

Scope of Work for Summative Performance Evaluation CLEAR Ukraine

(a) Activity Information

Activity Name	Community-Led Emergency Action and Response (CLEAR)
Implementer(s)	Lead: Global Communities Partners (Up to 15 Local CSO / NGOs)
Award Number	720BHA22GR00285
Title	End of Project Evaluation
Budget	\$15,000,000.00
Period of Performance	July 18, 2022, to January 17, 2024
Active Geographic Region	Chernihiv and Chernivtsi Oblasts, Ukraine

(b) Background and Context

The Community-led Emergency Action and Response (CLEAR) program is designed to address urgent and emerging needs in shelter, water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH), and protection in conflict-affected regions of Ukraine. The program leverages Global Communities' local network of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) to integrate local voices in intervention priorities and design, thereby empowering local actors to provide life-saving assistance in line with humanitarian principles and relevant international standards.

The CLEAR program is addressing gaps in reaching smaller communities that are severely impacted by population flows, market volatility, and changing frontlines in conflict-affected regions of Ukraine. The program is working to strengthen the capacity of local humanitarian assistance providers while also providing humanitarian assistance support. Global Communities facilitates connections between actors at different levels to ensure a forward-leaning humanitarian response that is in service of local affected people, with the goal of enabling CSOs and Local Government Units (LGUs) to address their own unprecedented humanitarian needs and respond to future humanitarian shocks. The program aligns with the United States Agency for International Development's (USAID) localization focus, which emphasizes empowering local actors to lead their own humanitarian responses.

Since the onset of Russia's invasion of Ukraine on February 24, 2022, the humanitarian situation in the country has continuously worsened. As of July 2023, more than [17 million](#) people within Ukraine are in need of immediate humanitarian assistance, with over [5 million](#) internally displaced. According to the latest estimates by the International Organization for Migration (IOM), over 50% of all IDPs are concentrated in just 5 oblasts within Ukraine, with Kharkivska and Dnipropetrovska oblasts having the largest IDPs presence (689,000 and 625,000 estimated IDPs, respectively). In Chernivetska Oblast the estimated number of IDPs amount to approximately [98,000](#) and in Chernihivska Oblast the numbers are slightly lower estimated at [72,000](#), according to latest IOM figures.

[OBJ]

IDPs face various obstacles on their way to find safer locations. Reports of difficulty finding places to sleep are increasing, despite the hospitality of rural communities in the west.¹ Women and children face increasing protection risks as they migrate from eastern oblasts to the west.

People unable to leave areas in or near hostilities have several needs, with older persons and persons with disabilities (PWDs) increasingly among those remaining in eastern oblasts. CSOs in all regions are quickly pivoting to provide localized assistance, but face dwindling supplies, lack of capacity, and emotional burn-out.

Description of the Activity

Global Communities designed the CLEAR program with the goal of addressing urgent Protection, Shelter and Settlements (S&S) and WASH needs for 22,580 vulnerable individuals in Ukraine affected by military hostilities. This goal directly aligns with BHA’s mission to save lives, alleviate human suffering, and reduce the physical, social, and economic impact of disasters.

In addition to the explicit purposes of reaching people in need with protection, S&S, and WASH support, CLEAR’s localized implementation approach prioritizes capacity building of local organizations to be effective responders to humanitarian needs. CLEAR leverages Global Communities’ network of the USAID-funded DOBRE program’s trained CSOs, and other CSOs in target oblasts, as partners and the voice of communities. As the humanitarian repercussions of the conflict continue, building local capacity is critical in enabling affected populations to meet their own critical lifesaving needs. CLEAR has integrated reflection and learning, including from the program’s final evaluation to capture lessons from this approach to be shared with USAID/BHA and the broader humanitarian community.

Theory of Change: If displaced and war-affected people in Ukraine have the information and services they need to prevent and respond to protection threats to their well-being, have access to dignified shelter options and WASH facilities, and are able to address their basic needs; and if local responders have the technical and operational capacity to lead responses that meet the humanitarian needs of people in their areas of operation; then lives will be saved, human suffering will be alleviated, and the impacts of the war will be mitigated.

Purpose 1: Provide gender-sensitive protection services while strengthening capacities of local protection actors to increase safety and well-being of 20,000 displaced and war-affected people.

Purpose 2: Provide safe, habitable, and gender-sensitive S&S solutions to 12,900 displaced and war-affected people, including improving access to suitable WASH facilities, while strengthening the capacities of local actors.

CLEAR achieves its purposes through activities within the following sectors and subsectors:

- Protection – Child Protection (CP), Prevention of and Response to Gender-based Violence (GBV), Psychosocial Support (PSS), and Protection, Coordination, Advocacy, and Information (PCAI).
- WASH – Hygiene Promotion (HP) and WASH Non-Food Items (NFIs)
- S&S – Shelter, Settlements and Shelter NFIs (SNFIs)

A summary of the intervention, sub-purpose and respective outputs and outcomes is illustrated in the table below.

¹ IOM Reach IDP monitoring report 4/5/22

Intervention	Sub purpose	Output	Outcomes
Protection	To provide gender-sensitive protection services while strengthening the capacities of local protection actors to increase the safety and well-being of 20,000 displaced and war-affected people.	Global Communities provides technical support and capacity building to CSO partners to expand service provision and ensure services are accessible to conflict-affected populations.	Increased protection of vulnerable crisis-affected populations, women, children, disabled, and elderly populations.
WASH	Provide safe, habitable, and gender-sensitive WASH solutions and access to suitable facilities to 11,789 displaced and war-affected people.	Increased number of people receive WASH and HP services through the provision of WASH NFI kits and HP activities to conflict-affected populations.	Improved WASH practices and access to hygiene promotion items / materials for crisis-affected people.
S&S	Provide safe, habitable, and gender-sensitive S&S solutions to 12,900 displaced and war-affected people.	Increased number of people receive support for shelter and settlements needs through SNFIs, rental assistance, home rehabilitation, and winterization activities.	Improved quality of living for vulnerable people in targeted settlements
Localization	Support CSOs in directly responding to needs identified in their communities and improving their own welfare/situations.	Global Communities provides technical support and capacity building to CSO partners to develop and implement safe, effective responses to humanitarian needs in their communities.	Increased local capacity and knowledge around safe and accountable humanitarian implementation.

(c) Evaluation Purpose and Type

The evaluation aims to generate evidence, best practices and lessons learned on specific components of the BHA CLEAR programming which Global Communities sees the strongest imperative for knowledge generation. Global Communities will utilize the unique opportunity in Ukraine to explore the effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of nexus programming by exploring the successes and challenges of localization and the role of civil society in the context of emergency response. Specifically, the evaluation will explore effectiveness of CSO capacity building especially vis-a-vis emergency program delivery, CSO delivery of protection activities and how well they met the beneficiary needs, beneficiary selection processes and NFI distributions (quality of selection process and distributed items), and level of beneficiary satisfaction with repair work conducted under small repairs.

In addition, the final evaluation will collect endline values for seven (7) key performance indicators listed below:

- **C01** - Percent of targeted children reporting an improvement in their sense of safety and well-being at the close of the program.
- **C03** - Percent of PCAI participants with an increase in understanding of basic protection principles.
- **C04** - Percent of people reporting improvements in their feelings of well-being and ability to cope at the end of the program.
- **S10** - Percent of settlement beneficiaries who believe settlement interventions met or exceeded expectations.
- **W08** - Percent of beneficiary households with soap and water at a handwashing station on premises
- **C07** - Percent of beneficiaries who report that complaint and feedback mechanisms are safe and accessible.
- **C08** - Percent of beneficiaries reporting that humanitarian assistance is delivered in a safe, accessible, accountable, and participatory manner.

The findings of the evaluation will be used by CLEAR program management and staff, BHA, implementing partners, respective clusters, and other actors with a stake in the implementation of locally-led emergency response.

(d) Evaluation Questions

Effectiveness

1. To what extent did the project increase the capacity of local community partners to engage in humanitarian response efforts both in terms of their technical and organizational capacity?
 - 1.1. *Illustrative sub-questions:* Were there differences based on type and size of the organization (I.e. local, international, small, large)? How did the localization approach help to reach the most vulnerable? Were there any unique constraints linked to the localization approach and what steps were taken to mitigate / adapt to these challenges?
2. Was the project successful in meeting performance goals as defined by key outcome indicators? What factors helped or hindered success?
 - 2.1. *Illustrative sub-questions:* Were targets realistic, and how could the target setting process improve in future emergencies responses?

Relevance

3. To what extent were the interventions employed under the project appropriate for meeting affected population needs?
 - 3.1. *Illustrative sub-questions:* Were there differences based on service delivery by type and size of the organization (i.e. local, international, small, large) or modality of service (cash, NFIs)?
 - 3.2. Were the interventions relevant (based on needs and culture) and did they meet the needs of affected populations? Are there some other unmet needs in the sectors of the intervention?

Sustainability

4. To what extent did the localization approach sustainably prepare local organizations to meet future humanitarian needs in their targeted communities?
 - 4.1. *Illustrative sub-questions:* Has the overall capacity of CSO staff increased in the humanitarian field? Has the CSOs' understanding of core humanitarian standards increased? Have the participating CSOs increased their capacity to attract additional funding for humanitarian activities? Were there differences based on type and size of the organization?

(e) Evaluation Methods and Limitations

The evaluation will use methodologies appropriate for responding to the evaluation questions. A mix of quantitative and qualitative methods drawing from both primary and secondary data is expected to be necessary. This includes:

- A systematic desk review of all key data and documents generated since the inception of the program including project proposal, baseline survey, work plans, progress reports, TPM reports, aggregated (non-sensitive) feedback and complaints information etc.
- Semi-structured key informant interviews with program management and staff, CSO partner staff, local community and IDP leadership, program beneficiaries, and local officials (with flexibility for in-person or online sessions)
- Participatory focus group discussions and key informant interviews with beneficiaries and community members, (I)NGO staff, CSO Staff, and others (with flexibility for in-person or online sessions)

- A representative quantitative survey of beneficiaries for measuring performance indicator values.

Sampling Methods:

The evaluation service provider is expected to develop a detailed evaluation methodology, covering sampling methods and sample size, and a quantitative and qualitative data analysis strategy.

For the **quantitative** beneficiary survey, a representative sample is to be drawn from the supported and targeted communities using appropriate probabilistic sampling methods, e.g. stratified random sampling. At a minimum, the suggested sampling strategy should be statistically significant at the 95% confidence level and a 5-7% margin of error per sector. See the proposed sampling frames below:

Sector	Sampling Frame*	Sampling comments	Performance Indicator
Settlement / WASH Intervention Beneficiaries (NFIs, cash, home rehabilitation)	8,516 households	Split proportionally between Chernihivska and Chernivitsi Oblasts	S10, W08, C07, C08
Child Protection Beneficiaries	Parents/caregivers for 8,500 children	Split proportionally between Chernihivska and Chernivitsi Oblasts	C01, C07, C08
PSS beneficiaries (Protection sub-sector)	5,950 individuals	Split proportionally between Chernihivska and Chernivitsi Oblasts	C04, C07, C08
<i>*There is an estimated 70% overlap between beneficiary sampling frames, which should reduce the overall number of total surveys, while still allowing for statistically representative samples within each stratification (sector). Final numbers will be provided to the evaluator during inception.</i>			

For the **qualitative** interviews and/or focus group discussions (FGD), the following table lists an illustrative set of key informants and FGD participants:

Description	Method	Number (per location)
e.g. Gov't officials	KII	e.g. 2 -3 per oblast
CSO Partner Staff	KII or FGD	e.g. 2 representatives per CSOs for FGDs; 3 – 4 CSO representatives per oblast for KIIs; or any combination thereof
GC staff	KII or FGD	Relevant program staff, 2 - 3 FGDs or 5 – 6 staff for KIIs
Community / IDP representatives	KII	e.g. 2 -3 KIIs per oblast
Beneficiaries	FGD	Minimum 3 – 5 FGDs per oblast EX - men / women; IDP / Host community / non-displaced, war-affected

The below table maps **suggested** methodologies per evaluation question:

Evaluation Question	Key Data to be Collected	Data Collection Methods (primary)	Existing Data to be Reviewed (secondary)
Example To what extent did the program meet the needs of targeted communities?	Beneficiary perceptions regarding the effectiveness of project interventions on their household and community Indicator xx: % of participants able to meet their household WASH needs	Household survey FGDs	Aggregated FCRM feedback PDM reports/ data

EQ 1. To what extent did the project increase the capacity of local community partners to engage in humanitarian response efforts both in terms of their technical and organizational capacity?	Local partners perceived and demonstrated change in capacity to respond to crises across functional areas (finance, human resources, logistics, technical sectors, data management etc.)	KIIs or FGDs (qualitative data) with partner staff Partner staff surveys with partner management and GC staff	ARC assessments PDM reports Program reports Third-party reports or studies on localization in Ukraine
EQ 2. Was the project successful in meeting performance goals as defined by key outcome indicators? What factors helped or hindered success?	Endline data for key performance indicators listed above. Implementation lessons learned (key challenges and successes)	Global Communities and partner staff KIIs / FGDs Beneficiary surveys	Indicator Tracking Tables Semi-Annual Reports PDM Reports
EQ 3. To what extent were the interventions employed under the project appropriate for meeting affected population needs?	Beneficiary feedback on the extent to which their needs were met by the program. Satisfaction levels with different assistance modalities	Beneficiary survey Partner staff KIIs / FGDs, Global Communities staff KIIs / FGDs, KIIs with community and IDP leadership / local authorities	PDM reports Feedback and complaint mechanism data
EQ 4. To what extent did the localization approach sustainably prepare local organizations to meet future humanitarian needs in their targeted communities?	Perceived and demonstrated changes in capacity. Documentation of organizational systems and processes and their use	Partner staff KIIs / FGDs, GC staff KIIs / FGDs, Community and IDP leadership / local authorities	ARC assessments PDM reports Program reports Third-party reports or studies on localization in Ukraine

(f) Evaluation Deliverables and Timeframe

The evaluation service provider is responsible for undertaking the tasks outlined below and submitting the deliverables as per the agreed timeline. The overall task of conducting the final evaluation is expected to take no more than 59 days. The final report should address all the evaluation questions, be written in a clear and concise style, and contain an executive summary (detailed structure and formatting requirements will follow). All quantitative and qualitative data sets must be shared with Global Communities to upload to USAID's DEC database.

Task	Deliverable	Duration
<i>Inception and Preparation</i>		
Desk review of relevant program documentation	An inception report outlining evaluation methodology, implementation plan and tools . Format of the evaluation methodology to be agreed with Global Communities.	14 days
Development of evaluation methodology, sampling framework and data collection tools		
Development of data collection calendar (including meeting/interview schedule)		
Presentation of Evaluation Plan to Evaluation Team		
<i>Data collection</i>		
Training of data collectors on consent handling, data collection instruments, participatory facilitation techniques	Pre-tested set of data collection tools and group of trained data collectors	7 days
Pre-testing and revision of data collection tools		
Data collection	Raw data sets	20 days

Data Processing, Analysis and Interpretation		
Data analysis and Interpretation	Draft report	7 days
Facilitation of validation workshops with key stakeholders (including at field level), using preliminary findings from prior data collection activities		
Preparation and submission of draft report		
Final Report Preparation and Submission		
Debriefing for Technical Review Team, Global Communities senior management to i) familiarize stakeholders with evaluation findings, and ii) validate and prioritize evaluation recommendations	Debriefing	4 days
Integration of feedback from stakeholders and submission of final report	Final report (with data sets attached)*	7 days

*Final report due to Global Communities by January 10, 2024.

(g) Management and Technical Guidance

The consulting firm will work under the overall supervision of the Global Communities MEL Manager with support from the HQ MEL Specialist. The Technical Review Team will be responsible for reviewing and approving the evaluation methodology, data collection tools and reports.

Global Communities responsibilities in facilitating the evaluation process are:

- Provide access to all necessary program documents (i.e., project proposals, annual work plans, baseline survey report, TPM reports, progress reports etc.) and share relevant contacts
- Coordinate meetings and conditions for the data collection process at each selected project site, including informing stakeholders and communities
- Support organization of the validation workshop with key stakeholders and the debriefing to the Technical Review Team.
- Coordinate the review and approval of the (draft) evaluation report and other key deliverables

(h) Evaluation Findings and Dissemination

The evaluation findings will be shared and disseminated by Global Communities through various platforms. These include:

- (1) Sharing the final report with the donor
- (2) Sharing findings with various clusters and coordination mechanisms
- (3) Sharing internally with other Global Communities departments and implementation teams

Evaluation Team Composition

Global Communities is seeking proposals from experienced evaluation firms with a qualified team lead and the ability to mobilize enumerators in Ukraine. The evaluation team leader should be an individual with experience spanning over 10 years leading large scale multi-sector evaluations, ideally in the following thematic areas: Localization/partnerships, protection, shelter & settlements, and WASH.

He/she should be a holder of a post graduate qualification in research, social sciences, statistics, evaluation, agriculture, or any other qualification relevant to the assignment. A PhD is recommended. Experience with BHA evaluations is highly desired.

The evaluation team must have at least one consultant under key personnel who is an expert in protection or who has significant experience monitoring and evaluating protection activities and/or interviewing individuals and groups at risk or victims of abuse, exploitation, and violence. It is preferable to have one team member with experience in gender analysis, child protection and safe and accountable programming.

The evaluation team should also include one or more experts in qualitative methods, with demonstrated experience leading qualitative tool design, data collection, analysis and presentation.

The Team must be available to hold regular update meetings with the Global Communities MEL Manager, Technical Review Team or designate and other relevant personnel.

All enumerators and evaluation personnel interacting with beneficiaries must be trained on Do No Harm, protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA), safeguarding, safe & accountable program, and safe interview techniques or related trainings.

The evaluation team should be able to demonstrate:

- Excellent and proven quantitative and qualitative research skills, including the development and application of participatory evaluation techniques and tools. Experience in participatory methods involving children and adolescents is considered essential.
- Experience interviewing individuals and groups at risk or victims of abuse, exploitation, and violence
- Knowledge and sensitivity to the Ukrainian context.
- Familiarity with evaluating humanitarian programs required (especially BHA programs). Additional experience on nexus or development programming a plus.
- Proven ability to interpret and analyze complex qualitative and quantitative data, and to present findings and recommendations in a clear, concise way.
- Proven ability to collect and manage sensitive data safely and ethically, in line with protection principles
- Strong training and facilitation skills
- Good interpersonal skills and ability to work in a team with diverse backgrounds
- Written and spoken Ukrainian and / or Russian (strong preference for both)
- Excellent English writing skills
- The data collection team's ability and willingness to travel to the project sites and work in difficult and challenging environments

(i) Reference Documents

The evaluation team will need to review activity documents to better understand the activity being evaluated. An illustrative list of potential documents to share includes:

- The CLEAR M&E Plan and Indicator Tracking Table (ITT)
- The CLEAR implementation plan
- Monthly reports
- PDM / TPM reports
- Baseline reports
- Semi-annual and Annual reports

- Relevant databases
- Maps / geographic coordinates to describe geographic areas of operation and/or target populations