**Tool 4.3**

**Terms of Reference (Sample with PGI integration)**

**Real-Time Evaluation of the**

**Indonesia Earthquakes and Tsunami Response[[1]](#footnote-1)**

1. **Summary**

**1.1. Purpose**: This real-time evaluation (RTE) will assess the ongoing IFRC operation (MDRID013) to support Indonesian Red Cross/Palang Merah Indonesia (PMI)’s response to the Indonesia Earthqaukes and Tsunami, and its context from late July 2018 with a particular focus on how the localization model has been applied and impacted the operational, cooperation and coordination mechanisms as well as the decision-making process, planning and service delivery both within and outside of the Movement. The outcome of the RTE will inform the continued response as well as IFRC readiness in adapting emergency operations, and coordination efforts with, and readiness requirements, including with public authorities, to adapt to locally-led operating conditions. The evaluation will aim at also reflecting a localized approach in analysing localized elements of the response and follow principles in the *IFRC Minimum Standard Commitments on Protection, Gender and Inclusion in Emergencies* during its design and implementation.

**1.2. Commissioners:** This RTE will be commissioned by Jagan Chapagain, the Under-Secretary General of Programmes and Operations, IFRC Geneva and Xavier Castellanos, the Regional Director, IFRC Asia Pacific Regional Office, Kuala Lumpur.

**1.3. Audience:** This RTE will be used by PMI, the IFRC country cluster support team (CCST) in Jakarta, the Asia Pacific regional office (APRO) in Kuala Lumpur, the IFRC headquarters in Geneva. It will also inform the National Societies participating in the response operation, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), non-RCRC donors and ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance (AHA Centre).

**1.4. Duration of consultancy:** not more than 30 days (with approximately 14 days in the field).

**1.5. Estimated dates of consultancy:** December to January 2019.

**1.6. Location of consultancy:** Indonesia (Lombok, Sulawesi and Jakarta), Kuala Lumpur and Geneva

**2. Background**

Indonesia was struck by a series of four strong earthquakes on Lombok Island in July and August, causing more than 510 deaths, destroying more than 80,000 houses and affecting more than 500,000 people (this should ideally be sex, age and disability disaggregated data). In July, IFRC allocated 211,569 Swiss francs (CHF) from the Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) to enable PMI to meet the humanitarian needs of 1,000 households (4,000 people) (here also it should be sex, age and disability disaggregated data) in Lombok.

Table 1: Breakdown of females and males targeted for assistance by sector

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sector | # of females targeted for assistance | # of males targeted for assistance |
| Shelter | 2,120 | 1,880 |
| Livelihoods and basic needs | 2,120 | 1,880 |
| Health | 1,060 | 940 |
| WASH | 1,060 | 940 |

In August, IFRC launched an Emergency Appeal for CHF 8.9 million to support PMI to provide assistance to 20,000 households in Lombok, and the DREF loan was increased to a total of CHF 500,000.

In late September, another strong earthquake followed by a tsunami and liquefaction affected the island of Sulawesi with more than 2,100 casualties, almost 70,000 houses damaged, and more than 430,000 people affected (this number should ideally be broken down by sex, age and disability). IFRC allocated CHF 750,000 from DREF to the response in Sulawesi, bringing the total DREF advance for the response in Lombok and Sulawesi to CHF 1.25 million. Additionally, the Emergency Appeal was revised to CHF 22 million to incorporate the response in Sulawesi, enabling PMI to deliver assistance to 40,000 households (20,000 in Lombok and 20,000 in Sulawesi). Currently, the Emergency Appeal has been revised up to CHF 38.5 million to assist 160,000 people (40,000 families) for up to 30 months.

***The Government***

The Government of Indonesia (GoI) decided to restrict access to foreign aid personnel and international assistance in both occasions. For Lombok, the disaster was declared a provincial disaster, with no international assistance requested, however it was accepted through defined channels. The Sulawesi response was declared a national disaster, but a similar approach towards international actors equally applied. While none of the UN Agencies or major INGOs could operate on the ground in Lombok, certain assistance, that (e.g. logistics and assessments) received approval were supported by international actors (e.g. WFP, DHL and MapAction) in Sulawesi. At Jakarta level, a preference was made to prioritize delegates from the ASEAN region. The GOI’s criteria on disaster declaration and requests, acceptance or denials or international assistance is based on Government regulationsP80P. The consideration for the determination of status and level of disaster is based on six main variables and the overarching principle of decentralization: the number of those affected, loss of physical material, damage to infrastructure, size of the affected territory and socio-economic impact, and most importantly, if there is a functional provincial administration in place to manage the emergency operation.

***Indonesian Red Cross (Palang Merah Indonesia, PMI)***

PMI is auxiliary to the public authorities in all humanitarian action, as outlined in the recently revised Red Cross Law (2017). Even as an independent organisation, PMI is required to follow GoI directions provided through the *Badan National Penanggulangan Bencana* (BNPB), the national disaster management agency, which is governed by the Prime Minister. As stipulated by the Red Cross Law, the BNPB allowed PMI to launch an international appeal through the IFRC, despite the GoI not requesting international assistance. This gave PMI a unique position towards international donors as they were the major channel for providing international assistance (some local NGOs were also allowed to receive international assistance through their international partners like World Vision, Plan International, etc.). In the early phase of the Sulawesi operation, the GoI also placed PMI into the role of receiver and coordinator of assistance for other foreign NGOs, a role new for PMI.

As with the GoI, PMI is also following a decentralized approach for disaster relief operations. While the initial phase of the operation is supported by HQ staff, the respective provincial chapter has to request, organize and manage operational support (e.g. volunteers) from other PMI chapters for the relief phase and is expected to take over full responsibility of the management of the operation after three months. It remains to be seen how PMI will manage this process, as at the time of the occurrence of the Sulawesi earthquake, the local management structure for the Lombok earthquake operation was not yet in place.

***IFRC and RCRC Partners***

IFRC provided immediate assistance in the form of operational support through national staff of the CCST office and the allocation of a DREF. With the issuance of the Emergency Appeal, limited international staff (mainly consisting of Bahasa-speaking APRO staff) were allowed to work in Lombok. However, as agreed between BNPB and PMI and between PMI and the IFRC, only very limited numbers of international staff could be present in the operational area in Lombok. This also applied for Partner National Society (PNS) staff. The IFRC established a “One Plan” approache to reflect the PMI plan and enable a common coordination and reporting mechanism across the response in Lombok and Sulawesi. IFRC and Indonesia-based partners followed these instructions quite strictly, and various PNS joining bilaterally, were accommodated and coordinated by PMI. The IFRC also partnered with the ASEAN Humanitarian Assistance Centre (AHA Centre) on civil-military relations and to share information on the needs and ongoing response on the ground.

***Humanitarian Imperative***

There are specific questions that can be raised in this context, given the localization approach. For example, have the conditions imposed by the GoI for international humanitarian organisations to work on the ground in Lombok and/or Sulawesi constricted in any way a timely, effective response in compliance with humanitarian principles and standards? This question cannot be easily answered as there has not been any independent assessments of the services delivered nor analysis of the gaps. Compared to the 2004 Tsunami response, major GoI-led assistance could be observed and was visible on the ground. Additionally, PMI and various other national NGOs provided assistance and services, many of them indirectly supported by their international partners’ organisations. However, not seeing a UN agency or major INGO present on the ground is a very different scenario. As the UN cluster system was only partially in effect, several ministries and the BNPB established local coordination mechanisms, which seem to be work in progress. The question of whether international humanitarian standards (e.g. SPHERE) have been followed is also unclear as no independent monitoring was taking place, but certain efforts were made by the AHA Centre. What is known about the Humanitarian Country Team’s (HCT) “Central Sulawesi Earthquake Response Plan” is that it is in line with the IASC Commitments on Accountability to Affected Population and Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse, the Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability and the Grand Bargain, providing quality control for support to the government.

***What is known from recent assessments***

* List here 2-3 of the major assessments and their results. For example the Joint Needs Assessment looks at all the different sectors, as does the FACT mission.
* Mention some of the major results and make sure that 2-3 PGI related points are mentioned. These can then be linked to the evaluation purpose and scope.
* For example, based on the [CARE Gender Rapid Assessment](https://reliefweb.int/site%E2%80%A6) of the Lombok and Sulawesi Response, the Central Sulawesi Earthquake Response Plan recognizes “the gendered impacts of disasters and the specific vulnerabilities of particular groups, specifically women and girls, in the context of pre-existing gender inequalities”
* The Joint Needs Assessment found that a significant number of women and girls have had challenges in finding menstrual hygiene management solutions. Less women and girls also have access to water.

**Evaluation purpose & scope**

The IFRC is committed to ensure quality and apply standards, and to a continued learning culture in its disaster response. The IFRC , as such, is committed to carrying out RTEs during all major disasters requiring an international response, and meeting certain criteria of scale, scope, complexity or riskP81P. All RTEs aim to improve service delivery and accountability to affected communities, donors and other stakeholders and to build lessons for the improvement of the IFRC disaster response system and operating model(s). The Indonesia earthquakes and tsunami response operation falls within these criteria.

The cooperation and coordination context for this operation is particularly complex and interesting for the humanitarian system and to the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement. As such, the RTE will evaluate the following areas, focusing on the localization agenda:

1. the **relevance, appropriateness, efficiency, effectiveness and coherence** of the IFRC support of PMI response and coordination system, including coordination with its Movement partners (NS, PNS and ICRC) and external actors (GoI, AHA Centre, other INGOs/NGOs) aimed at optimizing the response, based on a **localized model for coordinating international assistance**;
2. the **ability and preparedness** of PMI to lead its own response and work wide a wide range of local partners and donors; and
3. the **effectiveness and relevance** of existing response and readiness tools and for the humanitarian diplomacy approach used vis-a-vis other stakeholders (partner organisations, governmental, etc.).

The RTE will review what is working well, whether it is appropriate and relevant, what requires improvement, taking into consideration the context and capacities of IFRC, PMI and other Movement components and what measures IFRC should take to ensure that it is best suited for future operations following a similar approach. The RTE will also look at how the Strengthening Movement Coordination and Cooperation (SMCC) model has been relevant and if so, applied. To this extent, ICRC will be fully briefed on this RTE and will be encouraged to provide input into its findings. The RTE team will also recommend specific follow up actions that are realistic and feasible.

PMI shall be fully associated in the design, conduct and implementation of the RTE. AHA Centre will also be closely associated to the process, as an associate or adviser.

The RTE team will meet with and interview key Red Cross Red Crescent stakeholders in PMI, PNSs, and the relevant IFRC Secretariat (in both field locations (Lombok and Sulawesi), CCST Jakarta, Regional Office Kuala Lumpur and IFRC Geneva) and ICRC offices. The team will also consult with critical partners from GoI, AHA Centre, and other organisations such as the UN/NGOs/INGOs as appropriate to the evaluation’s objectives. While the focus will not be specifically on discussions with affected people, the team will take the opportunity to meet with volunteers from local branches, beneficiaries and other community actors as possible and in appropriate contexts.

The evaluation will cover the MDRID013 Indonesia Earthquakes and Tsunami response from the period when the first Lombok and Sulawesi earthquakes struck and PMI and IFRC initiated their response until the time the evaluators collect the data, considering earlier existing contingency planning and coordination for the operation.

**3. Evaluation criteria and key questions**

The specific criteria and possible key questions to be addressed in this RTE are listed below. Emphasis should be placed on the localization agenda in the ongoing response and coordination. The RTE is also required to consider possible future scenarios, options and directions for the IFRC disaster management systems and operational modalities. The questions below provide an initial guidance and are expected to be further elaborated by the RTE team:

**1. How is the IFRC system equipped to respond effectively, efficiently and with impact to disasters and crises under the localization agenda?**

* 1. a. How relevant was the Grand Bargain and IFRC’s role in it in this context? How did the localization agenda contribute to designing and shaping the operation? What have been the advantages of this? And what have been the gaps or concerns, including those around national and international capacities to work in this way?
	2. b. How did the IFRC manage to maintain readiness and adapt its operational modalities under the framework of the localized response modalities during the response?
	3. c. How have relations with the PMI and Government of Indonesia been leveraged to prepare for the localized aid scenarios?
	4. d. Was and Is IFRC’s organisational structure/model operations, both at field and Jakarta level as well as country and regional levels, appropriate according to the needs of the complex emergency situations in Indonesia?
	5. e. How did the localized approach contribute to shape the operation and what were its main gaps?
	6. f. Are there any recommendations for adjusting operational modalities for international response in similar contexts (particularly within ASEAN)?
	7. g. Are the surge deployment mechanisms in place and use of global tools in line with IFRC commitments to the localization agenda? How has surge optimization been addressed through the localized response context?
	8. h. How have the IFRC’s regional/global structures/models adapted to the localized model of operating? What have been the opportunities and challenges for surge deployment mechanisms and global tools in this environment?
	9. i. Are there humanitarian diplomacy recommendations relevant for IFRC which could assist to strengthen relationships, improve coordination and preparedness as well as formalise processes with PMI and the GoI authorities, which better fit the localized approach in large scale disaster response operations?
	10. j. Are there humanitarian diplomacy recommendations relevant for IFRC which could assist to strengthen relationships, improve coordination and preparedness as well as formalise processes with ASEAN and other relevant international and regional actors, which better fit the localized approach in large scale disaster response operations? What specific demands has working in this operation made on the capacities of the national and international actors? And what lessons are there from this for the future?

**2. Effectiveness of IFRC’s tools vis-a-vis other stakeholders (partner organisations, governmental, etc.) in local context.**

* 1. a. What role has IFRC taken in this operation? How could this role be strengthened in the future and what lessons should the IFRC take from this experience to improve this operation in the coming months or for other operations in future? How could the IFRC adapt its role to streamline and improve Movement coordination and cooperation in this context, to improve trust and operational efficiency now and in the coming months?
	2. b. What key messages were identified and how well were these communicated or used for advocacy in this context? How could the IFRC improve its humanitarian diplomacy priorities for the coming months?
	3. c. What, if any, has been the impact of PMI and IFRC international disaster response law (IDRL) advocacy in Indonesia since 2007 and can a direct correlation be made to the more confident and assertive leadership demonstrated by the GoI authorities in relation to the management of international assistance? And how will this relationship need to be developed to support the ongoing operational modality or for future responses?
	4. d. Which levels of engagement with PMI, the GoI and local authorities, as well as AHA Centre, diplomatic missions, local NGOs, militaries and civil protection actors worked particularly well or threw up specific challenges and what were these? How can these be improved or developed in the future coming months?

**4. Evaluation methodology & process**

The methodology will adhere to the IFRC Framework for Evaluation, with particular attention to the processes of upholding the standards of how evaluations should be planned, managed, conducted, and utilized.

An **RTE management team** will manage and oversee the evaluation and, with the evaluators, ensure that it upholds the IFRC Management Policy for Evaluation. The RTE management team will consist of four people not directly involved with the operation: two of which are from IFRC APRO PMER and IFRC Geneva PMER, and the other two who have direct experience in emergency operations and assessments – \_one from CCST Jakarta and one from PMI.

The **evaluation team** will consist of up to six people:

1. a) one **internal IFRC evaluator** with strong knowledge of the localization agenda, humanitarian diplomacy and the South-East Asia context as **team leader,** who will provide insights and advocacy on the subject matter and report on progress or challenges to the management group.
2. b) one **external evaluator** with knowledge of local context who will provide an independent, objective perspective as well as technical experience on evaluations. The external evaluator will be the primary author of the evaluation report. S/he will not have been involved or have a vested interest in the IFRC operation or context being evaluated, and will be hired through a transparent recruitment process, based on professional experience, competence and ethics and integrity for this evaluation.
3. c) one evaluation practitioner from the **IFRC PMER** to provide context on IFRC Framework for Evaluation and with technical experience on evaluations; and
4. d) two to three evaluation practitioners from **PMI, PNSs and external partner organisations** who will also provide the interface with the Secretariat offices in country and will help to clarify internal processes and approaches for the team.

The team will be gender balanced and should comprise as many Indonesians as possible (or at least one team member must be Indonesian). In addition, one evaluation team member should have a PGI in emergencies background, ensuring that the *IFRC Minimum Standard Commitments on Protection, Gender and Inclusion in Emergencies* are followed and implemented throughout the evaluation process. Each evaluation team member has to be briefed on and sign the IFRC Coode of Conduct, Child Protection Policy and Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA) Policy. During recruitment, screening and background checks on team members is mandatory. Ideally the team leader or one of the NS representatives should have regional knowledge/experience and speak Bahasa Indonesia, and ideally all candidates will have some experience with evaluation practices and the IFRC disaster response systems. Ideally, the team leader will have experience in training others on how to collect and store data ethically.

It is expected that all evaluation team members have strong evaluation experience and are able to conduct a reliable and informed evaluation of the emergency operation and the surrounding context that has legitimacy and credibility with stakeholders.

The specific **evaluation methodology** will be detailed in close consultation between the RTE team and IFRC, but will draw upon the following primary methods:

1. **Desktop review** of operational background documents, relevant organisational background and history, including prior any relevant sources of secondary data;

2. **Field visits/observations** to selected sites and to the Country/Regional offices;

3. **Key informant interviews** (institutional and beneficiaries as appropriate); and

4. **Focus group discussions** (institutional and beneficiaries) as time and capacity allow.

For the key informant interviews, it is important that there be a gender, age and diversity balance, as far as possible. For the Focus group discussions, especially in the case of beneficiaries, FGDs should be held separately with adult men, adult women, adolescent boys and adolescent girls, in order to capture a cross-section of views. Evaluation team members should also consult with PMI and other local organisations on vulnerable and marginalized members of the community in the Lombok and Sulawesi areas, in order to ensure that such individuals are not excluded during data collection. For all individuals interviewed, informed consent must be collected. In the case of individuals who are under 18 years of age, informed consent from his/her guardian/caregiver must be obtained.

Due to the complex nature of this emergency, it is likely that protection related cases will emerge during data collection, especially child protection or sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) related cases. It is important that each evaluation team member understand how to handle such disclosures and refer the person appropriately if necessary.

The RTE team will meet with and interview key and critical stakeholders in PMI, government officials, PNSs, ICRC and the relevant IFRC Secretariat offices. The team will also consult with other partners and organisations such as the UN and INGOs/NGOs as appropriate to the evaluations’s objectives, including beneficiaries.

The RTE team will also be briefed in Jakarta, Kuala Lumpur and Geneva.

Initial findings will be shared with PMI and the partner operational response teams in Indonesia. A draft report will be prepared by the evaluation team leader for **review**. This review process should occur within four weeks of submitting the draft report to the evaluation management team, and will involve the following stakeholders in the following order:

* **Submission of the initial draft of evaluation report (week 4)**: The evaluation management team to check content is in line with this ToR and IFRC evaluation standards. Stakeholders who participated in the evaluation to provide feedback on any inaccuracies or clarifications (differences of opinion should not be put forward here but outlined in the management response). Following this, a final draft is prepared.
* **Submission of the final draft of evaluation report (week 8)**: The evaluation management team is responsible to liaise with the evaluation team leader to ensure all comments are addressed in the final draft and forward to the commissioners for final review and approval.
* The IFRC RTE Guide and Procedures will be used for this RTE and made available to the evaluation team.

5. Evaluation deliverables & illustrative timeline

* The following will be developed and delivered in line with the IFRC RTE Guide and Procedures:
* **Inception Report** – \_The inception report will be a scoping exercise for the RTE and will include the proposed methodologies, data collection, data analysis and reporting plans with draft data collection tools such as interview guides, the allocation of roles and responsibilities within the team, a timeframe with firm dates for deliverables, and the travel and logistical arrangements for the team.
* **Debriefings/feedback to management at all levels**: The team will report its preliminary findings to the IFRC APRO in Kuala Lumpur and the team or team leader will debrief in Geneva, in a timely manner and will adhere to the above-mentioned review process.
* **Draft report**: A draft report, identifying key findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons for the current and future operation, will be submitted by the team leader within two weeks of the evaluation team’s return from the field. The report should clearly outline information/data reliability and verification measures to ensure findings and derivation of recommendations are accurate.
* **Final report**: The final report will contain a short executive summary (no more than 1,000 words) and a main body of the report (no more than 10,000 words) covering the background of the intervention evaluated, a description of the evaluation methods and limitations, findings, data analysis, conclusions, lessons learned, clear recommendations. Recommendations should be specific and feasible. The report should also contain appropriate appendices, including a copy of the ToR, cited resources or bibliography, a list of those interviewed and any other relevant materials. The final RTE report will be submitted one week after receipt of the consolidated feedback from IFRC.
* **Management response**. An evaluation management response team (MRT) should be identified from within the IFRC with the responsibility to formulate a management response and action plan to be disclosed jointly with the evaluation as an annex. The MRT will submit the management response and action plan to the USG of Programmes and Operations, who will oversee a management response and will ensure subsequent follow up.

All products arising from this evaluation will be owned by the IFRC. The evaluators will not be allowed, without prior authorization in writing, to present any of the analytical results as his/her own work or to make use of the evaluation results for private publication purposes.

The RTE will be commissioned by the IFRC USG of Programmes and Operations and Asia Pacific Regional Director, and will be managed by a management group (see section 5). The management group will oversee the conduct and quality of the evaluation. The team leader will report on progress or challenges to the management group. The preliminary and final reports will be submitted through the management group, who will ensure the quality of the report providing input if necessary.

The following is an illustrative timeline that will be revisited and refined with more detail during the inception stage of the RTE:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Time Schedule** | **Activities** | **Deliverables** |
| Week 1(3-9 December) | 1. Desktop study of background information
2. Initial briefings, planning an interviews to inform development of inception report
3. Development of detailed inception report, or data collection/analysis plan and schedule, draft methodology, and data collection tools
4. Virtual key informant interviews (by phone/Skype)
 | 1. Inception report with detailed data collection/analysis plan and schedule, draft methodology, and data collection tools
 |
| Weeks 2-3(10-23 Dec) | 1. Virtual key informant interviews (by phone/skype)
2. Data collection in country (key informants across all stakeholder groups in both location – Lombok dates and Sulawesi dates according to data collection schedule
3. Regional office visit/debriefing
4. Geneva interviews/visit and debriefing
 |  |
| Week 4(24-30 Dec) | 1. Prepare draft evaluation report
 | 1. Draft version of evaluation report
 |
| Weeks 5-7(31 Dec – 13 Jan) | 1. IFRC Review
 |  |
| Week 8(14-16 Jan) | 1. Revise and submit final evaluation report
 | 1. Final draft of evaluation report
 |

**6. Evaluation quality & ethics**

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 the people and communities involved and to ensure that the evaluation is technically accurate and reliable, is conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and contributes to organisational learning and accountability. Therefore, the evaluation team should adhere to the evaluation standards and applicable practices 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 regard for the welfare of those involved in and affected by the evaluation. Specifically, the IFRC Code of Conduct, Child Protection Policy and Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA) Policy must be adhered to at all times.

4. **Impartiality & Independence**; Evaluations should be impartial, providing a comprehensive and unbiased assessment that considers 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

**7. Qualifications**

Selection of the external evaluation consultant will be based on the following qualifications:

1) Demonstrable experience in leading evaluations of humanitarian programs responding to major disasters, with specific experience in RTEs preferred

2) Knowledge of strategic and operational management of humanitarian operations and proven ability to provide strategic recommendations to key stakeholders

3) Understanding of localization of aid/Grand Bargain preferred

4) Expertise in understanding and analysing operational, social, cultural and political contexts with due consideration of specific factors that exert local influence.

5) Strong analytical skills and ability to clearly synthesize and present findings, draw practical conclusions, make recommendations and to prepare well-written reports in a timely manner

6) Experience in qualitative data collection and data analysis techniques, especially in emergency operations

7) Ability to integrate protection, gender and inclusion as a cross-cutting agenda when conducting data analysis and making recommendations

8) Knowledge and experience working with the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement preferred

9) Demonstrated capacity to work both independently and as part of a multi-discipline, multi- national team

10) Excellent English writing and presentation skills in English, with relevant writing samples of similar evaluation reports.

11) Regional knowledge of the region/context and fluent in Bahasa Indonesia preferred but not required

12) Immediate availability for the period indicated

**8. Application procedures**

Interested candidates should submit their application material by 25 November 2018 to the following email: pmer.apzo@ifrc.org. Application materials are non-returnable, and any late or incomplete applications will not be considered. We thank you in advance for understanding that only short-listed candidates will be contacted for the next step in the application process.

Application materials should include:

1. **Curricula Vitae** (CV).

2. **Cover letter** clearly summarizing your experience as it pertains to this RTE, your daily rate, and three professional references.

3. At least one **example of an evaluation report** most similar to that described in this ToR.

1. Annex 5 in IFRC “Real-Time Evaluation Indonesia: Earthquakes and Tsunami (Lombok, Sulawesi) 2018 Final Report (23 January 2019 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)