**Standard Terms of Reference (ToR)**

**Look back study**

**1. Background**

Past evaluations of RC/RC developmental WatSan projects (such as projects within the GWSI framework) have been undertaken in most cases at the conclusion of the project period or shortly after. However, the real impact and indeed sustainability of these projects can only be realistically evaluated at least several years after implementation has ceased.

With the new ‘look-back’ methodology, the International Federation and its membership intends to provide a framework to conduct retrospective studies, where the assessment of sustainibility looks at the long-lasting WatSan structures and resources that help the community to become less dependent on external assistance and indeed we need to measure to what extent these projects contribute to ‘building community resilience’.

For 2012, the International Federation has commmitted to facilitate at least two look-back studies of past GWSI projects.

The purpose of the ‘look-back’ methodology is to facilitate, through a set of standard tools and guidance, a better understanding of the long-term impact of a WatSan intervention over time and the sustainability aspects of the intervention. It also helps to assess whether a software-oriented package with emphasis on the community-based management of the facilities and hygiene behaviour change has been applied, and whether this approach has been a critical element of success in terms of impact and sustainability closely linked to the physical or infrastructural outputs of the project.

**Project background:**

This project was implemented by XXX Red Cross and XXX (Partner/s) with funding from XXX (Donor/s) in XXX area (District, Province) from XXX (Month, Year) to XXX (Month, Year). The final evaluation of this project was carried out in XXX (Month, Year), right after the completion of the project, comprising a set of conclusions related to evaluation criteria such as relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, coherence, coverage, sustainability and XXX (others if applicable).

**2. Scope**

The ‘look-back’ methodology will be used in the context of the XXX (Name of the project) project to reveal further recommendations in the areas of appropriateness, replicability, impact and sustainability. It will help XXX Red Cross and its back donors to draw lessons and identifying good practices for improving the design and management of present and future WatSan interventions.

**3. Timing**

The starting date will be confirmed with XXX Red Cross, but the study should be carried out in XXX (period of the year), with final date XXX (Date/Month/Year).

The timeframe for the consultancy work is:

* XXX days for desk work – adapt the current ‘look-back study’ methodology and associated materials and tools to the context of XXX (Country), and 2) propose changes for further adaptation. Preparations for the field testing exercise (evaluation tools, contacts with NS, ToR, and logistic arrangements) will be undertaken during that period.
* XXX days for field work in XXX (Country).
* XXX days for final reporting and de-briefing (presentation, meeting, teleconference).

**4. Methodology**

The impact study in XXX (Country) will be conducted using the ‘look-back’ methodology (tools and guidance) developed in 2010-11 by the Netherlands Red Cross. The knowledge and experience generated by different field test studies (Indonesia, Mongolia, Vietnam and Uganda, Zimbabwe) is presently available to all partners within the Red Cross Movement. The main reference tools for the study in XXX (Country) will need to be re-adjusted to its specific context.

A XXX analysis will be the approach to follow considering that the XXX (Name of the project) project XXX (had or had not) generated a baseline survey (Year) and end-line survey (Year). A post-intervention or look-back survey in the form of a **household survey** will be conducted. This will provide fundamental data to perceive the changes occurred in the communities two years after the project concluded. XXX Red Cross will be the leading partner in this activity providing enumerators and organizing the logistic of the field activities. Training of enumerators, technical supervision of field activities and final data analysis will be facilitated by the evaluation team. In addition to the household interviews, a combination of quantitative and qualitative data will be gathered through different tools such as direct observation, FGDs, key informant interviews and any other relevant participatory tool such as community map, voting chart, etc. This will be facilitated by the evaluation team in close collaboration with XXX Red Cross volunteers and staff.

An exhaustive **inventory of water points** **and latrine infrastructure** will be produced to feed into further reporting on water and sanitation coverage (MDG. No 7). This will be undertaken by XXX Red Cross as part of the look-back study and if possible, prior to the deployment of the evaluation team.

The team of evaluators will start with a desk study, to detail the evaluation methodology and set-up. The methodology will at least include the following elements:

* + Both quantitative and qualitative information. However equal emphasis will be on quantitative & qualitative data and analysis.
	+ Various methods for data gathering, building on previous evaluation work in XXX (Country).
	+ Triangulation of data to ensure accurateness of data collected.
	+ Main stakeholder’s perspectives, especially those of the beneficiaries, will be taken into account.
	+ Innovative ways of presenting data collected and analysed, for example spider diagrams, etc.

It will be the responsibility of the evaluation team to establish and maintain contacts with XXX Red Cross, with the support of the Federation and XXX (other partners). This involves the organisation of travel and identifying and requesting resources required to carry out the study. For this, sufficient budget will be made available to the consultant and the National Society.

**5. General evaluation questions and list of indicators:**

Key questions that would lead the look-back study include, but are not limited to:

**Impact**

* To which extent were the overall objectives achieved?
* Do the changes brought about by the project still have an effect on the intended beneficiaries and the National Society?
* To what extent changes in the health status of the target population can be attributed to the project? Were the target groups empowered to take control of their own health status?
* Did the project contribute to changes in the socio-economic and socio-cultural status of the target population?
* Did the project generate changes on gender roles? Have women, men boys and girls gained opportunities for control and decision?
* Did the project have an impact on education (school attendance, children retention and absenteeism) in the project area?
* Did the project have any impact in the environment? Did it include any prevention or mitigation measures?
* What are the major factors that contributed to a significant impact for the National Society?

A detailed list of imapct indicators in included in the Look-back guidance.

**Sustainability**

* To what extent did the *benefits* of the project continue after donor funding ceased?
* Has the *approach* introduced by the particular project been sustained after closure?
* What was or would have been required to accomplish these benefits and sustainable approaches?
* Were the projects environmentally and financially sustainable?
* At which extent the collaboration between the national society and local authorities and other partners had some effect on sustainability of the programme?
* What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the projects?

A detailed list of sustainability indicators in included in the Look-back guidance.

**Replicability**

* Has there been a degree of replication within or beyond the project area by the National Society either through the Branches involved at project level or other Branches
* What can be done to strengthen the process in order to ensure it is sustained and even duplicated beyond the project area?

**Appropriateness**

* Were the intervention choices appropriately prioritised to meet the most urgent needs first?
* Was the intervention appropriate according to the perception (expressed needs/demand) of the target population and/or according to national policies: how were power relations, cultural perceptions and relevant customs of beneficiaries assessed, and taken into account?
* At the time of project implementation, were the approaches and technologies selected most appropriate for the specific context?

The evaluation team is expected to refine the questions and produce a set of evaluation tools (observation checklist, interview guides, etc) that will be discussed and agreed with the Federation, XXX Red Cross and XXX (other partners).

**6. Profile of the evaluation team members**

The evaluation team will be composed of three members, representing the Federation, the XXX Red Cross and XXX (other partners). It is recommended to have a fourth member in the team, preferably a local consultant, to lead the household survey process.

Those three (four) individuals will have:

* Strong methodological background
* Experience in WatSan/HP programming
* Experience in conducting impact studies, evaluations or similar
* Demonstrated fluency in XXX (working language in the country) and English
* Ability to write concise and comprehensive reports in English, preferably in both lenguages
* Cultural sensitivity and excellent interpersonal skills
* Computer literate
* Experience within the country preferred