

TERMS OF REFERENCE

AUSTRALIAN HUMANITARIAN PARTNERSHIP DISASTER READY PROGRAM WORLD VISION AUSTRALIA CONSORTIUM - Evaluation

BACKGROUND

The Australian Humanitarian Partnership (AHP) is a five-year (2017-2022) partnership between the Australian Government (the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, DFAT) and six Australian NGOs. DFAT established a Support Unit to provide coordination, administration, grants management, and support for monitoring, evaluation and learning and communications for the AHP including Disaster READY. The Australian Humanitarian Partnership Support Unit (AHPSU) is managed by Alinea-Whitelum.

About Disaster READY

Disaster READY was designed in 2017. It represents an AUD \$45 million disaster preparedness and resilience program currently being implemented by AHP partners and their local networks. The focus is to strengthen disaster preparedness and management in the Pacific. The program aims to support Pacific communities and governments to better prepare for and respond to disasters. There is a specific focus on ensuring vulnerable groups, including women, people with disabilities and children, are included and accounted for in disaster preparedness, management and risk reduction activities.

The objective of Disaster READY is to strengthen local humanitarian capability and preparedness in the Pacific and Timor-Leste so that communities are better able to respond to and recover from rapid- and slow-onset disasters. This objective is supported by five outcomes that were developed through extensive consultation in-country and based on the strengths and capacities of AHP NGOs and the individual country contexts.

1. Communities are better prepared for rapid- and slow-onset disasters.
2. The rights and needs of women, people with disabilities, youth and children are being met in disaster preparedness and response at all levels.
3. Government, NGOs, the private sector and communities coordinate more effectively for inclusive disaster preparedness and response.
4. National NGOs and faith-based organisations have more influence and capacity in the country humanitarian system.
5. AHP NGOs work effectively together and with other relevant stakeholders.

The AHP Disaster READY phase 1 will finish at the end of June 2022. A second phase (Phase 2) is expected to commence in July 2022, with the re-design process commencing in January 2022.

World Vision Australia (WVA) is one of the six lead agencies implementing the AHP Disaster READY Program which is being implemented across five Pacific Island countries, being Fiji, Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and Timor-Leste. Partners which are part of WVA's led consortium are: The Australian Bureau of Meteorology (BoM),

CBM Australia, Habitat for Humanity Australia (HfHA) and Field Ready. WVA has also engaged Humanitarian Advisory Group (HAG) to undertake a strategic research initiative as part of Disaster READY.

OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE THE INTERNAL EVALUATION ON WVA'S AHP DISASTER READY PROGRAM

The purpose of this internal evaluation is primarily to *assess the impact of the AHP Disaster READY program in Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, and Timor-Leste* in order to:

- Consolidate Learning from AHP Disaster READY Phase 1
- Develop recommendations to inform the design of AHP Disaster READY 2.0

It is expected that findings from this evaluation will also inform WVA's work on disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation, and broader resilience building in the Pacific.

The internal evaluation guiding question will be in line with the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, looking at the **IMPACT, EFFECTIVENESS, RELEVANCE, and SUSTAINABILITY** of WVA consortium-led AHP Disaster READY phase 1 program.

The evaluation will look at the achievements towards the project goal, outcomes, and outputs, on women, men, girls and boys, people with a disability, and those that are vulnerable. This evaluation should also inform who benefitted most, who did not and why, and description of the barriers they face to benefit from this program.

Specific Areas of Enquiry

The proposal is for an external consultant (or a team of consultants) to undertake an evaluation that specifically addresses the following areas:

1. IMPACT: What have we achieved in phase 1/ what has gone well/ what have we learned/ what are the challenges? The review could focus on the following areas (in addition to the usual evaluation standards, Evaluation question see annex):

- How AHPDR contributed to the Field Offices' preparedness and responsiveness to recent disasters in Pacific, particularly considering Tropical Cyclone Harold in Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, flooding in Timor-Leste.
- How AHPDR contributed to preparedness around COVID-19 and potential synergies and collaborations across the two AHP workstreams (DR and AHP COVID-19 activations).
- Localisation & thought leadership, and strategic intent around DRR and CCA.
- Impacts, relevance, and effectiveness at various levels: Australia; Pacific/Regional; in WVA's target countries, in target provinces, municipalities and communities

2. PARTNERSHIPS: How have we done it? What have been successes, challenges etc., as a consortium and as partners?

- Successes and challenges as a consortium
- Successes and challenges with partners
- Benefits/limitations of consortium members/partners (added value or not) models
- Whether we should partner with other organizations in the Pacific (regional level, other areas of expertise i.e. climate change).

3. RECOMMENDATIONS: How should we move forward? Who should we work with? How should we work together, where should we work, in what areas etc?

- Partners and type of partnerships, Strengthening AHP DR Committees
- Geographical locations
- Strategic areas of focus (key sectors of work in line of AHP DR 2.0)
- Alignment with broader Pacific initiatives and frameworks (such as: FRDP, Sendai Framework for Action, UNFCCC) and other donors investing in the Pacific on DRR/CCA
- Integration of Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience Building related activities.

COORDINATION & GOVERNANCE

This evaluation will be managed by Cedric Hoebreck, while key tasks will be undertaken by the consultant, supported by the project manager and a small team of WVA staff.

Name	Role
Consultant(s)	Responsible for delivery of product, lead writers
Cedric Hoebreck	Team leader, responsible for managing the consultancy, co-author
Charlotte Sterrett	Core Team Member, Co-author, Reviewer
Lali Foster	Core Team Member, Co-author, Reviewer
Lindsay Reilly	Core Team Member, Co-author, Reviewer
Junus David	Core Team Member, co-author, Reviewer

TIMELINE - 1st of October 2021 to 1st March 2022

What	By When	Other Comment
Finalise ToR, go to market and contract external consultant(s)	01/10/2021	ToR to be reviewed by WVA team that will be involved in AHP DR 2.0 redesign process ToR to be shared with AHPSU
Inception Report including finalisation of evaluation questions, methodology and timeline	15/10/2021	Will be developed by the consultants and reviewed and approved by WVA
Desk Review Phase and consultations	30/11/2021	Review of all relevant documentation related to AHP DR (contracts, reports, case studies etc.) and other relevant documentation on DRR/CCA initiatives in the Pacific
Interviews and consultations with NOs, Consortium partners and partners and other relevant	31/12/2021	
First Draft Report	20/01/2022	Will be reviewed by WVA core team
Final Report	01/03/2023	

DELIVERABLES

The consultant(s) will develop

- An evaluation plan detailing the proposed approach including detailed timelines, methods and research tools
- An Inception Report
- An evaluation report (20-50 page maximum, incl/excl annexes) with recommendations, to be published externally, and;
- A summary version (max 10 pages) of the final agreed report
- A strategy report (10 pages) outlining clearly the way forward

Authorship of the product will be co-owned – by the consultant and WVA.

Expected use

The primary audience for this evaluation is WVA. The secondary audiences are DFAT, AHPSU and World Vision Australia Consortium's partners and country offices in the Pacific. Findings and recommendations of the of the evaluation may be shared more broadly to DRR/CCA key stakeholders in the Pacific.

Consultant criteria

Required:

- Technical knowledge and experience in DRR/CCA and related areas (for example, climate change, disaster risk reduction, fragile contexts, economic development, environment, food security and livelihoods)
- Experience in analysis and writing, including meta-reviews and evaluations and ability to write in non-technical language
- Technical knowledge and experience in qualitative analysis methodologies including contribution analysis
- Academic qualification in international development and/or relevant field experience
- Demonstrated experience in working with multiple stakeholders sensitively across cultures.
- Field experience in the Pacific
- Strong knowledge on humanitarian and development sector

Preferred:

- Previous experience in developing or reviewing programs, consortiums, (evaluation and recommendation for a second phase)
- Previous experience working with World Vision or other international child-focused NGOs
- Previous experience working on external publications for the Australian NGO sector
- Expertise in DRR/CCA
- Strong Experience in the Pacific

ANNEX

Further details about Disaster READY

Disaster READY represents Australia's largest investment in disaster preparedness in the region and is an important element of Australia's stepped-up engagement for a more resilient Pacific. Phase I of Disaster READY is due to be completed in June 2022

Early thinking AHP DR 2.0 refresh - Summary

No substantive changes to expect on AHP DR mechanism (was 5 + 5 funding mechanism)
 Flexible approach to design, opportunity to scale, whether increase geographically or deepening / sectors
 The AHP DR 2.0 should and will probably focus more on:

- CCA and building Resilience
- Localisation & Partnerships
- Disability Inclusion & Gender
- Strengthening AHP DR Country Committees (Role and Structure)

Other points mentioned raised

- Strengthening Risk management, M&E
- Strengthening linkage Preparedness to response
- Strengthening linkage to FRDP (Standards coming up then indicators later this year, then FRDP Annual Review in 2023)

Evaluation questions

Area	Primary Questions	Sub-questions
Relevance	To what extent was the program realistic, appropriate and relevant?	1. Was the theory of change of the program realistic, appropriate and relevant? 2. To what extent were program objectives relevant and consistent with beneficiary needs and priorities, relevant government policies, and the overall operating environment? ² 3. Did the design of the program remain appropriate and relevant for the context? 4. Was the approach undertaken the best option for achieving planned results? ³ 5. What is the relevance of the completed program to progress on the broader climate change adaptation and mitigation objectives of the communities in which it occurred? 6. To what extent is the program design relevant to the broader CBA agenda internationally? How does it align and compare with best practice in the sector? ⁴
Effectiveness	To what extent have the objectives and outcomes of the program been achieved?	7. Did the program make the difference that was expected at the end of the investment? 8. To what extent was adaptive capacity and resilience built – at individual, household, community and local government levels? ⁵ 9. What unexpected outcomes or changes were brought about as a result of program activities? ⁶ 10. What activities have been expanded, replicated and scaled up across the implementation sites, and what are the contributing factors to this replication and expansion? 11. How have the communities and partners involved in the program defined success – and what evidence is there of achieving their visions of success? ⁷ 12. What were the key challenges and enabling factors in implementation? How has staff capacity in the relevant offices and geographic locations contributed to or hindered success? How have the

		existing institutional frameworks within Vietnam contributed to or hindered success? ⁸
	How has the program approach contributed to the program outcomes?	<p>13. What participatory methodologies and processes were used by the program? Which ones were found to be successful, and why?⁹</p> <p>14. To what extent is there evidence of the integration or uptake of participatory approaches, in particular child based, into institutional frameworks?</p> <p>15. Were there any innovative approaches that were used to achieve results?</p> <p>16. What were the strengths and weaknesses of taking a consortium approach in the program, and how did this approach impact on the achievement of program outcomes?</p>
Participation	How did the program reach and involve vulnerable populations?	<p>17. To what extent were the most vulnerable populations, including, but not limited to, people with a disability, ethnic and linguistic minorities, rural and remote communities and any other excluded groups, reached through the program? What approaches were utilised to ensure these cohorts were included?¹⁰</p> <p>18. How has program contributed to achieving equitable outcomes for women and men, boys and girls, and in particular, outcomes related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improved safety and livelihood security of women? ▪ Equal participation of women in decision – making and leadership? ▪ Improved access to appropriate and relevant services?
	How did the program reach and involve children?	<p>19. How have children benefited from activities, including the livelihood models and participatory planning?</p> <p>20. How were children involved in the design and monitoring of activities?</p> <p>21. To what extent did children take on a role as agents of change? To what extent have they come to be considered climate change champions across their schools/communities?¹¹</p> <p>22. How did the level and nature of children’s involvement in activities impact on the success of the program?</p> <p>23. Did the program ensure the appropriate safeguarding of children through its activities?</p>
Sustainability	How sustainable are results of the program and the systems and models developed?	<p>24. What measures have been put in place or evolved through the program that will contribute to its sustainability?</p> <p>25. What is the capacity of local partners (including local government to take forward the work? How has the program contributed to strengthening this capacity?</p> <p>26. Over the coming years, what benefits can realistically be expected to continue as a result of the Program and three years of implementation?</p> <p>27. To what extent have resilient communities been built – and what do these resilient communities look like over the next few years?</p>