

Terms of Reference: Review of Theology of Disaster Resilience in a Changing Climate (TDRCC)

Introduction

The Australian Humanitarian Partnership (AHP) is a partnership between Australian Government and six AHP partners (Australian non-government organisations) with a focus on disaster response, as well as disaster risk reduction and resilience. In disaster risk reduction and resilience, the AHP delivers the Disaster READY program across the Pacific and Timor-Leste.

The Australian Humanitarian Partnership Support Unit (AHPSU), through Alinea International, is seeking an individual or team to lead an independent evaluation for an innovative Pacific disaster risk reduction initiative, the Theology of Disaster Resilience in a Changing Climate (TDRCC) project, being implemented by the Church Agency Network Disaster Operations (CAN DO) consortium under the Disaster READY program. CAN DO is a key member of the AHP, with a consortium of eight faith-based organisations that operate under the administrative leadership of Caritas Australia.

The evaluation is scheduled to take place between February to June 2024. It will require both desk-based work and in-country component with travel to one-two countries in the Pacific. It is estimated to require up to 30 days input.

Overview

Disaster READY is a disaster risk reduction and resilience program funded by the Australian Government's Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) through the AHP mechanism. Disaster READY strengthens the ability of local communities and organisations in the Pacific to prepare for and respond to crises. AHP partners deliver locally led programs through their networks in Fiji, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea and Timor-Leste. DFAT has partnered with six Australian NGOs and their consortium partners to deliver on these priorities: CARE Australia, Caritas Australia (CAN DO), Oxfam Australia, Plan International Australia, Save the Children Australia and World Vision Australia.

The Partnership has entered Phase 2 of programming (2022-2027). In the lead up to Phase 2, partners participated in country and project-level design processes to support work to be undertaken between 2022-2027. All projects and country-level plans are designed to support the achievement of three intermediate outcomes:

- **Intermediate Outcome 1.1:** Communities (especially vulnerable groups) plan and implement effective, inclusive, and integrated disaster preparedness and climate change adaptation activities.
- **Intermediate Outcome 1.2:** Local civil society actors (NGOs, CBOs, OPDs, churches, informal groups) have improved institutional and technical capacity to fulfil their role in effective disaster preparedness and climate change adaptation.
- **Intermediate Outcome 1.3:** National and Sub-national governments are supported to lead effective, inclusive and coordinated disaster preparedness, climate change adaptation and response activities.

CAN DO is a consortium of faith-based agencies that implements under the AHP. During Phase 1 of Disaster READY 2017-2022 CAN DO designed and implemented The Theology of Disaster Resilience in a Changing Climate project in Fiji, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands and PNG. This approach has continued into Phase 2.

The TDRCC uses a theological lens to encourage disaster preparedness and resilience in Pacific communities and to counter prevalent perceptions that can work against the prioritisation of disaster preparedness. This includes perceptions that God will divert disasters (negating the need for preparation) or that disasters are divine punishment or divine will (also working against the principle of preparation). CAN DO has developed a series of theological materials and sermons that emphasise the need for disaster preparedness and the consortium is rolling these messages out across networks to change behaviours and attitudes. CAN DO leverages the high-level of authority and influence of community church leaders in the Pacific and uses biblical teachings and sermons to help prepare communities and support Disaster Risk Management leadership.

Table 1. Participating countries and partner organisations

| Country | Geographic area | Key partners |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Fiji | Northern Division, Eastern Division, Western Division and Central Division | Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA), Anglican Diocese of Polynesia, Caritas, Fiji Baptist Convention, Fiji Council of Churches (FCC), Methodist Church in Fiji, Olafou, Salvation Army and Seventh Day Adventist Church (SDA) |
| PNG | Southern Region – Milne Bay, Central, Gulf and Western Provinces Highlands Region – Western Highlands, Eastern Highland New Guinea Island Region – Autonomous Region of Bougainville (AROB) | ADRA PNG, Baptist Union PNG, Caritas PNG, United Church PNG |
| Vanuatu | Torba, Penama, Sanma, Malampa, Shefa and Tafea | Vanuatu Christian Council (VCC) and VCC member churches |
| Solomon Islands | Guadalcanal, Western, Central, Makira, Malaita, Choiseul | Anglican Church of Melanesia (ACoM), Adventist Development & Relief Agency Solomon Islands (ADRA), South Seas Evangelical Church (SSEC), United Church of Solomon Islands (UCSI), Solomon Islands Christian Association (SICA), Caritas Australia in Solomon Islands (CASI). |

Scope

Evaluation purpose

CAN DO began implementing the TDRCC project in 2017 and has developed materials and training programs which are being rolled out across the four target countries. In line with the multi-country approach of Disaster READY, the TDRCC initiative is being implemented at a different pace in each of the countries, providing the opportunity for cross-country analysis and learning.

The evaluation will assess the TDRCC project progress in changing attitudes and behaviours on disaster preparedness in the different contexts, highlighting success stories and challenges. Objectives of the evaluation include:

- Learning – The evaluation will draw lessons, derive good practices and develop pointers that can be used across the five Disaster READY country contexts, and potentially more broadly.
- Accountability – The evaluation will help CAN DO and AHP to present high quality and credible evidence of realised and likely impacts of the TDRCC project, and a theological approach to disaster preparedness and climate change adaptation.

Learning and accountability are mutually important purposes for this evaluation. Although partners are only partway through Phase 2 of the Disaster READY program, there is flexibility to enable partners to adjust workplans based on evidence of impact.

Evaluation users

Primary users of this evaluation will include the CAN DO consortium, local partners involved in implementing the TDRCC project and DFAT. Secondary users include the broader humanitarian and development sector and faith-based actors using theological approaches within these spheres.

Evaluation details

The AHPSU is seeking an independent evaluator/team to undertake a hybrid evaluation of the TDRCC. The evaluation will focus on both outcome and process:

- **Outcome evaluation** focuses on how effective a program has been in producing change. Outcome evaluations ask whether, how well and for who a program has met its goals.
- **Process evaluation** measures the effectiveness of program systems and processes by looking at how it was implemented. Process evaluation helps stakeholders to understand how a program achieved its outcomes or impacts and identifies inefficiencies and opportunities for improvement.

The evaluation will investigate four key criteria:

- 1) **Relevance** – the extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies and priorities.
- 2) **Effectiveness** – the extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives and results.
- 3) **Efficiency** – the extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way; and
- 4) **Impact** – the extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.
- 5) **Sustainability** – the extent to which the benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.

Table 2. Key evaluation questions (KEQs)

| Evaluation criteria | KEQs |
|---------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Relevance | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To what extent are theological beliefs a barrier to disaster preparedness and climate change adaptation activities in the Pacific? 2) To what extent does a theological approach offer opportunities in relation to disaster preparedness and climate change adaptation in the Pacific? |
| Effectiveness | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) To what extent is TDRCC achieving its objectives? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. To what extent has TDRCC contributed to attitudinal and/or behavioural change in target communities? b. To what extent are there differential results for marginalised groups, including women and girls and people with disabilities? |
| Efficiency | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4) To what extent have TDRCC systems and processes delivered timely and cost-effective results? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. To what extent have TDRCC systems and processes captured robust, quality data? |
| Impact | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5) What are the benefits and drawbacks of a theological approach to disaster preparedness and climate change adaptation in the Pacific? 6) Have there been any unintended impacts because of TDRCC? |
| Sustainability | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7) To what extent have partner organisations developed capacity to deliver TDRCC? |

Methodology

The methodology will be documented in an Evaluation Plan that includes the relevant data collection and analysis tools. The evaluation methodology will address the requirements of DFAT's Monitoring and Evaluation Standards ([DFAT Design and Monitoring and Evaluation Standards | Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade](#)). The evaluation approach should take full account of the program's focus on inclusivity. The proposed methodology should include:

- A **desk-based review process** (the evaluator/team will be provided with relevant documentation, like project designs, reports and MEL plans);
- Planned **data sources and collection methods**, including a justification for the proposed approach (interviews with key stakeholders including DFAT, AHPSU, CAN DO, partner organisations and including church members and communities are strongly encouraged); and
- A proposed **travel/data collection itinerary** (a minimum of two country visits for stakeholder interviews and community visits is strongly encouraged).

Key steps in the evaluation will include:

- 1) Developing a detailed evaluation plan, including methodologies, evaluation question matrix, data collection tools, interview guides, a framework for data analysis, and timeline. The evaluation team should ensure that the perspectives of the affected peoples are central to the evaluation plan. The evaluation plan will be updated and finalised based on feedback from the AHP NGOs, DFAT and the AHPSU.
- 2) Developing a rubric with input from key stakeholders identifying clear standards for each of the evaluation questions to enable the evaluation team to make a transparent judgement.
- 3) A desk review of background document and development of data collection tools.
- 4) Collect data through key informant interviews, focus groups, surveys, direct observation and/or other appropriate data collection techniques. Ensure all sectors of the community are reached, including people with disabilities. Other stakeholders to include are government, civil society organisations and humanitarian coordination platforms and clusters.
- 5) Analyse and triangulate data against the evaluation questions and rubric.
- 6) Present preliminary findings for sense checking with CAN DO consortium stakeholders, relevant DFAT representatives and the AHP staff and partners. It will be important for partners to see how input from various stakeholders (e.g., local communities, project beneficiaries, and implementing partners) have informed the findings through an evidence matrix or similar.
- 7) Write an evaluation report suitable for publication, which may be published on DFAT's official website, the AHP website and elsewhere.
- 8) Communicate key findings through a verbal report to the Evaluation Review Committee members and AHP NGOs. This may be delivered remotely.

Notes:

- Data collection will need to be culturally appropriate and consider issues of language and literacy.
- Data collected will be disaggregated by gender, disability, and other relevant attributes.

Ethics and safeguarding

The approach to ethics and safeguarding will be documented in the Evaluation Plan and must include high standards of ethical conduct. The evaluation process must be conducted in line with DFAT's Environmental and Social Safeguard Policy and DFAT's Ethical Research and Evaluation Guidance. The following points should be addressed:

- child protection and safeguarding protection policies
- informed consent practices for evaluation participants
- the management of confidentiality and privacy considerations
- the management of expectations of evaluation participants
- data protection and data sharing practices
- training of data collectors on the above.

Evaluation Governance

Evaluation Utilisation and Dissemination

The evaluation process, and the report produced, must be suitable for circulation as DFAT or the AHPSU may publish the evaluation report. The report should also provide the basis for AHP partners to share findings with local partners, affected

communities and to generate wider learning. The Evaluation Report executive summary should be suitable for broad dissemination as a standalone document.

Evaluation Review Committee

The AHPSU will set up an Evaluation Review Committee to oversee the evaluation. The Review Committee will include representatives from the CAN DO consortium implementing the program, DFAT and AHPSU. The role of the Review Committee will include:

- reviewing the evaluation plan and coordinating feedback
- reviewing the draft evaluation report and coordinating feedback
- reviewing and endorsing the final evaluation report
- participating in other ad hoc meetings and discussions on the evaluation as required.

Some members of the Evaluation Review Committee may also have a role in collating key documents for the evaluation team, assisting with contacts, scheduling in-country data collection and supporting other coordination activities. The AHPSU will facilitate this process and support the Review Committee to fulfil its role.

Key Documents

Some documents that will be useful for the evaluation are included below. CAN DO consortium partners, the AHPSU and DFAT will also make available to the Team Leader other information and documents relating to the project and the AHP as required. The evaluation team is expected to independently source other relevant material and literature.

The key documents will include:

- Project documents including project proposals and annexes (e.g. MEL logframes, Gender Equality, Disability and Social Inclusion (GEDSI) plans, activity plans, risk register)
- *Australia's International Development Policy: For a Peaceful, Stable and Prosperous Indo-Pacific*, Commonwealth of Australia, August 2023 [Australia's International Development Policy | Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade \(dfat.gov.au\)](https://www.dfat.gov.au/australias-international-development-policy)
- *DFAT Monitoring and Evaluation Standards* [dfat-design-monitoring-evaluation-learning-standards.docx \(live.com\)](https://www.dfat.gov.au/dfat-design-monitoring-evaluation-learning-standards.docx) including *DFAT's Ethical Research and Evaluation Guidance*
- Australasian Evaluation Society *Guidelines for the Ethical Conduct of Evaluations*, [AES Guidelines web v2.pdf](https://www.aes.org.au/AES-Guidelines-web-v2.pdf) and the *AES Code of Ethics* [AES Code of Ethics web.pdf](https://www.aes.org.au/AES-Code-of-Ethics-web.pdf)

Timing and deliverables

The Evaluation will run from **February to June 2024**. June 2024 aligns with the end of the annual workplan for the project, with reporting due end of July 2024. This work therefore will feedback into the annual reporting cycle.

Evaluation outputs:

- An **evaluation plan**: developed at the beginning of the process confirming the evaluation methodology and outlining key activities, travel, dates and so on;
- A **validation workshop** with key stakeholders on preliminary findings from the data collection;
- A **draft evaluation report**: a brief update on progress against the evaluation plan, including a summary of initial findings from the desk-based review and field work;
- A **final evaluation report**: outlining key findings, lessons and recommendations against the evaluation criteria and KEQs; and
- **Aide memoire presentation of the evaluation findings** to the AHPSU and DFAT.

The table below outlines the proposed timings and payments for each of the evaluation deliverables:

Table 3. Evaluation deliverables and milestone payments

| Deliverable | Timing | Payment |
|---------------------------|---------------|------------|
| Evaluation plan | February 2024 | 10 percent |
| Validation workshop | March 2024 | 15 percent |
| Draft evaluation report | May 2024 | 20 percent |
| Final evaluation report | June 2024 | 40 percent |
| Aide memoire presentation | June 2024 | 15 percent |

In addition to these deliverables, the evaluation team will provide monthly verbal updates to the Evaluation Review Committee on progress against the Evaluation Plan.

Budget

The maximum budget for this work is **AUD \$55,000**. This budget includes all inputs for the lead evaluator and (if applicable) the evaluation team, such as travel costs, administration fees and other support costs.

Submission requirements

Expressions of interest (EOIs) should be submitted to ap-recruitment@alineainternational.com by the 25th of January 2024. EOIs should include:

Table 4. Submission requirements

| Item | Details | Page limit | Criteria |
|----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Cover letter | Briefly introduce the consultancy and/or team members, values and mission as well as key examples of similar work completed. | Up to 1 | Quality of relevant experience |
| Proposed methodology | Outline the proposed methodology in-line with the guidance provided in this ToR. | Up to 5 | Quality of technical proposal |
| CVs of key personnel | Outline the relevant skills, experience, qualifications and work history of each team member in-line with the required skills and experience below. Identify roles within the evaluation team. | Up to 2 pages per team member | Quality of relevant experience |
| Detailed budget | Outline the breakdown of work per evaluation team member, travel, administration and any other relevant support costs. | Up to 1 | Budget represents value for money |

Required skills and experience

Lead evaluators are expected to possess the following skills and experience:

- A postgraduate qualification in evaluation, international development, humanitarianism or a related field;
- Significant demonstrated experience conducting evaluations, including outcome and process evaluation;
- A demonstratable understanding and appreciation of Pacific Island culture and the importance of religion;
- Highly developed communication skills, including advanced English speaking and writing skills, and proven record communicating with project participants and partners, including through interpreters;
- Experience working in the Pacific;
- Relevant subject matter knowledge and experience (i.e. disaster preparedness and climate change adaptation and/or faith-based approaches to development and humanitarian issues);
- Experience working with a large number of diverse stakeholders in an effective and culturally sensitive manner;
- Experience designing, capturing, analysing and presenting qualitative and quantitative data;
- A demonstratable understanding of data privacy, consent and ethics – including the ability to comply with Child Protection and Safeguarding requirements; and

- The ability to produce high quality evaluation reports and presentations that comply with the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade's Monitoring and Evaluation Standards.

Desirable skills and experience

It is desirable that lead evaluators or other members of the evaluation team possess the following skills and experience:

- Proficiency in one (or more) of the official languages used in Vanuatu, Fiji, Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands.

Contact details

Please send any queries related to the ToR to:

India Lynn, Disaster READY Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Coordinator

india.lynn@ahpsu.com

** Please do not send submissions to this email address, refer to the submissions section above. **