

Terms of Reference for Evaluation

1. Evaluation Summary

Program/Project, Project Number	SABALATA-Disability Inclusive Development through CBR/3081-MYP
Partner Organisation	International Nepal Fellowship (INF Nepal)
Project start and end dates, Phase of project	01/01/2014 – 31/12/2019 (5 years MYP) January 2020 – December 2020; Extended for One Year
Evaluation Purpose	To learn from the successes and challenges of project implementation to identify opportunities for improvement and to shift from CBR to CBID in the next phase
Evaluation Type (e.g. midterm, end of phase)	Project Final Evaluation (Inclusive Evaluation)
Commissioning organisation, contact person	International Nepal Fellowship (Nepal), Dinesh Raj Pathak
Evaluation Team members (if known)	External Consultant will be selected through open competition. The main lead for the evaluation will be the qualified and experienced external consultant, supported by one project staff and one DPO representative
Primary Methodology	Document review, Key Informant Interviews (KII), Focus Group Discussion (FGD), Field Observation. However, the final and appropriate methodology will be discussed and decided after the selection of evaluator.
Proposed Evaluation Start and End Dates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expression Of Interest (EOI) advertisement: Third Week of March • Selection of Consultant: Second Week of April • Start of the evaluation: By the third week of April • Draft report by the evaluator: Second week of May • Final report by the evaluator: Second week of June
Anticipated Evaluation Report Release Date	Last week of June 2020
Recipient of Final Evaluation Report	INF and its relevant stakeholders such as local DPOs, Copy of report will also be shared to CBM (NCO & its MA). The summary report will also be made available in Nepali language.

2. Background of Project

CBM and its partner organisations regularly conduct project reviews (internal) and evaluations (external or mixed teams).

CBM initiated its work in Nepal since the early 1980s. The programs were first administered through CBM South Asia Regional Office (SARO) and an office in Kathmandu was opened in 2013. With the recently developed five-year country strategic plan from 2019 to 2023, the NCO has streamlined all its programs and projects primarily on four strategic priorities.

Out of these four strategic priorities, the strategic priority two is "Building ***inclusive communities that promote better access to education, physical rehabilitation services, livelihood opportunities and mental health support mechanism, as well as strengthen resilience in the face of emergence***". Aligning with this strategic priority two, CBM, in partnership with International Nepal Fellowship Nepal (INF/Nepal), has been implementing a five-year multi-year project which is supported by CBM Switzerland.

INF Nepal is a Nepali non-government organization serving Nepali people through health and development works. INF Nepal aims to bring sustainable improvements in health and quality of life of people and communities. It works to overcome poverty and exclusion by bringing people together to take collective action in their communities. INF Nepal's areas of work include community health and development, community based rehabilitation, mother and child health and nutrition.

The current project "***SABALATA–Disability Inclusive Development through CBR***" is one of the projects on community based rehabilitation in partnership with CBM. This project has been implementing in three districts i.e. Surkhet, Jumla and Mugu of Karnali province of Nepal (former – mid-western part of Nepal). The project commenced in January 2015 and will end by December 2019. This project has mainly two ways of its implementation modality. In one aspect, INF has direct formal memorandum of understanding with local disabled people organization (DPOs) in the respective project districts where these are supported to strengthen their organizational capacity for enabling them to reach to community level and work on disability rights and inclusion by themselves. In another aspect, INF Nepal works directly at community level for the development of persons with disabilities by raising awareness and supporting on individual needs for the improvement of quality of life. The brief details of this project about its overall objective, specific objective and anticipated results are as provided below:

Overall Objective (OO): To improve the quality of life of persons with disabilities in Jumla, Mugu and Surkhet districts of Mid-Western Region of Nepal.

Specific Objective (SO): To empower persons with disabilities to have equal access to mainstream development benefits and services in the project areas.

The project has six key result areas which are:

R01: Strengthened SHGs, DPOs, CBR Networks and Government agencies to treat persons with disabilities as equal member of their family and society.

R02: Improved livelihood status of the persons with disabilities through skills development, business creation and other interventions.

R03: People with disabilities achieve their highest attainable standard of health in the local health centres.

R04: Children with disabilities will have equal opportunity to education in accessible educational institutions.

R05: Improved coordination and participatory monitoring and evaluation to ensure technical standard of the project.

R06: Developed internal mechanism to run the project smoothly.

The primary target beneficiaries of this project are persons with disabilities from all three project districts for whom the project envisaged to gain equitable access to the government services and resources like health, education, livelihood on an equal basis with others.

The mid-term evaluation has already been conducted in March 2018 by an external consultant. As already planned in the project, the final evaluation is also provisioned to be conducted in 2019. However, this could not happen in 2019. Since the project is extended for one year till 2020 as planning project, this final evaluation is again scheduled to be undertaken by this March 2020 so that its learning, challenges and good practices can contribute in developing new MYP in CBID approach. Therefore, this detail term of reference is developed.

3. Evaluation Objective, Scope and Intended Use

Clearly define the **purpose (objective) of the evaluation** (it is recommended to only formulate ONE purpose in order to ensure the usefulness of the evaluation).

The major purpose of undertaking this project's final evaluation is to capture the learning from the successes and challenges of project implementation to identify further opportunities for improvement and to shift from current CBR to CBID approach in the next phase. And, the use of this evaluation findings and recommendation for creating shared understanding among programme stakeholders and for learning and future programming.

Scope of the evaluation:

Describe the issues to be covered, the time period covered, types of interventions, funds actually spent, geographical coverage and target groups to be covered under this specific evaluation.

The final evaluation of this project will try to capture the learning of current successes and challenges for the implementation with this new government structure while working in partnership with local DPOs at community level.

The target group for this assignment are – local DPOs (themselves); self-help groups of all three project districts as community structures, local government agencies (sectoral agencies like health, education, livelihood, social development etc.); selected numbers of individual entrepreneurs with disabilities, children with disabilities and their parents who were supported for school education, other likeminded agencies.

Determine the target audience of the evaluation:

Describe the role of the evaluation team to facilitate learning. Consider in particular the usefulness of the evaluation for the partners and for the target groups and describe how the results will be made available – including necessary measures to ensure accessibility.

The target audience of this review are INF Nepal, CBM and its country office and project supporting agency – CBM Switzerland. Results will also be shared with local DPOs, women, men, girls and boys with disabilities and their families, project key stakeholders like local governments, district health offices and its institutions, educational institutions at districts and local level.

The evaluation consultant will first consolidate all of his/her observations and findings along with their learning. Then after, consultant will prepare selected key recommendations for the project implementing agencies and other key stakeholders. Based on these final recommendations, the consultant will finally share his/her key findings, recommendations and learning to all project audience through debriefing workshop.

The provided recommendations and learning will further be assessed by INF Nepal and INF Nepal will provide its management response and incorporate recommendations in the new MYP.

4. Evaluation Questions

These should expand on the objective above by detailing project specific areas of enquiry around the **key evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability**¹. There may also be other areas of enquiry on which you want to focus, e.g. Inclusion. **Gender and Child Safeguarding** (if applicable in the project) **are mandatory areas of enquiry for each evaluation**. Develop guiding questions that could refer directly to planned achievements (outcomes/objectives) and their indicators that are detailed in a logframe, project plan or theory of change. You need to know clearly the project's/programme's objectives, expected results, activities and target groups in order to complete the questions below.

The evaluation questions are tentatively designed as provided below discussing in a team. But, these are not limited to these only. These can be further modified or reviewed once the consultant is hired and even after discussing with local DPOs of three project districts who are working as sub-project partners.

a) Relevance and quality of design:

This measures the extent to which the project is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, the partner organisation, to local and national development priorities, to INF and CBM policies, including changes over time.

- What is the value of the intervention in relation to contributing to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD), , national priorities and policies, as well as Agenda 2030?
- Has the project considered and addressed the needs and priorities of

¹ The DAC Principles for the Evaluation of Development Assistance, OECD (1991), Glossary of Terms Used in Evaluation, in 'Methods and Procedures in Aid Evaluation', OECD (1986), and the Glossary of Evaluation and Results Based Management (RBM) Terms, OECD (2000).

the all women, men, girls and boys with disabilities including from under-represented groups such as persons with learning disabilities or persons with psycho-social disabilities or from ethnic minorities?

- Are the objectives, results and indicators coherent?
- How has the approach of the project been adapted to suit the local context?
- 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 in terms of geography and target people
- Are the project strategies and interventions relevant to INF's strategy, policy and values?
- Are the project strategies and interventions relevant to CBM's Federation Strategy 2023, policies and values?

b) Effectiveness:

This measures the extent to which the project actually achieved what it set out to do.

- Were the achievements of results and indicators according to the plan?
- To what extent are women, men, girls and boys across all impairment groups including from under-represented groups satisfied by the project's results and services?
- Has the project contributed to strengthen the government systems (health, education, etc.) in terms of accessibility, affordability, accountability, availability and quality (4A&Q)?
- How best can INF shift from CBR to CBID (rights based and system strengthening rather than medical and service delivery)?
- What are the learnings, the contributions and the difficulties that this project has had in terms of its design, implementation and management?
- Effectiveness of management process and their appropriateness of overall INF and SABALATA Project for implementation of the project.
- Was the SABALATA Project effective in delivering desired planned results?
- To what extent the project has achieved target set for each objective?
- How effective were the strategies and tools used in the implementation of the project?
- How much has the capacity of the staff and board members of Disabled People's Organizations (DPOs) of 3 districts been developed? Are they capable to advocate for their rights with minimal or no support of INF Nepal?
- What were the major factors which influenced the non-achievement of the objectives and results of the project?

c) Efficiency or cost-effectiveness (of planning and of implementation):

This measures the outputs in relation to the inputs (costs, both financial, staffing, time) and whether funds are used in the least costly way in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted.

- Was the financial and operational implementation according to the planned activities?
- Has the project coordinated with local authorities and/or other organizations and to what extent?
- Was INF Nepal's process of achieving results efficient? Specifically did the actual or expected results (outputs and outcomes) justify the costs incurred?
- Were the resources (human and financial) effectively utilized?
- Did project activities overlap and duplicate other similar interventions (funded nationally and/or by other donors? Are there more efficient ways and means of delivering more and better results (outputs and outcomes) with the available inputs?
- Was there any better approach implied which could have produced better results?
- How was the project's collaboration with local and district level line agencies and co-organizations?
- How efficient were the management and accountability structures of INF Nepal in regard to 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?
- What are the recommendations for the efficiency or cost-effectiveness for same type project in future?

d) Impact - Contribution to change:

This assesses the positive and negative consequences of the project activities, direct and indirect, intended and unintended.

- To what extent has the project contributed to changes in the lives of women, men, girls and boys across all impairment groups including from under-represented groups?
- Did the project address the different needs of women, men, girls and boys across all impairment groups and what are the reasons for these differences?
- To what extent do women, men, girls and boys across all impairment groups feel more empowered to participate in their communities?
- Were there any unintended impacts?
- Has the project contributed to the development and implementation of policies in favor of persons with disabilities?
- To what extent the goal has been achieved?
- To what extent were the impacts, outcomes and outputs achieved?
- Did the project have any unforeseen harmful potential impact?
- How the risks are addressed deepening impact on beneficiaries?
- Is the community more aware of issues related to Persons with disabilities and have they changed their attitude and behavior towards People with Disabilities?
- Is there a perceivable change in the quality of life for the persons with disability?
- What has happened in the life of people with disabilities as a result of the project?
- Has the capacity of DPOs been enhanced as a result of project intervention?
- How has the project impacted to the local government for implementing existing policies related to disability?

e) Sustainability:

The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

- How probable is it that the activities will continue after the termination of the intervention?
- What mechanisms were set in place with the community to ensure continuation of the activities?
- To what extent are women, men, girls and boys across all impairment groups and families organised and committed to continue project activities?
- How was the collaboration with the government/local authorities in terms of sustainability and taking over responsibility?
- What elements of the project are replicable to ensure systems are strengthened and a rights-based approach applied?
- To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to be sustained after the completion of this project? OR, what is the trend in women, men, girls and boys with disabilities across all impairment groups including from under-represented groups and DPOs indicating sustainability?
- What are the likelihoods of continuation and sustainability of project outcomes and benefits after completion of the project?
- What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability of project outcomes and the potential for replicating the approach?
- How were capacities strengthened at the individual and organizational level (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- Are the DPOs capable to sustain and are able to continue advocate for their rights ending the support of INF Nepal? If yes to what extent?
- Describe the main lessons that have emerged? What are the practices being implied for better achievement and sustainability?
What would be the recommendations for the better sustainable project in future?

f) Gender

The evaluation **must** consider gender aspects of the project and report on this. Data collected must be disaggregated according to gender.

- Has the project addressed gender equality/equal opportunities for women, men, girls and boys with disabilities?
- Has the project undertaken activities for promoting gender equality or empowerment of women and girls?
- What specific measures has the partner organisation taken to ensure gender equality?
- Does the project ensure data disaggregation related to gender and if so how are they analysed?
- In which ways has the project engaged women, men, girls and boys with disabilities?
- Does the target population purposely include both women and men with disabilities?
- Does the project consider family or household dynamics, including different effects and opportunities for individual members, such as the allocation of resources or decision-making power within the household?

- Is there a significant change on aspirations of women and girls with disabilities? Do they actually believe their aspirations are achievable?
- Do community structures & attitude support the changing aspirations of women and girls with disabilities?
- Has the project been able to mainstream participation of both men and women with disabilities?
- Are there any stereotypes or discrimination for women with disabilities compared to men with disabilities?
- Do people with disabilities, specifically women with disabilities, have the power to make their own decisions related to employment, housing, education, health care, etc.?
- Are men and women with disabilities included in disaster plans?
- Are there limitations that may affect men and women with disabilities' ability to have access to assets? Do women with disabilities have less access to assets than men without disabilities?

g) Child Safeguarding

First and foremost, please keep in mind to adhere to child safeguarding ethics during the entire evaluation process if children are involved.

The evaluation **must** consider child safeguarding aspects and report on this.

- Does the project partner have a child safeguarding policy?
- Are all staff trained on this policy?
- Have all the staff members signed the child safeguarding policy?
- What measures were taken to create safe environments for girls and boys at schools, institutions and community?
- How informed are girls and boys themselves of the child safeguarding policy and procedures? How aware are they of reporting procedures etc.?
- Are stakeholders aware of child safeguarding procedures?

h) Accessibility

Accessibility is a pre-condition to increase access of persons with disabilities to the services. Therefore, this must be considered while conducting final evaluation.

- Does this project ensure accessible environment for equal participation of all types of persons with disabilities?
- What kinds of accessibility measures have been practiced to ensure equal participation of all types of persons with disabilities in this project?
- What kinds of reasonable accommodations have been practiced by this project to ensure the participation of all types of persons with disabilities?
- Are public services within the project area accessible to people with physical disabilities?

5. Methodology

Explain how the evaluation should and could be conducted due to the given circumstances (geographical, political, time frame).

Indicate how the methodology will be decided upon in collaboration with the evaluation team leader and the RO/CCO/partner. Detail expectations /timing of consultant to provide detailed methodology.

The evaluator/s will develop the overall methodology in consultation with INF Nepal and CBM. Evaluator should visit at least one RM of each working district to collect the disaggregated data including gender, child safeguarding, children with disability within the specified time (mentioned in section 10 of ToR).

INF Nepal will oversee the overall facilitation of the evaluation process. The appropriate methodology will be determined in consultation with the consultant and partner organization. The consultant will provide the finalized methodology through an inception report prior to carrying out the evaluation within one week of agreement. The evaluator will collect quantitative and qualitative data and information through primary and secondary stakeholder (For detail see in appendix 1) using the following methodology:

- Desk study and review of all relevant project documents including INF's relevant documents, SABALATA project annual reports, annual work plan, logical framework, multi-year plan etc.
- In-depth interviews to gather primary data from beneficiaries and key stakeholders using a structured questionnaire
- Focus group discussion with the beneficiaries and other stakeholders.
- Interviews with relevant key informants, especially the staff of relevant government offices and newly elected local representatives
- Observations (field visits using checklist covering three districts). However, wards must be selected on the sample basis

During the evaluation, the evaluator/s will collect adequate disaggregated information (gender, children, disability, etc.) using appropriate sampling methods and data collection tools and techniques (accessible format, communication and place as far as practicable) of stakeholders especially the member of SHGs and analyze the findings accordingly.

During the data/information collection process, the evaluator should involve the persons with disabilities, DPOs, SHG members, project staff in their local area using KII, FGD, Observation, etc. The consultant will provide the preliminary debriefing to the project and management team of each district. The project team after debriefing by the consultant will provide necessary feedback to the consultant.

6. Limitations

Are there any conditions that might limit the evaluation, such as funding, time, logistic, politics?

The major limitation of this assignment is that there is a limited financial resource (budget) to accomplish this assignment which might limit to have field visits to entire project areas within the limited timeframe. Therefore, the sampling method will best be used to capture the key information required for this assignment.

7. Evaluation Team and Management Responsibilities

Commissioning responsibility

Explain who (office/ name) is responsible for commissioning the evaluation, their role and who needs to approve methodology, final reports etc.

As stated above, this assignment will be accomplished by a hired consultant who has experience of conducting such evaluations preferably a Participatory Rural Appraisal or Community Mobilisation expert. Though the hired consultant through INF Nepal's own hiring process will lead and commissioned the entire process, there will be also engagement of local DPOs representatives together as and when required throughout the process to make it more inclusive. CBM will also be consulted as appropriate. The required questionnaires and methodologies will be finalized consulting with three local DPOs representatives.

Evaluation Team

At least one person with disability from each DPO (for the respective district only) and one person from SABALATA project will be involved in the evaluation process along with the evaluator.

The evaluation process will be led by the external consultant and be supported by INF team and DPO representative from within the district. CBR Officer, will accompany or help consultant for all the logistics

Requirements for the lead consultant/consultancy are:

- Proven experience in research, monitoring and evaluation of non-governmental community development structures, process, and integrated programs.
- Sound knowledge and understanding of service provision to persons with disabilities, national standards, health sector policies and systems in Nepal.
- The Consultant must possess at least a Bachelor degree (having Master Degree will be an advantage) from a recognized university and has experience in evaluating CBR/disability programs.
- The Woman with disability meeting the criteria will be given preference and they are highly encouraged to apply.

Consultant/ consultancy should be registered in VAT, latest renewal and Tax clearance certificate.

8. Management of the evaluation and logistics

Explain who is responsible for getting what done - explain different offices' (or people's) scope of responsibility (e.g. Member Association, Regional Office, Country Office). Who is responsible for organizing transport, accommodation, booking interviews and organizing venues, flights. Who is responsible for ensuring disability inclusive venues/ translators etc.?

Detail specific **responsibilities of the consultant** regarding logistics:

INF Nepal has responsibility for: domestic flight booking, field arrangement (targeted project catchment area), confirm two local DPOs representatives communicating with CO, interpreter arrangement, confirming community level SHGs to whom to conduct FGDs, confirming key local government stakeholders, individuals for the KII, ensure local level safety security and arrange accommodation and hygienic food during the travel and stay at the project districts.

- INF Nepal will provide logistic (transportation, food and accommodation), local level coordination for the consultant during the evaluation period. INF Nepal's Mugu, Jumla, Surkhet and Nepalgunj offices will provide the necessary logistic support i.e. arranging vehicle, tickets, arranging venues, accommodation, provision of interpreter when required, financial payment, etc.
- The main contact person in INF Nepal is designated partnership officer (Mr Dinesh Raj Pathak) and for field level coordination and logistics management will be CBR Officer (Mr Mahesh Chaudhary)

Detail **budget** considerations and authority. Please provide the detail budget breakdown as how you are planning to use the allocated budget.

9. Expected Results

Specify what documents are expected to be developed as a result of the evaluation, for who and by when, in what language.

The evaluator will provide the final evaluation report consisting of the following contents:

- Executive Summary- maximum of 2 pages in English and also translated into appropriate local language when that will be useful for local staff and stakeholders.
- Introduction part (objective, scope, methodology), Context and Background, Analytical assessment of project result wise (organized into relevancy, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and good practices), lesson learned, Conclusion and
- Appendices (as required i.e. case studies, TOR, work schedule, list of respondents, referral documents that adds further understanding to the evaluation process and results.

A debriefing meeting/workshop need to be conducted with project staff and INF management to share learning and for feedback. The report should be presented in the provided standard evaluation report format

Detailed work plan and evaluation tools.

Inception Report due by:

Draft Report due by: Second week of April

Finalised Report due by: Last week of April

10. Duration and Phasing

The total duration for this assignment is expected to be accomplished within 1 & ½ months with its final report.

The tentative plan is as provided below:

Task	Location	Number of Days	Expected Dates
Travel to Surkhet by air	Surkhet	3	
Travel to Mugu from Surkhet	Mugu	3	
Travel from Mugu to Jumla	Jumla	3	
Travel from Jumla to Nepal Nepalgunj	Nepalgunj	1	
Travel back to own's place	As preferred	1	
Debriefing	Nepalgunj/Surkhet	1	
Sharing with CBM for feedback	Through mail	2	
Report writing		7	
Final report sharing			

11. Costs and payments

Give an indication (if appropriate) on how funds and payments will be managed. Detail payment milestones according to delivery of specific products (batches of payment – inception, mid-term, final).

- 25% of the cost may be disbursed after signing the agreement
- 75% will disburse after the submission of the final report.

12. Attachments

List documents that need to be known to the evaluation team in advance of the mission, such as project description, logical framework or theory of change documents, most recent reports, recent financial report or audit documents, any previous assessment, review, evaluation report (as applicable).

Following are the key documents to be read and understood by the consultant that will be made available:

- 3081-MYP year wise narrative, Log frame and total budget.
- UNCPRD principles, DID standards and its elements
- WHO CBR guidelines
- Project related disaggregated data
- Selected case studies and reports
- CBM Safeguarding policy and consent forms
- INF Nepal SHG guidelines, protocols and revolving fund guidelines
- INF Nepal related legal documents
- INF Nepal, LPO guidelines
- INF Nepal child protection policy
- Other publications related to the project
- Disability Right Act, 2017
- CBM Federation Strategy 2023

Appendix 1: Stakeholder Analysis for Evaluation.

You could use a matrix like this to examine stakeholders involved in the project, and determine whether and how they could contribute to the evaluation, through interviews, surveys and meetings.

Please list **all** current and potential external and internal stakeholders including beneficiaries that contribute or influence the success of the proposed project(s)² being evaluated.

Stakeholders	What is their interest and contribution in the proposed project?	What is their power and influence in the project (1-5 rating, 1=low, 5=high)	Will the project involve / these stakeholders in the evaluation? How?
Primary Stakeholders			
e.g. Women and men with disabilities			
e.g. Girls and boys with disabilities			
Secondary stakeholders			
e.g. Mothers, fathers, care givers			
e.g. Volunteers			
e.g. Local Government			
e.g. Board of partner organisation			
e.g. Central Government			
e.g. Community			
e.g. NGOs			
e.g. Project staff			
e.g. CBM staff			