

# DEC Myanmar Earthquake Response

FUNDED BY DEC

## 5.1 SUMMARY TABLE DD

Country Office Name	Myanmar
Contract Number	BIL2B
Partners (if applicable)	Min Lan Earthquake Response Committee (MLEQC)
Location (country/ies, region/s)	Sagaing
Project title	Myanmar Earthquake Response - Phase 2
Sector(s)	FSL, WASH, MHPSS
Duration	9 months
Starting Date	01/10/2025
Ending Date	31/06/2026
Donor	DEC
Evaluation Type	Process
Evaluation Dates	May – June 2026

## 5.2 ACRONYMS

AAP – Accountability to Affected Populations  
 ACF – Action Against Hunger  
 CFRM – Complaints, Feedback and Response Mechanisms  
 CHS – Core Humanitarian Standard  
 CSO – Civil Society Organisation  
 DEC – Disasters Emergency Committee  
 EQR – Earthquake Response  
 FCRP – Feedback and Complaint Response Process  
 FGD – Focus Group Discussion  
 FSL – Food Security and Livelihoods  
 GPI – Gender, Protection and Inclusion  
 HQ – Headquarters  
 HoD – Head of Department

MEAL – Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning  
 MHPSS – Mental Health and Psychosocial Support  
 NGO – Non-Governmental Organisation  
 PDM – Post-Distribution Monitoring  
 PSEA – Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse  
 SOP – Standard Operating Procedures  
 WASH – Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

# 1. PROJECT BACKGROUND

## 5.3 1.1 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Objectives of the project	Provide a multi-sectoral response to people affected by the earthquake in Sagaing
Expected results and key indicators	<p>M1 - Earthquake-affected population including pregnant and lactating women, infants and children have improved access to hygiene promotion and hygiene supplies, contributing to improved health and reduced disease transmission.</p> <p>M3 - Improved coordination and integration of MHPSS and Nutrition services across the earthquake response interventions</p> <p>M4 - Earthquake-affected population are informed about available humanitarian assistance and are empowered to provide feedback through accessible and responsive mechanisms.</p> <p>M7 - Earthquake-affected household with pregnant and lactating women, infants and children have expanded access livelihood capacities through targeted financial support, business development and continuous coaching, enabling them to regain income sources and improve household resilience.</p> <p>M8 - Earthquake-affected people with disabilities have improved access to information, referral services, and essential assistance through inclusive, evidence-based interventions that promote safety, dignity, and social cohesion.</p>
Main activities implemented	<p>Training of Min Lan Earthquake Response Committee in AAP and CFRM</p> <p>M1 outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Hygiene Promotion Session</li> <li>- Hygiene Kit distribution</li> </ul>

	<p>M3 outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training and Coordination on MHPSS for EQR actors as requested by the cluster</li> <li>- Community education sessions- coping with adversity</li> <li>- Psychosocial well-being sessions for livelihood programme beneficiaries</li> <li>- Trauma support group for adolescents</li> <li>- Referrals for specialised mental health services</li> </ul> <p>M4 outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Awareness raising on FCRP, AAP and PSEA</li> </ul> <p>M7 outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Livelihood Grant Provision</li> <li>- Livelihood business development and planning and financial management training</li> </ul> <p>M8 outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gender, Protection, and Inclusion (GPI)_General Disability Awareness session</li> <li>- Gender, Protection, and Inclusion (GPI)_Referral</li> </ul>
--	---

The project logframe is attached in Annex I.

## 5.4 1.2 PROJECT CURRENT STATUS

The project has now advanced after initial delays, with key activities underway across all sectors. Under FSL, 300 beneficiaries have been selected and preparatory discussions were held, with financial literacy and business skills trainings scheduled next, followed by the development and review of individual livelihood plans. In WASH, hygiene kits have been procured in Yangon and Mandalay and are being moved to community storage, while hygiene promotion activities have already reached 300 households and will continue through home visits and additional awareness sessions. MHPSS activities have begun with training of psychosocial workers, initial community education sessions, referrals of two children, and trauma-focused adolescent group sessions starting soon, alongside the development of a formal referral system. The CFRM is functioning through hotline and direct contact channels, with three feedback entries recorded so far.

## 2. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

### 5.5 2.1 RATIONAL FOR THE EVALUATION

The evaluation is requested by the project donor, but it will also contribute to internal learning. It will focus on the process to highlight, analyze and learn from the many challenges that the team faced during phase 1 and 2 implementation. It will thus aim at informing future programming in similar emergency contexts.

## 5.6 2.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation focuses primarily on internal processes. Its objective is to understand how the internal dynamics of the project and the organisations involved (DEC, ACF, local volunteers, local partners including local civil society organisations, and local authorities, national authorities and informal actors) are affecting, or are likely to affect, the end results.

To reflect on the following:

- Whether the support provided was timely and effective and in accordance with the specific needs and priorities of different community members
- The quality of the partnership approach used in the project: was it equitable? Did it address conflict sensitivity? Did it strengthen capacities?
- How affected communities participated in the project: How did people and communities, including people from vulnerable and marginalised groups participate in the project design? Were marginalised groups included in the project and were their specific voices taken into account? How did Action Against Hunger receive and manage feedback from people and communities? Were feedback mechanisms accessible? How did programmes adapt based on feedback from communities, including vulnerable and marginalised groups?

Action Against Hunger aims at generating learning to be used for future interventions in Myanmar, in any other DEC intervention and any other future multisector earthquake response, including in the network.

## 2.3 USE AND USERS OF THE EVALUATION

This is primarily a process evaluation intended to inform and improve ACF systems, approaches and partnership practices. Through this exercise, the evaluation will generate learning on both the effectiveness of internal processes and the experiences and perspectives of crisis-affected communities, including the perceived effects of DEC-funded ACF programming in Myanmar. Findings will be used to strengthen future DEC-funded responses and inform wider humanitarian programming by ACF and partners.

## 5.7 2.4 DISSEMINATION PLAN

Audience	Objective	Tools used for dissemination	Forum	Who will be in charge?	Timeline
<i>Identify who will be interested by the evaluation final product? Who need to be informed about the main findings?</i>	<i>What we expect from the sharing of the main evaluation findings? Share information? Contribution to knowledge? Creating changes? Actions?</i>	<i>I.e. report sharing, briefings, meeting, articles, presentation and discussion, etc.</i>	<i>Do we identify existing forum (i.e. country office coordination meeting) that could be used to disseminate the findings?</i>	<i>Who is responsible to ensure the dissemination?</i>	<i>When the dissemination will happen?</i>
Myanmar Country Office, including SMT and Programme Technical team	Actions: review findings and develop internal action plans to improve processes Integrate recommendation into ongoing and future program design	Evaluation workshop Report sharing	Country coordination meetings Evaluation recommendations tracker	Evaluator MEAL TA MEAL HoD	During the evaluation At the end of the evaluation
ACF HQ (Pool, ERRU, DEP)	Contribution to knowledge Creating change Action: Review findings and adapt global tools and strategy where relevant	Presentation Report sharing	Pool meeting DEP meeting	MEAL TA	At the end of the evaluation
ACF-UK	Share information Contribution to knowledge Action: Use findings for accountability, learning and future funding decisions	Presentation Report sharing	Evaluation steering committee	MEAL TA	At the end of the evaluation
DEC Secretariat	Share information Contribution to knowledge	Presentation Report sharing	Ad Hoc meeting	ACF UK	At the end of the evaluation
DEC Membership and humanitarian agencies	Share information Contribution to knowledge	Publication of summary on ALNAP/DEC website/AAH website			

## 3. EVALUATION SCOPE

### 5.8 3.1 ELEMENTS COVERED BY THE EVALUATION

The whole project will be covered by the evaluation.

### 5.9 3.2 CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

The evaluation will take two core crosscutting issues that shape the quality, accountability and relevance of the DEC-funded emergency response. First, it will assess equitable and quality partnership approaches, with a focus on how collaboration with local actors supported localisation, shared decision making and strengthened local capacities. Second, the evaluation will review the inclusion of marginalised groups, exploring how women, adolescent girls and boys, persons with disabilities, older persons, minority groups and female-headed households were participated in the response.

## 4. EVALUATION APPROACH AND QUESTIONS

Nota bene: The evaluator may adapt the evaluation criteria and questions, but any fundamental changes should be agreed between ACF team and the evaluator, and reflected in the inception report.

1. Implementation efficiency in a highly constrained context  
(Linked to CHS 2024: *Timely & effective support; respectful, competent and well-managed staff – with localisation & inclusion mainstreamed*)

Timeliness & delivery under constraints

1. What was actually delivered, when, and where vs. the initial plan? Which outputs were not delivered, and why?
2. How did timeliness impact the overall effectiveness of the response in terms of addressing community needs?
3. What enabling/limiting factors most influenced timeliness and how were they managed?

Effectiveness & outcomes

3. To what extent did delivered activities (including those carried over from Phase 1) achieve intended outcomes for people affected – and how is this evidenced (monitoring data, CFRM trends, PDMs, focus groups)?
4. Did the intervention meet the needs of the community, including members of marginalised and vulnerable groups?
5. How did community members, including vulnerable and marginalised groups participate in project design of ?
6. How did Action Against Hunger and partners address the priority needs of community members including vulnerable and marginalised groups?
7. Did delays and sequencing changes reduce effectiveness or create opportunities and what compensatory measures were taken?
8. How were activities adapted based on feedback from communities?

Workforce capacity, duty of care & wellbeing (staff/volunteers/partners)

8. Were staff and volunteers competent and wellmanaged?

9. Duty of care & wellbeing: What was the level of staff safety and wellbeing throughout implementation and how were incidents, near-misses recorded, and addressed ?

#### Conflict sensitivity & do-no-harm

10. Did the chosen delivery modalities exacerbate tensions or protection risks ? What mitigation measures were effective ?

## 2. Equitable and Quality Partnership Approaches

*(Linked to CHS 2024: participation, resilience, coordination, staff & volunteers, ethical resource management)*

### Partnership Formation & Localisation

1. How was the local partner (Min Lan Earthquake Response Committee) selected, and to what extent was the process transparent, equitable, and aligned with localisation principles?
2. How well did the partnership model reinforce local leadership and decision-making throughout the project cycle, including assessment, targeting, delivery, monitoring and adaptation?

### Capacity Strengthening & Mutual Accountability

3. How effectively did the project strengthen partners' capacities (technical, MEAL, safeguarding, CFRM, protection, security risk management) and promote system strengthening to improve community ownership?
4. To what extent did collaboration mechanisms (joint planning, joint monitoring, shared learning) function effectively and foster mutual accountability?

### Partnership Quality & Conflict Sensitivity

5. How did partnership arrangements mitigate risks related to conflict dynamics, political pressure, aid diversion, or partner exposure to harm?
6. How were tensions or unintended negative effects arising from partnership arrangements identified and addressed?

## 3. Complaints, Feedback and Response Mechanisms (CFRM)

*(Linked to CHS 2024: information, participation, safety & non-harm, safe complaints systems)*

### Accessibility & Inclusion

1. To what extent were CFRM channels (hotline, community focal points, complaint boxes, digital channels) accessible, safe and culturally appropriate for all groups, especially women, adolescent girls and boys, people with disabilities, ethnic minorities and displaced households?

### Usage, Trust & Safety

2. Did community members understand their rights to complain and feel safe using the mechanisms without fear of retaliation or discrimination?

### Responsiveness & Learning

3. How effectively were complaints and feedback logged, analysed, validated, and resolved?
4. How were response decisions communicated back to community members in ways that were safe, accessible and trusted?
5. To what extent did feedback trends lead to meaningful programme adaptations (targeting revisions, adjustments to distributions, partner performance improvements, safeguarding actions, etc.)?

## 4. Inclusion of Marginalised Groups

*(Linked to CHS 2024: equitable access, participation, non-discrimination, resilience, safe support)*

### Identification & Reach

1. How effectively did marginalised groups – including women, persons with disabilities, elderly individuals, ethnic minorities, single-headed households, adolescents participated in the design, monitoring, implementation and evaluation of the project?
2. What barriers (social, physical, security-related, cultural, informational) limited their access to assistance, and how did the project address these?

#### Quality & Relevance of Assistance

3. Did marginalised groups perceive the support (livelihoods, MHPSS, WASH) as relevant, dignified and adapted to their specific needs?

#### Participation & Voice

4. To what degree were marginalised groups able to safely influence decisions about the project (targeting, modalities, timing, distribution methods)?

## 5. METHODOLOGY

### 5.1 DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY

#### Data collection methods

The evaluation will adopt a mixedmethods approach led by an international evaluator, who will recruit and supervise a national evaluator responsible for conducting fieldlevel data collection in Myanmar. Together, they will combine interviews and focus group discussions with

- Project and management staff (Myanmar field teams, Myanmar Management, French HQ MEAL, ACF-UK team, DEC team),
- Local partner project and management staff as well as volunteers,
- Diverse community members, including marginalised groups, to capture a wide range of perspectives.

Both evaluators will have full access to project documentation (needs assessments, monitoring data, CFRM records, partner reports, security updates, and secondary sources), which they will analyse prior to and throughout data collection in order to refine interview guides and ensure purposeful, evidence-based inquiry.

Primary data collection will also integrate creative and participatory tools adapted to sensitive contexts, such as photo-language, life-story interviews, Most Significant Change, community timelines, social mapping, power walks... allowing respondents, especially vulnerable groups, to express experiences and perceptions in non-extractive ways. The international and national evaluators will jointly synthesise findings and hold a debrief and analysis workshop in Chiang Mai at the end of the mission to consolidate insights, validate interpretation, and draft the evaluation's conclusions and recommendations.

#### Triangulation

Triangulation will be ensured by comparing data across respondent groups (community members, volunteers, partners, staff), across methods (individual interviews, group discussions, participatory tools, documentation), and across evidence types (perceptions, quantitative indicators, narrative data, administrative records). Discrepancies will be explored systematically, and emerging findings will be contextualised through iterative cross-checks with project documentation and operational constraints. The Chiang Mai final workshop will serve as an additional space to validate interpretations and ensure the robustness of conclusions.

## Methodological limitations

Limitations may arise from access restrictions, security constraints affecting field movement, and potential sensitivity around discussing operational delays or partnership challenges. Remote collaboration between the international evaluator and the national evaluator may also create gaps in shared observation. Availability of staff and partners, as well as the completeness of documentation, may influence the depth of analysis. While participatory tools are designed to reduce respondent fatigue and social desirability bias, they may require careful adaptation to cultural norms and security considerations. These limitations will be mitigated through flexible planning, close coordination with the national evaluator, and careful triangulation of all evidence sources.

## 5.2 SAMPLING

### Sampling Methodology

A non-probability, mixed sampling strategy will be used. Sampling will combine purposive (or snowball), and opportunistic approaches to ensure the inclusion of diverse perspectives while remaining feasible within security and access constraints.

Purposive sampling will guide the selection of key informants who hold strategic or operational knowledge of the project: ACF management and project staff, MEAL staff, partner staff, volunteers, and community leaders. This approach is essential to understand decision-making processes, contextual challenges, and implementation dynamics.

Within communities, purposive sampling will intentionally include marginalised groups (women, adolescent girls and boys, persons with disabilities, elderly individuals, ethnic or religious minorities, and female-headed households) to ensure their experiences and barriers are represented. A stratified purposive sampling approach will be applied during community-level data collection to ensure representation across different categories of beneficiaries (e.g., livelihood grant recipients, WASH session participants, households reached by MHPSS activities). Strata may also include geographic zones, age and gender groups, or specific vulnerability profiles. The national evaluator will adapt the sampling frame to local realities through consultations with community committees, volunteers, and partner staff.

Where access limitations, security incidents or availability constraints create gaps, convenience or opportunistic sampling will be used to complement the sample, prioritising diversity over numerical representativeness.

The evaluators will refine the sampling strategy during the inception phase, using early document review (monitoring data, participant lists, CFRM logs, partner reports) to identify priority groups, gaps, and areas where triangulation is most needed. The national evaluator will validate feasibility on the ground based on local security assessments and community accessibility. The final sample will strive for maximum variation, ensuring the evaluation captures the breadth of experiences, constraints, and outcomes across staff, partners, volunteers, and affected people.

## 6. KEY DELIVERABLES

The following are the evaluation deliverables the evaluator will deliver to ACF:

Deliverables	Deadlines
Inception Report (including the evaluation questions mapping tool)	01/06/2026
Draft Evaluation Report	06/07/2026
Final Evaluation Report	20/07/2026
Evaluation restitution	24/07/2026

All outputs must be submitted in English and follow the format shared by ACF.

The quality of the deliverables will be assessed by, discussed with and approved by the Steering Committee.

## 7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS AND WORKPLAN

These evaluation TORs have been developed in a participatory manner, by the steering committee based on inputs from relevant stakeholders.

The evaluators will directly report to the evaluation lead. The evaluators will submit all the evaluation outputs directly and only to the evaluation lead. The evaluation lead will forward a copy to the steering committee for comments/feedback/review. The evaluation lead will consolidate the comments and send these to the evaluator by date agreed between the steering committee and the evaluator or as soon as the comments are received from the steering committee. The evaluator will consider all comments to finalize deliverables and will submit it to the evaluation lead for a second review. If the steering committee still has comments/feedback, others back and forth will be done. Then, the evaluation lead will share the final version of the report to the steering committee and relevant stakeholders (according to the dissemination plan).

### TENTATIVE WORKPLAN

Activities	Team leader Working Days	National evaluator	Dates
Set up of the steering committee and identification of the evaluation lead			30/11/2025
Design of the ToRs and evaluation questions mapping			20/03/2026
Identification of the evaluator			15/05/2016
Evaluator briefing	0.5		Mid May
Desk review and <u>Inception Report</u>	4	1	01/06/2026
Data collection	5	10	
<u>Draft Report</u>	5	3	06/07/2026
Evaluation workshop	3	3	13-14/07/2026

Back and forth between the consultant and ACF country office team	3	1	
<u>Report finalization and validation</u>	3	1	20/07/2026
<u>Restitution meeting</u>	0.5	0.5	24/07/2026
Total:	24 days	20 days	

Deliverables	Deadlines
Inception Report (including the evaluation questions mapping tool)	01/06/2026
Draft Evaluation Report	06/07/2026
Final Evaluation Report	20/07/2026
Evaluation restitution	24/07/2026

## 8. PROFILE OF THE EVALUATORS

The evaluation will be carried out by a team of evaluators with the following profiles:

### Team Leader:

- Knowledge in multisectoral projects (food security, nutrition / health, MHPSS and WASH) and emergency responses;
- Significant field experience in the evaluation of humanitarian / development projects;
- Experience in evaluations or project management in Myanmar;
- Relevant degree / equivalent experience related to the evaluation to be undertaken;
- Significant experience in coordination, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes;
- Good communications skills and experience of workshop facilitation;
- Ability to write clear and useful reports (may be required to produce examples of previous work);
- Fluent in English,
- Knowledge of humanitarian standards and best practice including CHS, Sphere and Localisation
- Understanding of donor requirements;
- Ability to manage the available time and resources and to work to tight deadlines;
- Independence from the parties involved.

### National evaluator:

- Knowledge in multisectoral projects (food security, nutrition / health, MHPSS and WASH) and emergency responses;
- Significant field experience in the evaluation of humanitarian / development projects;
- Relevant degree / equivalent experience related to the evaluation to be undertaken;
- Significant experience in coordination, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes;
- Good communications skills and experience of workshop facilitation;

- Ability to write clear and useful reports (may be required to produce examples of previous work);
- Fluent in English and in Burmese (national evaluator), any other local language is a plus,
- Knowledge of humanitarian standards and best practice including CHS, Sphere and Localisation
- Understanding of donor requirements;
- Ability to manage the available time and resources and to work to tight deadlines;

#### Responsibility for recruitment and management of the national evaluator

The international Team Leader will be fully responsible for the recruitment, supervision, and overall management of the National Evaluator. This includes drafting the Terms of Reference for the national role (in coordination with ACF), overseeing the selection process, ensuring compliance with safeguarding and conflict-of-interest standards, and providing ongoing technical guidance throughout the evaluation. The Team Leader will also be accountable for coordinating workflows, harmonising tools and methodologies, ensuring ethical and safe field data collection, and guaranteeing the quality of all deliverables produced by the National Evaluator. ACF will facilitate administrative processes when necessary but the operational and managerial responsibility for the national evaluation component will remain with the Team Leader.

#### LEGAL AND ETHICAL MATTERS

The ownership of the draft and final documentation belong to ACF. Action Against Hunger is to be the main addressee of the evaluation and its results might impact on both operational and technical strategies. This being said, Action Against Hunger is likely to share the results of the evaluation with the following groups:

- Donor(s)
- Governmental partners
- Various coordination bodies
- Given the evaluation's engagement with marginalised and potentially vulnerable groups, the evaluation will adhere to robust safeguarding and ethical standards throughout the process. The consultant/team will be expected to comply with ACF safeguarding, protection from sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (PSEAH), confidentiality and do-no-harm principles, and ensure informed consent, privacy and safe participation of all respondents. Data collection methods should be age-, gender- and context-sensitive, minimise risks to participants, and include appropriate referral pathways where safeguarding concerns arise. Particular attention should be paid to ethical engagement with vulnerable and marginalised groups to ensure participation is safe, inclusive and respectful.

For independent evaluations, it is important that the consultant does not have any links to project management, or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of the evaluation.

## 9. TERMS OF PAYMENT

The payment for this consultancy will be done after successful completion of each deliverable as per below payment plan.

	Deliverable	Weightage of Payment
1	Orientation of the TOR and signing of the contract of the consultancy	20%

2	Upon satisfactory completion of 50% evaluation works and submission of supporting documents	30%
3	Final report of consultancy	50%

## 10. LOGISTICS ARRANGEMENT AND CONDITIONS

The consultant will be responsible to bring all necessary equipment: Laptop and computer accessories

Under the consultant agreement, a month is defined as 22 working days, and fees are charged accordingly. Consultant are not paid for weekends.

Flight costs, transport costs, insurance cost and any other costs related to this work should be included as part of the consultancy fees. This will be not be covered separately by Action Contre la Faim.

Consultants are not entitled to payment of overtime. All remuneration must be within the contract agreement;

No contract may commence unless both Action Contre la Faim and the consultant sign the contract;

As per Action Contre la Faim consultant policy, payment is made against approved deliverables. No advance payment is allowed unless in exceptional circumstances against bank guarantee, subject to a maximum of 20 per cent of the total contract value in cases where advance purchases, for example for supplies or travel, may be necessary”;

The candidate selected will be governed by and subject to Action Contre la Faim’s Terms and Conditions for individual contracts.”

## 11. SAFEGUARDING POLICY

"Action Contre La Faim (ACF) commits to protect the beneficiaries and people of the communities where it operates from all forms of harm, abuse, exploitation, and neglect by the employee and associated personnel, partners or suppliers."

The consultant is required to acknowledge and agree to the terms and conditions outlined in the safeguarding policy, and provide their signature as confirmation of their commitment to the policy.

The consultant must be willing to sign and adhere to the ACF code of conduct too.

## 12. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

Qualified candidates are expected to send their applications to ACF in English including:

- a. CV of the consultant(s) / Company Profile
- b. Cover Letter
- c. Copy of degree/diploma
- d. Technical proposal: It should include methodology and work plan.
- e. References from organizations that have previously contracted the consultant (list of 4 reference)
- f. Business Registration if consultant firm

- g. Financial proposal - Offered Currency in MMK or USD and payment through bank transfer (offer should be included all relative cost, VAT and Taxes).

Please note: Consultant per day professional fee includes all charges such as consultancy fee, hotel accommodation, flights, etc and all government taxes (if any).

Interested parties are to submit applications no later than 24 MAY 2026 at 5:00PM Myanmar Time to

[loghod@mm-actioncontrelafaim.org](mailto:loghod@mm-actioncontrelafaim.org)

[acftender@mm-actioncontrelafaim.org](mailto:acftender@mm-actioncontrelafaim.org)