

Terms of Reference

Doctors Without Borders/Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) is an international medical humanitarian organization determined to bring quality medical care to people in crises around the world, when and where they need regardless of religion, ethnical background, or political view. Our fundamental principles are neutrality, impartiality, independence, medical ethics, bearing witness and accountability.

The Stockholm Evaluation Unit (SEU), based in Sweden, is one of three MSF units tasked to manage and guide evaluations of MSF's operational projects. For more information see: evaluation.msf.org.

Name of evaluation: OCB Ops Monitoring Review	
Starting date:	May 2023
Duration:	Final report to be submitted <i>by September 2023</i>
Requirements:	Interested applicants should submit: 1) A proposal describing how to carry out this evaluation (including budget in a separate file), 2) a CV, and 3) a written sample from previous work
Deadline to apply:	Monday April 24, 2023
Send application to:	evaluations@stockholm.msf.org
Other:	Anything that might affect the process; e.g. COVID-19 restrictions etc (TBC).

BACKGROUND

MSF carries out its social mission through the implementation of its medical humanitarian projects. Project implementation, while led by the Operations Department, is the result of a collaboration with the Medical, Logistics, Supply Chain, Finance, Human Resources and Analysis Departments. The Operations Department is set up on the basis of project teams, country coordination or support teams (not in all regions) and then either a cell based in Brussels or a regional support team based closer to the projects. Two directors of Operations oversee the department.

On an annual basis, MSF Operational Centre Brussels (OCB) implements approximately 110 projects, across close to 35 countries (based on 2022 statistics). Implementing these projects is MSF's core business.

As part of its recommendation, the OCB's Bureaucratization Report (managed by the Stockholm Evaluation Unit, 2017¹) suggested adapting the cycle of meetings and reporting practices for an improved monitoring of projects. The processes of identifying medical-operational needs, defining

¹ Available at <https://evaluation.msf.org/evaluation-report/msf-ocb-bureaucratization-review-2017>

objectives, and implementing activities to reach these objectives was reframed in 2020. Currently, several activities of this process are being implemented (i.e., annual review of operations, multiyear review of operations, roundtables, quarterly monitoring meetings).

“Monitoring is a process to periodically collect, analyse and use information to actively manage performance, maximise positive impacts and minimise the risk of adverse impacts.... Monitoring processes can monitor change and progress in different aspects: needs, the operating context, activities, and the results of activities, projects, programmes and policies.”

<https://www.betterevaluation.org/methods-approaches/themes/monitoring>

Whereas OCB collects and analyses data on many levels, a systematic approach to both project and strategic monitoring has yet to be developed and adopted across the organization. With regards to project monitoring, OCB wants to focus on reporting and discussing progress on project activities, achievement of project results and objectives, as well as the needs, planning, and use of resources. The primary forum to discuss this are OCB’s quarterly monitoring meetings (QMMs). The strategic/institutional level refers to monitoring OCB’s Operational Portfolio (total dossier of projects) as well as progress towards the strategic documents (including the Operational Prospects and the Medical Strategy).

Different projects, units and even individuals have developed their own approach(es) to respond to this gap on a day-to-day basis. To name some issues, it can be challenging, in the current setup, to integrate the data collected horizontally and vertically (data flow), know and how it can be analysed between different levels and users in order to drive an effective monitoring system.

To sum it up, knowing whether projects deliver what they set out to do and whether they are doing this well, and how this contributes to and achieves strategic objectives, can be difficult to assert in a straightforward and usable way, irrespective of which department or on what level (i.e., project, capital, head of department) someone operates on.

Unlike many other international agencies, MSF does not receive institutional donor funding. As a result, the organization is not driven to put in place a monitoring system for the sake of reporting to bilateral donors. Rather, OCB recognizes the need to improve its approach to project and strategic monitoring, for the sake of its own learning, accountability and operational decision making as a centrally contributing factor to being able to carry out its social mission. This review seeks to be a step in the direction of revising and adapting OCB’s monitoring practice.

PURPOSE

This review should produce a systematic and comprehensive mapping and analysis of MSF OCB’s existing monitoring activities aimed to assessing operations, and ought to clarify:

- what is being collected, of what quality,
- which operational progress indicators have been developed and or used,
- how it is being done, including what tools and capacities (i.e., roles and responsibilities) exist,
- how are the results of monitoring activities being used and,
- if the sum of these activities is coherent with the organization’s needs.

Keeping an operational lens on this review, it should cover (1) project, (2) coordination (or Country Support Team (CST)), (3) cells and or regional support team (RST), (4) department level.

INTENDED USE

Working with the findings from this review, OCB should be able to identify gaps, areas of overlap, and potential synergies in its existing systems and processes to form an understanding of to what means OCB monitors its work and with what results. As such, it should form the basis for strengthening the design and implementation of OCB's Monitoring Strategy, on both the project and strategic level.

EXPECTED DELIVERABLES

- Work plan

The work plan ought to include a detailed proposal, including methodology and timeline, developing further what has been suggested in the initial proposal, clarifying the main stakeholders' expectations and what and how this review can deliver to that.

- Draft Report

The draft report delivers on the purpose as stated in this ToR.

- Working Session

As part of the report writing process, a working session will be held with the commissioner, consultation group members and SEU evaluation manager.

- Final Report

The final report will have addressed feedback received during the working session and written input from a feedback loop.

- Sensemaking session

As part of the report writing process, a working session will be held with the commissioner, consultation group members and SEU evaluation manager.

- Dissemination and use

A presentation and discussion of the Final Report to a more general MSF audience in the form of a webinar. Possibly other activities as well.

RECOMMENDED DOCUMENTATION

The following is a non-exhaustive list of documents to review. Data collections tools and systems (i.e., databases) should also be reviewed. OCB will help the consulting team to identify and locate documents that need to be reviewed, yet uncovering these is also to be part of the actual review:

- Strategic MSF and OCB documents, including Strategic Orientations, Operational Prospects, Medical Department Strategy,
- Existing project management and review processes, including tools, manuals, and guidelines,

- Project documents (project proposals, log frames, strategies, situational reports, Snapshots, annual reports, project visit and end of mission reports, organigrams, project budgets, assessments reports)
- Routinely collected medical data (including raw data from medical databases),
- Previous reports, reviews and mappings completed to assess and seek to address challenges that exist in monitoring projects,
- SEU Bureaucratization Report (2017) and other relevant evaluations.

PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REVIEW

Number of evaluator(s)	Flexible.
Timing (Besides the start date, other dates are estimated)	Start: May 2023. Work plan: May 2023 Finish: August 2023

The SEU has established a consultation group (CG) for this review, with the objective to increase understanding, buy-in, learning during the process as well as quality of the end result. The CG is led by a commissioner. They have contributed to finalizing this ToR.

The key deliverables (inception report, draft/final report) will be processed through a feedback loop, collecting input from the consultation group (see below, Practical Implementation). Each deliverable is reviewed by the SEU and endorsed by the review's commissioner.

When planning how to prioritize projects to be considered as a part of the review, this exercise must take into consideration the ongoing structural changes happening in the organization through initiatives such as the networked organizational directorate and field recentralization program (that seeks to put the project better in the centre of operations).

PROFILE/REQUIREMENTS FOR EVALUATOR(S)

The review requires an individual or team of individuals who can demonstrate competencies in the following areas.

Requirements

1. Proven expertise in humanitarian program monitoring.
2. Experience in humanitarian health program management.
3. MSF experience and or understanding of the organization.
4. Fluency in English (spoken and written).

Valuable

5. Academic or practical background in global public health.
6. Additional languages, especially French, that could serve the review process (e.g., documentation, interviews).

APPLICATION PROCESS

The application should consist of a technical proposal, a budget proposal, CV, and a previous work sample. The proposal should include a reflection on how adherence to ethical standards will be considered throughout the process, as well as how values and perspectives of different stakeholders will be brought into the process. The consultant(s) will need to demonstrate an understanding of the request and its context and reflect this in the proposed methodology as well as the team set-up.

Offers should include a separate quotation for the complete services, stated in Euros (EUR). The budget should present consultancy fee according to the number of expected working days over the entire period, both in totality and as a daily fee. Travel costs, if any, do not need to be included as the SEU will arrange and cover these. Do note that MSF does *not* pay any per diem.

The level of effort is to be proposed by the consultant(s). The consultant(s) will not be hired full-time over the period.

Applications will be evaluated on the basis of whether the submitted proposal captures an understanding of the main deliverables as per this ToR, a methodology relevant to achieving the results foreseen, and the overall capacity of the evaluator(s) to carry out the work (i.e. inclusion of proposed evaluators' CVs, reference to previous work, certification et cetera).

Interested teams or individuals should apply to evaluations@stockholm.msf.org referencing **MONI** no later than **April 24, 2023**. We would appreciate the necessary documents being submitted as separate attachments (proposal, budget, CV, work sample and such). Please include your contact details in your CV.

Please indicate in your email application on which platform you saw this vacancy.