i. Terms of Reference for the Evaluation (Extract with Objectives)

**Overall Objectives**

- To evaluate the appropriateness of the SCUK response to the crisis caused by the eruption of the Goma volcano, including consideration of efficiency, impact, coverage, sustainability, and coherence.
- To evaluate the appropriateness of internal organisation and the effectiveness of working relationships between different parts of SCUK involved in supporting the response.
- To draw lessons from these aspects in relation to future programme portfolio changes, where appropriate.

**Specific Areas of Review**

a) Appropriateness

- Were the actions undertaken appropriate in the context of the needs of the affected population, and the context in which the organisation was operating?
- How were the needs determined – what kind of situation analysis was undertaken, were any particular “tools” used.
- Was the assistance appropriate in terms of the customs and practices of the affected population?
- To what extent were potential or actual beneficiaries consulted as to their needs and priorities? What was the level of beneficiary involvement in project design, implementation and monitoring? How effective were these processes in ensuring relevant and timely product delivery in support of the most needy and vulnerable?
- Was the assistance provided in a timely manner? What were the constraints to this?
- Were international standards – specifically the Sphere Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards for Disaster Response, Interagency Guiding Principles on Unaccompanied and Separated Children and the Red Cross Code of Conduct – used in the planning and implementation of the response?

b) Efficiency

- How were project objectives and indicators determined?
- Were resources used efficiently? Was there an appropriate balance between the use of internal and external resources?
- Did an emergency preparedness plan exist and to what extent was it utilised? To what extent would greater preparedness measures have resulted in a more effective and less costly response?
- To what extent could have preparedness mitigated the impact of the event (e.g. incidence of family separation)
- Were any inputs misused or misappropriated, and if so, how? What could have been done to avoid such misuse?

c) Impact

- What evidence is available that the activities undertaken contributed to the stated goals of the programme?
- What systems or indicators were used to assess the effectiveness of the work?
d) Coverage

- Was assistance provided to all major affected population groups? What criteria were used to determine the geographical coverage?
- What efforts were made to ensure that particular populations and vulnerable groups were not overlooked?
- Were the beneficiaries correctly and fairly identified?
- Was gender considered in the emergency assessment and subsequent programme implementation? If so, were these aspects systematically monitored?
- Were children’s issues and perspectives considered in the emergency assessment and subsequent programme implementation?

e) Sustainability

- Was assistance provided in a way that took account of the longer-term context and developmental opportunities?
- How was the capacity of local stakeholders (local government, local civil society groups) enhanced? Or did the response hinder such entities?

f) Coherence

- What steps were taken to ensure that actions were co-ordinated with other responses taking place?
- What co-ordination structure was in place, or established? How did SCUK work within such a structure? How were needs determined in relation to the response of other agencies?
- Were advocacy opportunities exploited to complement the relief programme?
- To what extent was a rights-based approach incorporated into programme planning and implementation? What could potentially have been the added value of greater use of a rights-based approach, as compared with the actual response implementation?
- How did SCUK use its position to influence the response of other organisations?

g) Internal organisation

- To what extent were existing country level and regional level preparedness plans appropriate? Were there any gaps in planning and co-ordination?
- How effective and timely was the evacuation of staff and assets from Goma? What lessons can be drawn in relation to future evacuation contingencies?
- To what extent were the provisions contemplated by SCUK’s Child Protection Policy implemented during the emergency response programme? What lessons can be drawn in terms of high-risk areas of work with children in the region?
- Were measures to support and care for staff working across borders adequate (i.e. staff from the Goma programme operating inside Rwanda)?
- How appropriate were the support and advisory functions carried out by London HQ and Nairobi Regional Office staff? How can these support roles be enhanced for future operations of this type?
- How effective was the co-ordination and mutual support between the four SCUK country programmes involved (i.e. East DRC, Rwanda, Burundi, South Sudan)? What lessons can be learned for enhanced regional preparedness and joint response operations?
- What are the implications of the global portfolio changes (i.e. phasing out of the Rwanda and Burundi programmes) in terms of future support to the DRC programme (for example to a mass displacement scenario)?