



Terms of Reference

Name/position/Work:	Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Specialist 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.

One of the main assigned roles of MEAL Study is monitoring and evaluation of all implementation of project objectives and sub-titles that have been specified and committed in the project. In the line of this, project tools implementation and department coordination between field and Sub-HQ level will be discussed, notes will be submitted as lesson learned.

3. Scope and focus of the Monitoring and Evaluation

The Monitoring and evaluation will look at the following areas: Project management; project activities; reflection of humanitarian coordination engagement and partnerships with the Government of Turkey and partnerships with other development partners and local government. It will address the results achieved, the partnerships established, as well as issues of capacity and approach.

i) **Relevance** – Assess design and focus of the project

- To what extent did the Project achieve its overall objectives?
- What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project for Physical Rehabilitation Centers of MSYD-ASRA in Mersin and Hatay
- To what extent were the results (impacts, outcomes and outputs) achieved?
- Were the inputs and strategies identified, and were they realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results?
- Was the project relevant to the identified needs?

ii) **Effectiveness**- Describe the management processes and their appropriateness in supporting delivery

- Was the project effective in delivering desired/planned results?
- To what extent did the Project's M&E mechanism contribute in meeting project results?
- How effective were the strategies and tools used in the implementation of the project?
- How effective has the project been in responding to the needs of the beneficiaries, and what results were achieved?
- What are the future intervention strategies and issues?

iii) **Efficiency** – Of Project Implementation

- Was the process of achieving results efficient? Specifically did the actual or expected results (outputs and outcomes) justify the costs incurred? Were the resources effectively utilized?
- Did project activities overlap and duplicate other similar interventions (funded nationally and /or by other

Terms of Reference

donors? Are there more efficient ways and means of delivering more and better results (outputs and outcomes) with the available inputs?

- Could a different approach have produced better results?
- How was the project's collaboration with the IMC, ECHO, Turkey national institutions, local government?
- How efficient were the management and accountability structures of the project?
- How did the project financial management processes and procedures affect project implementation?
- What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the project's implementation process?

iv). Sustainability

- To what extent are the benefits of the projects likely to be sustained after the completion of this project?
- What is the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of project outcomes and benefits after completion of the project?
- Describe key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability of Project outcomes and the potential for replication of the approach?
- How were capacities strengthened at the individual and organizational level (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- Describe the main lessons that have emerged?
- What are the recommendations for similar support in future?

4. Methodology for Evaluation

The evaluation will provide quantitative and qualitative data through the following methods:

- Desk study and review of all relevant project documentation including project documents, annual work-plans, project progress reports, annual project reports.
- In depth interviews to gather primary data from key stakeholders using a structured methodology,
- Focus Group discussion with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders,
- Interviews with relevant key informants (see attached list of relevant institutions),
- Observations (field visits using checklist)

5. Expected Deliverables:

The following deliverables are expected.

- An inception report, outlining the key scope of the work and intended work plan of the analysis, and evaluation questions, shall be submitted after 5 days of commencing the consultancy. The evaluators will prepare an inception report which will outline the scope of work, intended work plan and analysis. The inception report will provide MSYD and key stakeholders the opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation objectives. The inception report should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report will be discussed and agreed upon with all stakeholders.
- Draft comprehensive report that will inform all the key stakeholders

Terms of Reference

- The report will be produced in English and in Turkish. The report should provide options for strategy and policy as well as recommendations.

MSYD responsible for ensuring timely arrangement for a meeting committee which will be composed of ED, HP and Committee members will provide comments within 10 days after the reception of the Draft Report. The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria.

- The Final Report: This will be submitted 10 days after receiving comments from the Steering Committee Members. The content and structure of the final analytical report with findings, recommendations and lessons learnt covering the scope of the evaluation should meet the requirements of the UNDP M&E Policy and should include the following:
 - o Executive summary (1-2 pages)
 - o Introduction (1 page)
 - o Description of the evaluation methodology (6 pages)
 - o Situational analysis with regard to the outcome, outputs, and partnership strategy (6-7 pages)
 - o Analysis of opportunities to provide guidance for future programming (3-4 pages)
 - o Key findings, including best practices and lessons learned (4-5 pages)
 - o Conclusions and recommendations (4-5 pages)
 - o Appendices: Charts, terms of reference, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed

6. Duration of the Evaluation

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.

7. Required expertise and qualification

The Evaluator shall have the following expertise and qualification:

- 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.