



Terms of Reference

Name/position/Work:	Independent Project Outcome (Report) Evaluation of Project for Physical Rehabilitation Centers of MSYD-ASRA in Mersin and Hatay
Country/City of Assignment:	Turkey/Ankara/Mersin/Hatay
Reporting Lines	a) Reports to: ED/HP b) Supervises:
Date of Issue	

1. Organizational Background

ASRA, is a non-governmental and humanitarian aid organisation which mainly aims at meeting basic needs and improving living conditions of the individuals and communities who are affected by humanitarian crisis, conflicts, human rights violations and natural disasters.

ASRA continues its works at national and international level within principles of non-discrimination, transparency, impartiality, and accountability, according to the international standards of humanitarian privacy. ASRA has a role in enhancing living conditions of crisis affected individuals and communities through activities and emergency responses carried out at national and international level.

ASRA, by carrying out field studies which regularly analyse the conditions of crisis affected people, and publishing situation reports; directs the attention of relevant organisations to crisis regions.

ASRA, pursuant to the principles of non-discrimination, transparency, impartiality and accountability, adopts direct and quick response to the crisis affected individuals and communities, as the main principle.

2. Background

Turkey now hosts the largest number of refugees in the region with over 3.657.694 registered Syrian refugees in the country as the date of 28th of August 2019. Women and children make up 75% of the refugee population, of which some 50% is comprised of children. In 25 camps across the country, humanitarian assistance and basic need services' delivery for Syrian refugees is handled directly by the Government of Turkey (GoT) but only 6,4% of Syrians live in these camps. In Turkey, over 93,6% of refugee households live outside of camps. The differential levels of access to basic services between camp and non-camp dwellers is most pronounced in the basic sectors such as health. The number of Syrians under temporary protection is 202.678 in Mersin according to the latest official records. Also, number of Syrians who are under temporary protection and lives in Hatay is 437.231. In addition to Syrians, the number of foreigners under international protection in Turkey is 112.415 who are mainly from the countries of Iraq, Afghanistan, Somali, Iran, Pakistan.

The proposed project will be targeting mainly Syrian refugees living in Mersin and Hatay but will also include the non-Syrian refugees. The community centers are located in hub-areas such as Akdeniz and Toroslar in Mersin. Furthermore, there is one office as field office in Hatay, Antakya. While the Physical Rehabilitation Centers in Mersin and Hatay focused on Syrian refugees, mainly resided in this district.



Terms of Reference

MSYD-ASRA responded to the health sector for people who are in need for Physical Rehabilitation and Mental Health by holistic approach a two-pronged relief operation. For a long time, the problems have not received the attention it deserves, by (I)NGOs and other service provider organizations. While a kind of protection 'reductionism' in the humanitarian responses in Turkey focuses on shortening and closing the distance between the services and refugees, the level and quality of service provision on mental health/ psychosocial support (MHPSS) and physical therapy and rehabilitation is less than expectations. MSYD-ASRA has conducted comprehensive project including Physical Rehabilitation and MHPSS services in order to provide comprehensive approach to the targeted population checking the priority areas of existing humanitarian response in Turkey and focus all humanitarian actors' attention to the often-ignored areas.

This evaluation will assess MSYD-ASRA's response to the Physical Rehabilitation as well the period leading up to the reconstruction phase, with a view to drawing lessons for country office, including risk reduction and future response.

3. Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is three-main pillar:

- a) Assess the quality of MSYD's response to health sector with Physical Rehabilitation (including MHPSS) Centers in Mersin and Hatay including adherence to Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability, during the response and implementation relative to MSYD's Benchmarks.
- b) Develop lessons learned and recommendations that will assist MSYD to build risk management and emergency preparedness capacities into future programming in order to help communities better cope with risk, and to enable a more timely and appropriate response to humanitarian crises and needs in the future.
- c) Assess the extent to which MSYD was able to engage appropriately with the Local Authorities during the humanitarian response in health sector. The evaluation will make recommendations on future MSYD policy on civil-government relations.

Evaluation recommendations will be based on accepted MSYD Code of Conduct, to which MSYD members are signatories, as well as Sphere Minimum and Core Humanitarian Standards and MSYD MEAL Policy. Some specific areas which the evaluation will examine include:

- Timeliness and Appropriateness of response – to what extent did the field and Sub-HQ offices have the capacity, systems and procedures, sufficient human resources and appropriate level of preparedness to facilitate a rapid and appropriate response? How did MSYD's capacity to staff-up affect the quality of the response? Was gender taken into consideration adequately in all relevant areas of the response?
- Efficiency – What were the outputs (both qualitative and quantitative) in relation to the inputs? Was MSYD's response cost effective?
- Impact – Review of the impact of MSYD's response in terms of preservation of life and reduction of human suffering. Assessment of the extent to which international standards (e.g., international humanitarian and human rights law; (I)NGOs Code of Conduct) and relevant standards (e.g., Sphere, CHS) were applied and their impact. Assessment of the impact of the response using a Do-No-Harm lens.



Terms of Reference

- Coverage – scale and ability to reach those most in need, given the political, religious, geographic and social context of the emergency, and providing intended beneficiaries with assistance and protection that is proportionate to that need.
- Connectedness and Sustainability – links to local capacity, plans and aspirations and the collaboration and co-ordination with intended beneficiaries (including the effectiveness of communication/feedback systems), within MSYD and with external partners and stakeholders.

4. Components of the evaluation report

- a) Introduction. The context of MSYD's intervention in the health sector, the salient characteristics of the response and their implications. Specific issues for MSYD, for example security and profile.
- b) MSYD's decision to engage in Physical Rehabilitation. Criteria influencing the decision and the implications of the decision.
- c) Human resources and management systems. The challenge of expansion from a small development-focused base. Mechanisms used in recruiting or transferring staff. Implications for the organization of the nature of the staff in the short, medium and longer terms.
- d) Partnerships. The nature and quality of partnerships with implementing agencies, other NGOs, the UN system and government organizations. The nature of co-ordination and co-operation and actual modes of operation.
- e) Community capacities and needs. Community responses in different phases, Building, maintaining and strengthening community capacity. Community participation modes. Community structures. The nature of need assessment at different levels and stages. Prioritization of needs.
- f) Gender. Specific vulnerabilities and limitations on women/elderly and children. Gap identification and gap filling. Specific activities for women/elderly and children. Strategic implications of interventions, Implications for and of human resources past present and future.
- g) Programming and delivery. Process focus. Other stakeholder views, including community. Longer term strategic significance of modes for sustainability. Do no harm principle and accountability. Adherence to codes.
- h) Logistics. Procurement, delivery mechanisms, accommodation and site development. Specific problems of project provide and dependence on travel.
- j) Preparedness and development. Transition to development. Incorporation of preparedness, risk assessment, vulnerability reduction mechanisms and surveillance systems in the planned development context.

Many issues are relevant in different sections. There will be cross reference between these but no undue repetition. The evaluation criteria will be used as appropriate in the assessments of each section. Where necessary material will be elaborated in annexes. Findings will be used in the preparation of action-focused recommendations.

5. Evaluation Methodology

- a) The methodology of the evaluation will include a combination of a desk review of relevant field and (Sub)HQ office documentation, field travel, key informant interviews or focus group discussions with MSYD staffs (both field and HQ). The evaluation team will also interview a selection of beneficiaries in communities and key external stakeholders such as government representatives, other international NGOs, and UN agencies.

Terms of Reference

- b) Confidentiality of information - all documents and data collected from interviews will be treated as confidential and used solely to facilitate analysis. Interviewees will not be quoted in the reports without their permission.
- c) Communication of Results – an official report of the evaluation will be prepared. However, this report will be supplemented by a presentation of preliminary findings for key stakeholders (both internal and external) to both provide immediate feedback to MSYD staff and beneficiaries(?) and give the Evaluation Team an opportunity to validate findings.
- d) Report: a concise report with focused practical recommendations will be prepared emphasizing both feedback to MSYD managers and providing replicable lessons to inform MSYD's humanitarian risk management and emergency response in future. MSYD interviewees will be given an opportunity to comment on the draft reports prior to finalization. While the Evaluation Team will retain responsibility for drafting and editing the report, the Country Office will have the option of making a written response, which will be attached as an annex to the final report. Once finalized, the report will be shared within the MSYD.

6. Evaluation Team Composition

MSYD anticipates that the evaluation team will be made up of 2 persons including a Team Leader; a national M&E Specialist and a national M&E Officer.

The Team Leader Qualifications:

Required:

- Extensive experience of emergency management and risk management approaches
- Monitoring and evaluation of emergencies
- Previous Evaluation Team Leader experience
- Good knowledge regarding use of Sphere standards, Code of Conduct, beneficiary accountability systems, etc. in humanitarian contexts
- First-hand knowledge of the Turkey context
- Excellent drafting and communication skills

Desired:

- Understanding of the Turkey context
- Experience in managing humanitarian programs
- Gender in emergencies experience
- Fluency in Turkish and English is required. Knowledge of Arabic is an advantage

Other Team member combined experience:

- Monitoring and evaluation experience
- Strong knowledge of Turkey context (particularly south of Turkey)
- Fluency in Turkish and English is required. Knowledge of Arabic is an advantage



Terms of Reference

Use of Evaluation Results:

The Evaluation will make recommendations to various levels within MSYD (e.g. the SubHQ) in order to improve the quality of MSYD's preparedness and response to future emergencies. The target audiences of the evaluation will develop a plan of action based on the evaluation report and its findings within one month of distribution of the final report. An appropriate system for monitoring implementation of recommendations will be agreed by MSYD, who will each nominate a focal point to monitor implementation of recommendations.

Proposed Timeframe:

The evaluation is expected to start in September 2019 for an estimated duration of 20 working days. This will include desk reviews, field work - interviews, and report writing. The evaluation schedule will include:

Activity	Approximate Dates	Person(s) responsible
Desk review	First week of September	Team leader & team members
Field Visit to MSYD's project sites	Second week of September (5 days)	Team leader & team members
Interviews with MSYD's staff	Mid-September (2 days)	Team Leader
Circulation of Draft Report	Third week of September	Team Leader
Final Report (after incorporating feedback on draft)	End-September	Team Leader
Stakeholder review of recommendations	End-September	MSYD ED, HP, PM
Stakeholder Plans of Action circulated	First week of October	MSYD ED, HP, PM, CO
Monitoring Implementation of Recommendations	Ongoing	MSYD ED, HP, PM, CO