

Terms of Reference (TOR) for NorCross Strategic Evaluation

Study on:

“Support to the development of National Societies Financial Management capacity”

1. Summary

Purpose: The evaluation will identify from existing literature and operations which activities are likely to contribute to improved humanitarian delivery through finance development support. In addition, the evaluation will inform NorCross internal capacity building on FD and the development of FD cooperation with the ICRC and partnerships with Movement-external actors.

Audience: Norwegian Red Cross and RCM partners will use the insight from the evaluation to improve results from financial development programming and further develop technical competencies in this field.

Commissioners: This study is being commissioned by NorCross International department, section on Strategy and Evaluation”

Reports to: Head of Strategy and Evaluation

Duration: Maximum 40 working days, not including the overall management of the evaluation.

Timeframe: September to November 2018

Methodology summary: Primarily desk study of relevant documentation, combined with semi-structured interviews with individuals in institutions with a high degree competency in Financial Development in countries with conflicts and protracted crisis

Location: Desk-study combined with visits/interviews/workshops with leading expert communities in Community Health Promotion in Africa and Asia

Application requirements: Broad experience from Financial Development Support to civil society (incl RCM) in countries in conflict and protracted crisis.

2. Background

Norwegian Red Cross (NorCross) aims, as part of its international strategy, at improving the Financial Management of National Society partners as part of National Society Development (NSD) to enable improved humanitarian impact.

As part of the present Norad funding-cycle to 2020 NorCross is supporting 12 NS partners in the area of Financial Development: Burundi, Somalia, South-Sudan, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, Lebanon, Palestine, Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras. In the overall NorCross results framework FD-support is defined under the enabling objective “Improve Financial Development, Resource Mobilisation and PMER” and the underlying outcome “The NC financial management and financial resources enables efficient and effective humanitarian results”. Indicators of achievement of NS-support for this outcome are: *consolidated annual budgets, established mitigation routines to prevent fraud and corruption, consolidated annual financial report and Annual income and surplus raised domestically from individual/corporate donors and from income generating activities*. Under the enabling objective: “Strengthen complementary roles and responsibilities” one of the indicators is *RCRC Movement standards for Financial Development established and published*. Under the enabling objective: “Strengthen complementary roles and responsibilities” one of the indicators is *RCRC Movement standards for Financial Development established and published*.

The FD intervention area is characterized by challenges in demonstrating lasting change and impact across partners from the supported interventions. NorCross wants to assess what types of interventions works where and why, to use this information to improve their overall strategic approach in the area. This evaluation will therefore go beyond stock-taking of immediate and medium- term results of NorCross support to NS in the areas (outputs and outcomes). The aim is to conduct a strategic learning-exercise by mapping and analysing what mechanism successfully cause

activities/interventions to trigger desired changes to NS-practice, and to use these insights to articulate changes in future FD interventions.

With this background, tasked by the Strategic Management Team April 2018, Norwegian Red Cross will prioritize to develop a better understanding of best practices and define technical standards for financial development interventions. This would aim to increase objective fulfilment of its international strategy.

This learning process will include collaborative work amongst technical experts during June 2018 – June 2019 and entails an evaluation of finance development interventions which again will inform program designs during 2019 onwards.

3. Evaluation Purpose & Scope

Purpose (overall objective). The evaluation will identify from existing literature, operations and leading expertise what activities in Finance Development (FD) support to National Societies are likely to contribute to improved humanitarian delivery. In addition, the evaluation will inform NorCross internal capacity building on FD and the development of FD cooperation with the ICRC and partnerships with Movement-external actors.

The audience of the evaluation, Norwegian Red Cross and RCM partners will use the insight from the evaluation to improve results in their financial development programming and further develop technical competencies in this field.

Scope. This scope of this strategic evaluation is

- **Geographic and organisational scope:** Experiences with PNS in countries in conflict or protracted crisis in Mena, Africa or Asia having received financial development support from NorCross or other RCM donor national societies and peer organisations the last 5 years
- **Thematic scope:** Assess value for money of relevant modalities of financial development support, particularly the model where FD support cover a broad range of activities over a longer period of time (such as in Africa) vs support to a few key activities over shorter period of time with the aim to meet short term goals (such as Lebanon, Iraq etc.).

4. Evaluation Criteria – Objectives - Questions

Evaluation criteria

The primary evaluation criteria for this study is **Value for money** defined as the optimal use of resources, given restrictions and constraints, to achieve the intended outcomes. Definition of optimal: The most desirable possible given expressed or implied restrictions or constraints (see UK National Audit Office cited in British Red Cross Value for Money Workshop, GVA April 2016). Value for Money is comprised of two core elements:

- effectiveness: what are the intended outcomes,
- efficiency: how to achieve the intended outcomes

The aim of the evaluation is to answer a set of questions (although not limited to), organised under three main objectives

Objective 1: Main challenges and modalities for Financial Development support mapped and analysed

1. What are the main persistent challenges faced by National Societies in financial management in target countries for this study?
2. What are the most critical financial management challenges to address to ensure improved humanitarian impact through National Societies in the target countries for this study?
3. What are the main different modalities that have been used to support National Societies with Finance Development by RCRC Movement partners and which ones are more likely to provide Value for Money?
4. How can long-term sustainability of financial development support be ensured while allowing for time-bound interventions and investments?

5. What are, if any, the established standards for financial development support that ensure improved humanitarian impact?

Objective 2: NorCross experiences with Financial Development support analysed

6. To what extent have financial development support by NorCross been implemented according to established standards?
7. What are the planned and unplanned effects of financial development support provided by NorCross in (selected) target countries?

Objective 3. Implications for improved performance for NorCross Financial Development support defined

8. What are the most effective interventions of financial development that NorCross should aim to support in National Societies in areas of conflict and protracted crisis?
9. What are the criteria for successful financial development interventions of NorCross in countries of conflict and protracted crisis?
10. What changes must NorCross do to be able to fulfil the requirements of the new criteria?
11. What concrete actions should NorCross take to fulfil the requirements (skillsets, standards, organization, sustainability etc)?
12. What should be the role of NorCross and what can be sourced from local, regional and international consultancy firms and/or NorCross corporate/institutional partners such as PwC? I.e. what capacity and resources does NorCross need and what can be more effectively sourced through consultancies or external partnerships?

5. Evaluation Methodology

This strategic evaluation will be a meta-study of relevant international experiences in Financial Development support in National Societies in relevant countries in conflict or protracted crisis. The resources and time available for this study does not provide the opportunity to conduct traditional results-oriented program/project evaluations or evidence-based evaluations. Its objective requires a broader approach to data collection to collect lessons learned from a variety of relevant program and projects, to be used in the overall NorCross learning process.

Key data sources

Secondary data will be the main data sources for this study, and will include evaluations, reviews and studies on Financial Development Support within the defined scope. This means much of this study will be a desk-review of:

- NorCross projects in Financial Development Support, with focus on M&E-data (baseline study, midterm evaluations, regular monitoring reports, etc)
- Evaluations, reviews, assessments, reports and studies on Financial Development Support conducted by or for other RCRC PNS (such as Sweden, Denmark and UK), peer institutions and relevant companies having worked with National Societies or corresponding organizations.

Data sources are also expected to include interviews with individuals in institutions with a high degree of insight and expertise in the focus areas of the study. In addition to NorCross itself, this may include RCM members, relevant consultancy companies, and peer organizations. It is expected that this will be further defined in an Inception Report.

6. Deliverables (or Outputs)

- ***Inception report*** with a detailed description of methodology to be used, a data collection plan, information sources and solutions to identified challenges.
- ***Draft report*** in English including background, findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations
- ***Lessons Learnt workshop*** in Oslo to present and discuss the initial findings, conclusions, and recommendations from the draft report before revision and final approval of the final report.
- ***Final report*** in English of max 30 pages (excl. Executive Summary and Annexes) within 24 November 2018 including:
 - Executive summary – max 3 pages

- Background
- Evaluation methods and limitations
- Findings
- Conclusions
- Lessons learned
- Recommendations
- Appropriate appendixes

7. Proposed Timeline (or Schedule)

Time Schedule	Activities	Deliverables
Week 1 By Sept. 14	1. Desktop study: review intervention documentation, and related primary/secondary resources for the evaluation. 2. Development of detailed inception report, or data collection/analysis plan and schedule, draft methodology, and data collection tools.	1. Inception report, data collection/analysis plan and schedule, draft methodology, and data collection tools. To be approved by NorCross.
Week 2-5	1. Data collection in target groups according to data collection schedule.	1. Communities completed according to data collection plan.
Week 6 By Nov. 17	1. Prepare draft evaluation report.	1. Draft version of evaluation report.
Week 7 By Nov. 24	1. Present Lessons Learnt Workshop of initial findings, conclusions, and recommendations before revision and final approval of the final report. 2. Address feedback with revisions in report where appropriate.	1. Lessons Learnt Workshop.
Week 8 By Nov 31	1. Revise and submit final evaluation report.	1. Final version of evaluation report.

8. Evaluation Quality & Ethical Standards

The evaluators should take all reasonable steps to ensure that the evaluation is designed and conducted to respect and protect the rights and welfare of people and the communities of which they are members, and to ensure that the evaluation is technically accurate, reliable, and legitimate, conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and contributes to organizational learning and accountability. Therefore, the evaluation team should adhere to the evaluation standards and specific, applicable process outlined in the [IFRC Framework for Evaluation](#). The **IFRC Evaluation Standards** are:

1. **Utility:** Evaluations must be useful and used.
2. **Feasibility:** Evaluations must be realistic, diplomatic, and managed in a sensible, cost effective manner.
3. **Ethics & Legality:** Evaluations must be conducted in an ethical and legal manner, with particular regard for the welfare of those involved in and affected by the evaluation.
4. **Impartiality & Independence:** Evaluations should be impartial, providing a comprehensive and unbiased assessment that takes into account the views of all stakeholders.
5. **Transparency:** Evaluation activities should reflect an attitude of openness and transparency.
6. **Accuracy:** Evaluations should be technical accurate, providing sufficient information about the data collection, analysis, and interpretation methods so that its worth or merit can be determined.
7. **Participation:** Stakeholders should be consulted and meaningfully involved in the evaluation process when feasible and appropriate.
8. **Collaboration:** Collaboration between key operating partners in the evaluation process improves the legitimacy and utility of the evaluation.

It is also expected that the evaluation will respect the seven **Fundamental Principles of the Red Cross and Red Crescent**: 1) humanity, 2) impartiality, 3) neutrality, 4) independence, 5) voluntary service, 6) unity, and 7) universality. Further information can be obtained about these principles at: www.ifrc.org/what/values/principles/index.asp”

9. Evaluator/s & Qualifications

- At least five years of direct full-time experience with different modalities of **financial development support** to civil society organisations in complex and fragile settings required, preferably with RCM movement
- Excellent knowledge of **finance management standards** and familiarity with trends and developments in the field
- Practical experience with **auditing** of projects managed by civil society organisations in complex and fragile settings required, preferably with RCM movement
- Insight into **organisational development** is an advantage
- Experience with efforts to reduce **fraud and corruption** in in complex and fragile settings
- Minimum qualification of a **Master in business** and administration or equivalent.
- Proven track record of conducting **similar strategic evaluations** or meta-studies required.
- Strong interpersonal and communication skills.

10. Application Procedures

Proposals will be ranked according to how they fulfil the three following requirements:

- Team qualifications (50%)
- Methodological approach (25%)
- Price (25%)

Interested candidates should submit their application material by August 12 to:

- Øivind Hetland oivind.hetland@redcross.no with copy to
- Lars-Andrè Skari Lars.Skari@redcross.no

Application materials should include (note evaluations do not always require each of these items – this is only a list of examples to consider):

1. **Curricula Vitae** (CV) for all members of the team applying for consideration.
2. **Cover letter** clearly summarizing your experience as it pertains to this assignment, your daily rate, and three professional references.
3. A brief **description** of your firm or institution (for applicants other than individual contractors).
4. **Technical proposal** not exceeding five pages expressing an understanding and interpretation of the TOR, the proposed methodology, and a time and activity schedule.
5. **Financial proposal** itemizing estimated costs for services rendered (daily consultancy fees), accommodation and living costs, transport costs, and any other related supplies or services required for the assignment.
6. At least one example of a strategic **evaluation report** most similar to that described in this TOR authored by the proposed team members.

Application material are non-returnable, and we thank you in advance for understanding that only short-listed candidates will be contacted for the next step in the application process.