



# Evaluation Terms of Reference

## Depaul International/CAFOD DEC Ukraine Crisis Response Programme

### I. INTRODUCTION

---

#### I.A. Evaluation Overview

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to reflect on Depaul's response to the Ukraine Crisis, learn lessons and ensure accountability to clients and communities, partners and donors. The evaluation will assess implementation and results vis-à-vis OECD/DAC criteria and the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS). Findings from the final evaluation are intended to inform Phase 2b of the DEC programme, Depaul's wider Ukraine response and both Depaul and CAFOD's future programming.

#### I.B. Background:

The Russian invasion of Ukraine in late February 2022 led to an estimated 16 million people either displaced from their homes or struggling to survive under extreme conflict conditions – and in urgent need of humanitarian assistance. The Ukraine Crisis is a massive, sudden-onset emergency which continues to evolve giving rise to many challenges, some of which are familiar, others less so.

The Depaul Group of charities work across the world with a mission to end homelessness and change the lives of those affected by it.

**Depaul International (DPI)** is the parent organisation of the Depaul Group, based in London. Depaul Group members are present in Croatia, France, Ireland, Slovakia, UK, USA, and Ukraine. The Depaul Group has not historically delivered humanitarian programmes or worked in insecure environments.

**Depaul Ukraine (DPU)** was founded in 2007 and has consistently worked with vulnerable and marginalised people. Before 24 February 2022 DPU employed around 60 staff, working in Kharkiv, Kyiv, and Odesa cities in Ukraine as well as in Ivano-Frankivsk oblast. Services delivered were typical of an organisation working with people affected by homelessness – night shelters, day centres, hygiene services, working with vulnerable children, and social support / casework. By March 2023 DPU had over 150 full time staff plus volunteers and was managing funding equivalent to around 30 times the 2021 budget, with services including food and NFI distribution, shelter repairs/ building materials, mental health and psychological services (MHPSS), cash transfers, and accommodation for internally displaced people (IDPs). At the beginning of the full-scale invasion

**Depaul Slovakia (DPS)** has procured food and hygiene items to send to Ukraine since the start of the humanitarian programme.

**The Catholic Agency for Overseas Development (CAFOD)** is the official development and humanitarian relief agency of the Catholic Church in England and Wales and is part of Caritas Internationalis (CI). With an annual income of approximately £50m, it works alongside people of all faiths and none, and with around 450 partners in over 30 countries across the world to bring hope, compassion and solidarity to poor communities to end poverty and injustice.



In February 2022, CAFOD together with the Disasters Emergency Committee (DEC), launched an emergency appeal in response to the conflict in Ukraine. Prior to this emergency, CAFOD did not have an on-going presence in Ukraine. In response to the conflict in Ukraine, CAFOD developed the Ukraine Crisis Response Programme from March 2023 funded by a combination of funds from the DEC Appeal, CAFOD Appeal and other donors. The programme is being implemented by a number of partners across Ukraine, Romania, Poland, Moldova and Slovakia. CAFOD has partnered with Depaul to implement three projects in Ukraine funded from the DEC Appeal (from March 2022 to 28 February 2025), with remote support from CAFOD’s Ukraine Programme team.

### I.C. Project Goal and Objectives

The main focus of this evaluation will be a review of Phase 2b projects in Ukraine (this will be 6 months into an 18-month project which started in September 2023).

It will also include a final evaluation of CAFOD’s DEC Phase 1 (ended in August 2022) and Phase 2a (ended in August 2023), which will feed into learning for Phase 2b.

Table 1: Depaul/ CAFOD DEC Ukraine projects to be included in the evaluation

<b>Project Timeframes &amp; Budget</b>	<b>Total individuals reached and oblasts</b>	<b>Focus Areas</b>
<p><b>Phase 1 - complete</b> March 2022 to August 2022 (6 months)</p> <p>Budget: GBP 4,490,835.68 (includes some CAFOD non-DEC funds)</p>	<p><b>45,000 individuals</b> Kyivska Odeska Kharkivska Mykolaivska Sumska Zaporizka Zakarpatska</p>	<p>Large scale distributions of food and hygiene items Provision of hot meals Homeless shelter services</p>
<p><b>Phase 2a - complete</b> September 2022 to August 2023 (12 months)</p> <p>Budget: GBP 7,974,604.71 (£1.8m underspend carried over to 2b)</p>	<p><b>67,083 individuals</b> Kharkivska Kyivska Odeska Mykolaivska Poltavska Sumska Zaporizka Zakarpatska</p>	<p>Gradual reduction of food and hygiene distributions Introduction of multi-purpose cash transfers (MPC) Holistic support services including MHPSS and legal advice Homeless shelter services Temporary accommodation for vulnerable IDPs Winterisation support including fuel, generators, NFIs, replacement windows, shelter repairs and building materials.</p>
<p><b>Phase 2b - ongoing</b></p>	<p><b>18,793 individuals</b></p>	<p>Food distributions only in insecure/remote locations</p>



September 2023 To February 2025 (18 months)  Budget: GBP 3,556,493	Kyivska Odeska Kharkivska Zaporizka	Continuation of MPC for highly vulnerable households Introduction of conditional cash grants for health and employment Introduction of a case management approach Holistic support services including employment support, MHPSS, hygiene, medical and legal advice Homeless shelter services Temporary accommodation for vulnerable IDPs
---	--	---

These DEC funded projects are worth a total of £14,221,933 and have reached a total of 130,876 individuals (some individuals will have been supported in multiple phases). The projects have had the following intended outcomes:

- A. Affected populations have access to food assistance (1, 2a and 2b)
- B. Affected populations have access to basic hygiene assistance (2a and b) and medical services (1)
- C. Affected populations have access to vital services (1) / holistic support services (2a and 2b)
- D. Affected populations have access to accommodation (2a and 2b)
- E. Affected populations have access to multi-purpose cash (2a and 2b)
- F. Affected populations are supported with winterization (2a)
- G. Affected populations have access to safe and dignified feedback mechanisms (2b)
- H. Capacity strengthening of staff in humanitarian response (1)
- I. Trauma-informed approaches improved (1)

## II. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

---

### II.A. Purpose of the Evaluation

The main purpose of the evaluation is to support learning and accountability by taking stock of achievements, what has worked, what has not and the factors contributing to success and failure of CAFOD/ Depaul's DEC funded Ukraine projects. Findings from the evaluation will support learning and inform future programming of Depaul and CAFOD, whilst demonstrating accountability to clients, communities, partners and donors.

This evaluation will feed into the evaluation of CAFOD's wider programme for the Ukraine Crisis Response, which is scheduled to take place in early 2024 and Depaul's evaluation of its overall Ukraine crisis response in 2024. The objectives of this evaluation are:

1. To assess how CAFOD/ Depaul's DEC-funded projects engaged the affected population and the application/adherence to commitments of the Core Humanitarian Standards, with a focus on identifying relevant learnings to inform Phase 2b programming.
2. To objectively assess the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and impact of CAFOD/ Depaul's DEC-funded projects, with a focus on identifying relevant learnings to inform Phase 2b programming.



3. To identify examples of good practices, challenges, lessons learned and critical gaps in the project implementation with a focus on providing recommendations for improving programme quality in Phase 2b, wider and future programmes, as well as for general organisational learning.
4. To identify specific lessons for CAFOD and Depaul’s future programme work and the wider humanitarian community.

## II.B. Key Audiences and Uses

STAKEHOLDERS	STAKEHOLDER EVALUATION DATA NEEDS AND USE	STAKEHOLDERS’ ROLE IN THE EVALUATION	JUSTIFICATION FOR STAKEHOLDER ROLE
<b>DEC</b>	Accountability and learning purposes	Audience	Donor
<b>CAFOD</b>	Accountability purposes; as a basis to improve future projects and partnerships of a similar nature	Respondents, primary source of data, audience	DEC member
<b>Depaul Ukraine</b>	Accountability purposes; as a basis to improve future projects and partnerships of a similar nature	Respondents, primary source of data, audience	Responsible for project implementation
<b>Clients and affected communities</b>	Share perspectives and perceptions relating to the value of the project, in particular how the project had affected individuals, families and communities positively and negatively	Respondents, primary source of data	Primary recipients of assistance
<b>Depaul International</b>	Accountability purposes; as a basis to improve future projects and partnerships of a similar nature.	Respondents, primary source of data, audience	Grant holder and responsible for supporting/advising DPU with implementation
<b>Other DEC member agencies and NGOs in Ukraine</b>	Gain insights into the effectiveness of the project and Depaul’s approach	Audience	Implementing similar responses within the same context

## III. EVALUATION QUESTIONS / OBJECTIVES

---



OECD-DAC criterion will be incorporated with CHS quality criteria, as the basis for the evaluation and in line with best practices in the sector. The following table provides suggested questions and outlines linkages between the CHS quality criteria and OECD-DAC criteria. These questions should be further refined by the evaluator(s) in consultation with the evaluation stakeholders with an aim to identify 6 priority questions.

<b>OECD/DAC</b>	<b>Core Humanitarian Standard</b>	<b>Critical Learning Question (IEPM)</b>
<b>Appropriateness, Relevance</b>	<b>CHS 1: Is humanitarian response appropriate and relevant?</b>	To what extent has this project reached those most at risk and excluded?
		To what extent has this project responded to the clients and affected communities individual and evolving needs?
		To what extent has the project addressed longer term/deeper issues already present within the affected communities before the crisis?
		What difference has the project made to clients and communities?
		To what extent does the programme build upon Depaul's expertise and values?
<b>Effectiveness, Appropriateness</b>	<b>CHS 2 – Is humanitarian response effective and timely?</b>	To what extent did the project achieve its objectives?
		Were the planned objectives and outcomes achieved? What results were achieved beyond the logframe (if any)?
		Which objectives were not met (if any) and why?
<b>Impact, sustainability</b>	<b>CHS 3 - Is humanitarian response strengthening local capacity and avoiding negative effects?</b>	Did the project have unanticipated negative or positive effects observed on its clients and communities? If so, what were they and how did they affect clients?
		How well has the project engaged with communities to ensure the project is safe and dignified and adjusted to meet clients and communities needs and priorities?
		How well has the project built upon and strengthened existing local capacities and structures?
		To what extent are the project results/benefits likely to continue after the project?
		What evidence is there of likely long-term impacts (positive or negative) of the project?
<b>Relevance, coherence.</b>	<b>CHS 4 - Is humanitarian response based on communication,</b>	How well was participation and feedback used to identify and address programme gaps and challenges?
		To what extent did clients/communities feel that they were consulted and engaged during design, implementation and monitoring of the project?



	<b>participation and feedback?</b>	To what extent were clients and community members informed about their entitlements, expected staff behaviour and feedback? Which project interventions were perceived as the most valuable by clients and why? What opportunities are there to enhance client and community communication and participation?
<b>Coherence</b>	<b>CHS 5 – Are complaints welcomed and addressed?</b>	To what extent were the feedback and complaints mechanisms relevant and appropriate to the context?
		To what extent were the feedback and complaints mechanisms implemented, effective and timely?
		To what extent did community members use the feedback and complaints mechanisms?
		Did client face any barriers to using the feedback and complaints mechanism, and if so, are there other ways community members may feel more comfortable giving feedback?
		How can feedback and complaints mechanisms be improved?
<b>Relevance, efficiency, sustainability, coverage, coherence.</b>	<b>CHS 6 - Is humanitarian response coordinated and complementary?</b>	To what extent did the project coordinate with and was complementary to other relevant social support and aid efforts?
<b>Coherence, impact</b>	<b>CHS 7 – Are humanitarian actors continuously learning and improving?</b>	To what extent has the monitoring and evaluation system supported reflection and learning?
		Has learning led to any adjustments or improvements in the project?
		How likely is it that project approaches can be scaled up, replicated or institutionalised within Depaul and more widely?
<b>Effectiveness</b>	<b>CHS 8 – Are staff supported to their job effectively and are they treated fairly and equitably?</b>	How well have project staff been supported to do their job effectively?
		To what extent has the project supported staff welfare and treated staff fairly and equitably?

#### IV. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

##### IV.A. Evaluation Design and Approach

The evaluation criteria will follow OECD/DAC criteria for evaluations and Core Humanitarian Standards applying an appreciative enquiry approach. The evaluation questions identified in the TOR will serve as a



basis for key areas of inquiry, data collection and corresponding evaluation tools. The evaluator(s) will provide a description of their selected methods to answer the questions and rationale for choosing them. The evaluation should follow DEC guidelines (DEC Evaluation & Collective Initiatives Policy).

Overall, it is expected that a range of qualitative methods (secondary data review, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, site visits, observations, etc.) will be applied to gather information from various stakeholders including project beneficiaries, community/government stakeholders, Depaul International, Depaul Ukraine and CAFOD staff.

#### **IV.B. Sources of Data and Data Collection Methods**

Evaluator(s) will detail links between data collection methods and sources to evaluation questions and sub-questions in their proposals. This should include any sampling approaches to data collection methods and data sources.

Depaul International will provide beneficiary data to aid in the selection of a representative sample of evaluation participants. Evaluation participants should include:

- CAFOD Ukraine Programme Manager
- CAFOD Ukraine Programme Officer
- CAFOD Data Quality Advisor
- CAFOD Programme Accountant
- Depaul International: CEO, Programmes Director, International Programmes Director, Head of Programme and Business Development, Senior Humanitarian Advisor?
- Depaul Ukraine: Director, Programme Director, Safeguarding Manager, Chief Programme Officer, Branch Directors
- Project beneficiaries
- Local community stakeholders (Social services/ authorities)
- Other NGOs implementing similar programs in Ukraine

Key secondary data will be provided to the evaluator(s). This includes: project proposals, logical frameworks, budgets, monitoring data, progress reports, risk logs, lessons learned, financial reports, etc.

#### **V. EVALUATION TEAM**

---

The external evaluation consultant(s) should have proven experience of leading evaluations in a humanitarian relief and response contexts. Ideally the consultant will be familiar with the Romanian or Ukrainian Crisis context and have experience evaluating DEC-funded projects. The evaluator must meet the following technical qualifications:

##### **Essential**

- Experience in the humanitarian sector



- Substantial professional management or research experience in the evaluation of international development programmes
- A proven track record in conducting different types of evaluation and learning reviews and knowledge of various qualitative evaluation methods
- Understanding of the Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability
- Strong analytical and facilitation skills
- Excellent English report writing skills

### Desirable

- Experience of the Ukraine crisis
- Spoken Ukrainian
- A master's degree in international development, social sciences or a related field
- Understanding of Sphere Standards
- Understanding of partnership approaches
- Understanding of homelessness

Applications should include:

- An evaluation proposal providing an expression of interest, and outlining the chosen methodology, timeframe and summary budget in no more than 4 pages.
- A CV with two references.
- Examples of past work may be requested from shortlisted candidates.

Applications for the consultancy should be submitted by e-mail to Laura Donkin [laura.donkin@depaulinternational.org](mailto:laura.donkin@depaulinternational.org): specifying in the subject line: **Consultant for the evaluation of the Ukraine Crisis Response Programme.**

The deadline for applications is **14 January 2024.**

The roles and responsibilities of the evaluator(s) should be detailed in the submitted proposal. Roles and responsibilities include conducting desk review, refining evaluation questions, developing evaluation methodology, drafting an inception report, coordinating/overseeing the evaluation process, final reporting and incorporating comments/suggestions and presenting findings through a briefing session. The evaluator(s) are expected to apply predominantly qualitative tools and conduct appropriate data analysis processes, including triangulating/validating data.

The independent evaluation should adhere to DEC evaluation policies and guidance, as well as standards and principles of CAFOD and Depaul International. The evaluation team will work closely with CAFOD, Depaul International and Depaul Ukraine who will guide the process of the evaluation and approve the selection of the external evaluator, approval of the evaluation methodology and endorsement of reports. The selected consultant(s) are expected to closely liaise with CAFOD Programme Manager and Depaul International's Senior Humanitarian Advisor throughout the evaluation process. CAFOD and Depaul International's project management staff will provide required documents for the desk review stage.





Depaul Ukraine will provide logistical support to the evaluator(s) for in-country visit. CAFOD, Depaul International and Depaul Ukraine will provide comments to the final report, with CAFOD and Depaul International jointly issuing a management response.

## **VI.REPORTING AND DISSEMINATION PLAN**

---

### **VI.A. Evaluation Report**

The suggested layout and content for the evaluation report is as follows:

- A title page
- A list of acronyms and abbreviations
- A table of contents, including a list of annexes
- An executive summary summarizing key findings, lessons learned, recommendations and assessment against evaluation criteria
- 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
- 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 findings
- Lessons learned and good practices based on the evaluation findings
- Recommendations based on the evaluation findings
- Appendices, including amongst others the Terms of Reference, List of documents reviewed, List of Persons/organizations consulted, data collection instruments, etc.

The report (excluding Appendices) should not exceed 30 pages.

### **VI.B. Dissemination Plan**

The evaluation team will involve the following people in identifying implications and drafting recommendations.

- The preliminary findings will be presented in-person to selected Depaul Ukraine staff at the end of the site visits and to Depaul and CAFOD staff online for validation. This feedback will inform the production of the draft report.
- Learning from the evaluation will be shared and explored through a dissemination meeting with CAFOD, and Depaul staff.
- The final report will be shared internally amongst Depaul and CAFOD staff and externally through the CAFOD, Depaul Ukraine, Depaul International and ALNAP websites.



- An executive summary will be shared (translated into Ukrainian) with local communities and stakeholders.

STAKEHOLDER	KEY FINDINGS	CHANNEL(S) OF COMMUNICATION	PRODUCT(S) TO SHARE
CAFOD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lessons learnt &amp; recommendations</li> <li>• Findings against the OECD/DAC criteria &amp; Core Humanitarian Standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning meeting (conducted by the evaluator)</li> <li>• Website CAFOD</li> <li>• ALNAP website</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PowerPoint presentation</li> <li>• Final report</li> <li>• Management response</li> </ul>
Depaul International and Depaul Ukraine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Findings against the OECD/DAC criteria &amp; Core Humanitarian Standards</li> <li>• Lessons learnt &amp; recommendations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning meeting (conducted by the evaluator)</li> <li>• Internal meetings</li> <li>• Email communication with relevant departments/units</li> <li>• Meeting to validate preliminary findings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PowerPoint presentation</li> <li>• Final report</li> <li>• Management response</li> </ul>

## VII. SCHEDULE AND LOGISTICS

The evaluation will be undertaken between February and March 2024, with a total of 30 working days. All deliverables are to be submitted no later than 30 April, 2024. CAFOD/Depaul foresee four main stages of the evaluation:

- 1. Inception phase:** Initial desk review of project documents, on which basis an inception report will be submitted detailing the evaluation approach, methodology, key questions and foreseen limitations. CHS quality criteria should be used to develop data collection tools.
- 2. Data collection and analysis phase:** This phase concerns the implementation of the evaluation mission and the synthesis of findings. Data collection will take place in project locations in Ukraine and should be undertaken in March 2024. Interviews will also be held with relevant CAFOD and Depaul International staff.
- 3. Reporting phase:** A draft report will be submitted for review and validation by CAFOD/Depaul prior to the submission of a final report. The report should refer to the CHS quality criteria to structure the analysis and present findings. All data sets are required to be submitted along with the final report.



4. **Using the evaluation:** Findings of the evaluation will be presented to CAFOD/Depaul by the evaluator(s). As a follow up CAFOD/Depaul will provide a management response, which will be disseminated together with the report internally and externally.

**Logistical arrangements:**

Where requested, CAFOD and Depaul can assist in arranging in-country flights, accommodation and transportation, the costs of which will be borne by the evaluation budget. CAFOD will assist in scheduling required interviews with CAFOD staff. Depaul will schedule on-site meetings, interviews with beneficiaries and community discussions in accordance with the final timeline submitted by the evaluator(s). Depaul Ukraine will provide local transportation support in Ukraine and office space if required. The office space can be used to meet with Depaul Ukraine staff and community members. Translators should be arranged by the evaluator(s) with support from Depaul if needed.

**VIII. DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINE**

The following table provides a suggested timeline for expected deliverables of the evaluation. Evaluator(s) may propose alternative timelines but should not exceed a total of 30 working days and the given budget. The final version of the evaluation report should be completed no later than 30 April 2024. Final payment is contingent upon receipt and approval of all expected deliverables.

DELIVERABLES	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF DAYS NEEDED TO COMPLETE	TARGET DATES TO COMPLETE
Independent evaluator/evaluation team selected (CAFOD/Depaul)	14	26/01/2024
Initial discussion on ToR, scope of work and expected deliverables (evaluator(s) & CAFOD/Depaul)	1	01/02/2024
Literature review completed	2	07/02/2024
Inception report completed and submitted	5	14/02/2023
Inception report approved	3	21/02/2023
Data collection tools completed and field tested	4	01/03/2023
Data collection completed	10	22/03/2023
Data analysed	3	29/03/2024
Draft report completed	5	05/04/2024
Results validated through reflection meetings with key stakeholders (in Ukraine and online)	2	12/04/2024
Final report completed (including a succinct summary of findings, lessons and recommendations)	3	19/04/2024
Dissemination meeting	1	30/04/2024



<b>Datasets (or recordings and transcripts/notes), codebooks, syntax or other files submitted</b>	1	30/04/2024
---	---	------------

## IX. BUDGET

---

The evaluator(s) are expected to submit a budget proposal. The budget should include the following:

1. Per diems/daily subsistence allowances
2. Interpreter allowances (if required)
3. Direct costs relating to selected methodology
4. Daily fees for the evaluator(s)
5. Communication costs (as required)
6. Any other foreseen costs - Insurance and transport costs to be discussed with DPI.

## X. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

---

In proposals submitted by evaluator(s), a section should be provided on ethical considerations and how they will be addressed. For example, basic principles such as respect for project participants should be demonstrated by seeking informed consent. Evaluation participants should be made aware through clear communication of how confidential information is treated and how privacy will be protected. If collecting information from vulnerable populations (i.e. pregnant and lactating women), written consent must be secured.

The following ethical considerations should be explained in the evaluation plan:

- Informed consent
- Voluntary participation
- Anonymity
- Do no harm
- Confidentiality