

Contractor Application – Terms of Reference

Mid-term evaluation of IPPF’s humanitarian response to the Ukrainian crisis

Applications must address all requirements of the Terms of Reference and submit proposals respecting the formats and guidelines from section 7.

<p>1. Background</p>	<p>The International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) is a global service provider and advocate of sexual and reproductive health and rights for all. IPPF currently works in 142 countries through its national member associations and collaborative partners, supported by 6 Regional secretariats.</p> <p>The European Network of IPPF (IPPF EN) works in 40 countries across Europe and Central Asia to empower everyone, especially the most socially excluded, to live with dignity and to have access to sexual and reproductive health care. IPPF EN comprises 30 Full Member Associations (MAs) who have passed IPPF’s full accreditation system and 8 IPPF Affiliated Collaborative Partners (CPs) who have passed our due diligence processes and with whom IPPF has a formal partnership MoU. Our MAs and CPs are independent organisations and movements championing the needs of their local populations, particularly the most marginalize and underserved.</p> <p><u>Context</u></p> <p>The Russian invasion of Ukraine in February 2022 caused the largest humanitarian crisis within Europe since the second world war and is one of the largest human displacement crisis in the world today. According to the most recent UNHCR’s estimates, there are almost 8 million Ukrainian refugees across Europe and more than 6 million IDPs. Data¹ show that 53% of IDPs in Ukraine are women; 90% of refugees are women and children. The International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) humanitarian response for the Ukraine crisis is mainly driven by local CSO’s and NGO’s who have rapidly adapted their functioning to respond to the current humanitarian landscape.</p> <p>An element of this humanitarian crisis is that Ukraine and the surrounding countries – where most of the refugees are located – are middle/high income countries, with structured, albeit not necessarily well performing, health systems. Health services, and more specifically SRH services, are usually available, but refugees face multiple access barriers, particularly those from marginalized communities. Within Ukraine, the war has negatively impacted the availability of SRH services for those who need them. In recent years, SRHR and access to abortion care have been increasingly restricted in many of the countries now receiving refugees from Ukraine (notably in Poland, Hungary), which has created a complex and restrictive operating environment for SRHR actors and those wishing to access services.</p> <p>IPPF’s Ukrainian Member Association (MA) and partners in neighboring countries (Bulgaria, Hungary, Moldova, Poland, Romania and Slovakia) have been involved in this response since the beginning of the crisis.</p>
----------------------	--

¹ GBV AOR Ukraine Report April 1 2022

	<p>These partners are in the most part non-humanitarian, advocacy-oriented actors who do not have direct SRH service provision in their portfolio and have had to adapt their work to the needs and conditions of the current crisis. IPPF has a long experience in working in humanitarian settings and have a dedicated team and funding available at global level. They have provided financial, technical and operation support to partners.</p> <p><u><i>The intervention(s) to be evaluated</i></u></p> <p>IPPF’s humanitarian response to the Ukrainian crisis involves 7 countries and 17 partners, for a total committed budget of over 3.5 Million USD coming from multiple donors including CARE, FCDO, OSF and BMZ. It consists of short-term emergency response interventions aimed at delivering the Minimum Initial Service Package (MISP) for SRH. However, given the specificities of the context described above, the interventions have a strong focus on service accessibility. The overarching goal of IPPF’s humanitarian response is to support local civil society organisations in Ukraine and border countries to facilitate access to and deliver life-saving SRHR services including safe abortion care to vulnerable Ukrainians and refugees.</p> <p>In Ukraine, the interventions support (1) increasing access and availability of SGBV, and SRH information and services including abortion care in 5 regions. In surrounding countries receiving refugees (Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Moldova), local CSO are supported to: (1) facilitate access to GBV/SRH services with a focus on the most marginalized by increasing refugees awareness on available services, providing patient advocates and translators to accompany women to services and covering costs where necessary; (2) provide obstetric and psychological support for pregnant women including women from the Roma community; (3) facilitate access to abortion care by raising awareness on available services and supporting transportation to other EU countries for care not available in country; (4) provide sexuality education and information for refugees including LGBTQI, adolescents and young people; (5) enhance access to SRHR services for refugees through advocacy to state health facilities.</p> <p><u><i>Results Monitoring system</i></u></p> <p>Partners are expected to submit midterm and final reports. This includes an analysis of the progress towards the objectives. All partners report against an overall results framework.</p>
<p>2. Scope of Work</p>	<p><u>Contract Purpose</u></p> <p>IPPF-EN is looking to contract consultancy services to conduct a mid-term evaluation of the IPPF’s humanitarian response in Ukraine.</p> <p>Purpose and use of the evaluation</p> <p>The evaluation aims to understand if the mechanisms and strategies put in place by IPPF and its partners to answer the SRH needs of the populations affected by the Ukrainian crisis are fit for purpose. The objectives of this evaluation are the following:</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. assess if the supporting mechanisms for partners put in place by IPPF (and more specifically the funding mechanisms) are adapted to the context and to the partners’ needs and capacities; 2. assess if the strategies implemented by the partners to reach the affected population are adapted to the context and respond to the needs of the targeted populations. <p>Given that the response is still ongoing, the evaluation will have mainly a learning focus: it should provide not only an assessment of IPPF’s response, but stimulate and accompany the reflection of the concerned stakeholders on the topics of interest, supporting the adaptation of the implementation strategies, both at the level of IPPF and partners.</p> <p><u>Scope</u></p> <p>The evaluation will focus on the interventions that are part of IPPF’s humanitarian response in Ukraine and that were or are currently implemented in Ukraine, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Moldova countries.</p> <p>Being a mid-term evaluation, it will not focus directly on quality of SRH services or changes at the level of the targeted populations, but mainly on assessing if the conditions required to achieve these objectives are in place. The effectiveness and impact of the interventions, as well as the final users’ perspective on the interventions, will be part of the final evaluation of the projects.</p> <p><u>Intended users and use of the evaluation</u></p> <p>Given the evaluation’s objectives, the main intended users of the evaluations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partners: as part of the evaluation process (see section on methodology) partners will share and mutually learn on strategies and practices. The evaluation will help them to identify good practices and provide the information required for them to adapt their intervention strategies. - IPPF’s humanitarian team: based on the identified strengths and weakness of existing IPPF’s humanitarian funding mechanisms and partners’ support modalities in the context of the Ukrainian crisis, IPPF’s humanitarian team will be able to further improve their working practices. They will use the evaluation findings to identify the most promising and relevant partners’ strategies to achieve the expected outcomes and scale them up in the remaining implementation time; they will adapt if required the way they work with non-humanitarian actors working in a crisis setting to ensure that they are able to deliver the expected outcomes.
<p>3. Overview of Evaluation Assignment</p>	<p><u>Evaluation questions</u></p> <p>This mid-term evaluation will focus on two main thematic areas:</p> <p>A. IPPF’s funding mechanisms to respond to the crisis (relevant DAC criteria: relevance, efficiency, coherence)</p>

1. Were funding mechanisms supported through IPPF adapted to work with a large number of small partner organizations, in the specific context of the Ukrainian crisis? How did they help or hinder the partners to efficiently deploy their interventions and leverage other funding sources?
2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of providing direct funding to partners' organizations in this specific context when looking at the interventions' efficiency² and (potential) effectiveness³?

B. Partners strategies to answers' the SRH needs of the affected populations (relevant DAC criteria: relevance, efficiency, (potential) effectiveness)

3. In which ways, if any, did IPPF's non-humanitarian, advocacy-oriented partners adapt their work to respond to the SRH needs of the targeted populations in a humanitarian setting? What kind of organizational (internal to the partners) and contextual (related to the national setting) characteristics favored or hindered their capacity to adapt?
4. Which strategies put in place to answer the needs of the affected populations are the most adapted and effective⁴ in: (1) reaching the targeted groups and (2) answer their specific SRH needs? Which good practices should be scaled up, and which strategies should be adapted?
5. How did the partners adapt the Minimum Initial Service Package (MISP) to the context, considering the specificities of the Ukrainian humanitarian crisis? Were these adaptations relevant to respond to the SRH needs of the affected populations?

The list of evaluation questions is tentative and can be further refined in the inception phase.

Methodological approach

The proposal should clearly take into account the following elements:

- The learning focus should be reflected in the evaluation approach and process. The evaluation is expected to include a mutual learning event/workshop for partners (TBD at inception phase together with the coordinator of the response if in presence or online⁵), which will allow partners to reflect on their strategies and the way forward. This event should be fully integrated in the evaluation approach in such a way that (1) partners can already benefit from the evidence and information collected by the

² When looking at efficiency, we follow the DAC criteria definition which defines efficiency as the economic and timely use of resources, where resources should be interpreted in a broad sense (human and financial resources and time)

³ We refer to (potential) effectiveness because it is most likely too early to assess if the interventions contributed to the expected outcomes. At this stage of implementation, it should be possible to assess their ability to reach the targeted groups, but not yet to measure the way the interventions contribute to answer their needs. The evaluation will therefore focus more on the assessment of how the implemented strategies put in place meet the conditions required to achieve the expected outcomes.

⁴ See footnote 3 on the notion of effectiveness.

⁵ If in presence, transport and accommodation costs for participants (including for the evaluators) will be budgeted separately.

	<p>evaluator(s) and (2) the latter can collect additional insights to further refine the answers to the evaluation questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The evaluation approach should analyze, transversally or by clusters, the interventions implemented in border countries. This to identify existing common trends and allow comparison across interventions and countries. - The evaluation approach should include one/two field visits (to be defined together with the coordinator of the Ukrainian response) to better understand the context and allow for in-person discussions with key stakeholders. - The evaluation approach and process should ensure that the intended users’ – and partners in particular point of view is taken into account. - The evaluation approach should make use of existing evidence and include suggestions for primary data collection methods to complement it – the final choice of the data collection strategy will be done at the moment of the inception report, after review of the available evidence. <p><i>Evaluation process</i></p> <p>The proposal should include a tentative planning for the evaluation. The evaluation process should include at minimum the following steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - kick of meeting with the coordinator of the response - mutual learning event/workshop (TBD if online or in presence at the inception phase) - final restitution with relevant stakeholders. <p><u><i>Ethics in IPPF Evaluation</i></u></p> <p>The contractor will be required to sign IPPF confidentiality agreement related to access and use of information. The contractor needs to ensure that the principle of “do not harm” will be applied throughout the evaluation, towards all the stakeholders, including final beneficiaries.</p>
<p>4. Roles and responsibilities</p>	<p>The contract can be awarded either to a natural (individual) or legal (company) person with the requested qualification.</p> <p>The service provider will be in direct coordination with the IPPF EN Emergency Coordinator within IPPF EN.</p> <p><u>Contractor’s specific roles and responsibilities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing the evaluation methodology; primary data collection tools to be used; • Collecting primary data from project staff and collaborators • Cleaning and analysis data (primary and secondary) • Generating the reports in English (see deliverables) • Facilitating the mutual learning event/workshop • Attend 1 inception meeting and final restitution

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regularly update the IPPF EN coordinator of the humanitarian response on the progress of the evaluation <p><u>IPPF EN's specific roles and responsibilities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring that the evaluation runs according to plan and meets the milestones or deliverables on time • Ensuring evaluators have access to all relevant project / program documents and stakeholders involved in the interventions and/or the evaluation • Provide feedback at each step of the evaluation process • Organize and co-facilitate the mutual learning event/workshop • Problem-solving where needed (or direct issues to the relevant individual / entity to address) • Specify the reporting requirements in terms of progress in the implementation of the evaluation (including reporting of important challenges and their resolution or which potential issues need to be raised for decision making elsewhere) • Ensuring the quality of and approval of the deliverables
5. Timeline	<p><u>Commencement date:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Beginning of March- Data gathering and interviews to be completed by the end of March <p><u>Anticipated completion date:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data gathering and interviews to be completed by the end of March with the final report due in April. <p>Taking into account the start and end date of the evaluation, the proposal should include a tentative timeline (which will be further discuss and finalized during the inception phase).</p>
6. Deliverables	<p><u>Deliverables</u></p> <p>At minimum, the following products should be part of the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inception report, including revised evaluation questions, evaluation methodology and matrix. Max. 10 pages, word document in English - Intermediate/draft report: (max. 20 pages) – word document in English - Summary of the main insights from the mutual learning event/workshop: to ensure that the mutual learning event remains a safe space for discussion, this product will be shared only within IPPF and the implementing partners. 1-2 pager, in English. - Final report: The final report should include an executive summary, main findings, conclusions and recommendations - max 30 pages , in English, including executive summary.

	<p>- Final ppt: presentation of main findings and recommendations that IPPF can use to further present and disseminate the finding – in English.</p>				
<p>7. Contractor requirements</p>	<p>Experience & Skills required</p> <p><u>Must have:</u> It is anticipated that the consultant/company has expertise and previous expertise in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent knowledge of qualitative and mix-methods evaluation techniques (at least 5 years of experience in evaluation) • Experience in evaluating humanitarian interventions (at least 3 evaluations in the last 5 years) • Experience in evaluating sexual and reproductive health interventions (at least 3 evaluations in the last 5 years). • Fluency in both written and spoken English. <p><u>Nice to have (advantages):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience in evaluating SRH interventions in humanitarian setting • Knowledge of the MISp • Knowledge of the national context(s) and functioning of their health (SRH) service • Lived experience in Eastern Europe will be a strong advantage, as will knowledge of languages other than English <p><u>Other requirements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAFEGUARDING - The consultant will be expected to sign and adhere to IPPF’s code of conduct and safeguarding on signing the contract. As per our policy on the protection of children and vulnerable adults, they may also be required to undergo a criminal record check. • The successful candidate must hold a passport which allows for visa free travel to the countries. 				
<p>8. Submission of Proposal</p>	<p>Interested Consultant(s) should submit their proposals jnewnham@ippf.org, no later than 28/02/2023 (midnight, CEST), in the following format:</p> <p><u>Technical proposal</u></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="237 1604 1503 1873"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="237 1604 444 1675">Particulars</th> <th data-bbox="444 1604 1503 1675">Details</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="237 1675 444 1873">Agency details</td> <td data-bbox="444 1675 1503 1873"> <p>Provide details of their:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Official Name of the applicant agency • Registered office address • Contact information (e-mail, phone, web site) </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Particulars	Details	Agency details	<p>Provide details of their:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Official Name of the applicant agency • Registered office address • Contact information (e-mail, phone, web site)
Particulars	Details				
Agency details	<p>Provide details of their:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Official Name of the applicant agency • Registered office address • Contact information (e-mail, phone, web site) 				

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Official representative
Agency experience/ portfolio	Provide a list of previous similar assignments in the past 5 years (see the contractual requirements/ section 5 of this document)
Approach & Methodology	<p>Provide an overall approach & methodology to cover the details provided in the scope of work above, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall approach and its responsiveness to the purpose. Methodology to be adopted to undertake the scope of work Key risks and mitigation strategies to be put in place Team composition and management for completing the assignment
Team members	Provide CVs of key personnel to work on the IPPF project (outlining relevant qualifications and experience).
Financial Quote	<p>Provide a budget for the evaluation included estimated number of days and daily rate</p> <p>Any travel expenses undertaken as part of the evaluation will be budgeted separately by IPPF</p>

Financial Quote

The maximum available budget for this contract is 35,000 USD The payment will be split in separate instalments according to a calendar that will be agreed between the service provider and IPPF EN at contract signing stage.

The financial quote should be provided in the table below:

	Type of unit (e.g. daily fee)	Unit value (EURO) Excluding VAT	Total line value (EURO) Excluding VAT	VAT as per the current rate applicable	Total Fee (EURO)
Type of costs/ Budget line	(A)	(B)	(C) = (A) X (B)	(D) = ..% *(C)	(E)=(C)+(D)

I am:

- a VAT Payer, and my VAT number is:
- not a VAT Payer and:
 - the reason for VAT exemptions is (*according to country legislation in which you are registered for fiscal purposes*):

	<p>○ My fiscal identification number (e.g. company number) is:</p>
<p>9.Proposal's Evaluation, Criteria, Timeline</p>	<p><u>Type of evaluation process</u> Shortlisted candidates might be asked to attend an interview to clarify some of the aspects of their proposal</p> <p>Type of evaluation criteria and weight of each type</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical criteria (70%) • Financial criteria (30%) <p>Timeline: Application deadline: 28/02/2023</p>