakeholders.

Evaluation and Assessment period

The project will end by 31st July 2019 and the evaluation is expected to commence within one month of completion of the project.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Event | Who | Proposed period |
| Brief introduction about ECHO project and evaluation and assessment purpose | Program manager and M&E Coordinator | One day |
| Evaluation and survey tools design, QA of tools | Consultant /M&E Coordinator | One week |
| Desk review and secondary data collection | Consultant | One week |
| Enumerates training about evaluation Tools and evaluation method | Evaluation team | Three days |
| Data collection | Evaluation team | Three weeks |
| Data analysis and report writing | Consultant | Two weeks |
| Reporting sharing | Consultant | One week |

**Evaluation team contain**

The evaluation will be led by an international external or national consultant with experience in Resilience and Development Programs. The consultant will lead the overall management of the evaluation design, implementation including capacity building for survey teams, data management and analysis, and report writing. The consultant will work with NCA team for local understanding, provision of ICT4D devices and access to project areas for data collection. The consultant will ensure that the survey team with whom it works have sufficient and qualified staff for data collection, entry and supervision. NCA will provide support in approval of tools and travel permits, transport the evaluation team between the project sites, provide stationary and recruiting the data collectors.

NCA DP will provide support to the evaluation team, making arrangements for travel and guest house reservation, vehicle transport, and facilitating contact with project staff, partners, and local stakeholders at the field level. Furthermore, the evaluation team is expected to provide their own laptop computers, and any software necessary to plan for and implement the FE.

**Evaluation and Assessment report**

The expected report from the consultant is not less than 30 pages and not more than 40 pages. Each report should meet the following points:-

* A title page
* A list of acronyms and abbreviations
* A table of contents, including a list of annexes
* An executive summary
* An introduction describing the program’s background and context
* A description of the program, including the results framework or theory of change
* A statement of the purpose of the evaluation and Assessment
* Key evaluation questions or objectives and a statement of the scope of the evaluation, with information on limitations and delimitations
* An overview of the evaluation approach and methodology and data sources
* A description of the evaluation and assessment findings
* Recommendations based on the evaluation and assessment findings
* Lessons learned and good practices based on the evaluation and assessment findings
* Appendices