

**Uganda Host and Refugee Community Empowerment Project**

**Terms of Reference**

**Consultancy to undertake a Mid-Term Evaluation**

**Programme /Project Title:** Uganda Host and Refugee Community Empowerment Project

**Scope of Advertisement:** National

**Type of Contract:** Local Consultancy

**Post Type:** National Consulting firm

**Duty Station:** Home-based with mission travel

**Expected Areas of Travel:** Adjumani, Lamwo and Obongi Districts

**Languages:** English

**Duration of Contract:** 42 days spread over a period of two calendar months

**Start Date:** 1st November 2021.

1. **Background and Context**

Uganda is the largest refugee hosting country in Africa with over 1.5 million refugees and asylum seekers. The vast majority are from South Sudan (882,058), the Democratic Republic of the Congo (418,369), and Burundi (48,404) (UNHCR, 2020). The refugee population in Uganda is a product of complex political, social and economic situations in neighboring countries – with civil war in South Sudan and ethnic conflicts in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and Somalia having forced the flight of hundreds of thousands in recent years.

Refugee hosting districts, where many of these refugees and asylum seekers reside, are located in the poorest and least developed parts of Uganda that are still recovering from over 20 years of conflicts. Furthermore, social service delivery systems in these refugee hosting districts are weak. Economic opportunities are also quite limited due to the remoteness of refugee settlements and limited infrastructure. Consequently, with the influx of South Sudanese refugees, both refugees and host communities experience higher occurrences of food insecurity, water scarcity, decreased access to education and health facilities, high level of unemployment, discrimination, as well as violence/victimization. It is worth noting that approximately 80% of refugees in Uganda are women and children and 64% of all households are women-headed households, with an average of 5 family members per household. Many women and children among the refugee population are exposed to protection risks such as gender-based violence (GBV) and harmful practices, such as intimate partner violence and early marriages. Evidently, refugee hosting presents increasing social, economic, and environmental pressure on host communities which require targeted and integrated support.

UNDP Uganda with the support from the Government of the Republic of South Korea is implementing a USD 9M (KOICA 7M: UNDP 2M) project - **Uganda Host and Refugee Community Empowerment Project’**, for the period 2019-2022. This is an area-based, gender responsive emergency livelihoods and economic recovery project, implemented using the UNDP 3X6 model[[1]](#footnote-1).

The project which is in its 3rd year of implementation is being implemented in the three districts of Lamwo, Adjumani and Obongi. The overall objective of this project is to improve the economic livelihoods of communities with an emphasis on women and youth in refugee hosting communities. Two major inter-related outcomes are expected: (i) Socio-economic gender equality in the context of livelihood improved, (ii) Enhanced capacities for mainstreaming gender equity/GBV prevention among key sub-national government agencies, communities, livelihood actors, and private sector. The project aims to support 7,200 direct individual beneficiaries and indirectly benefit over 36,000 people.

**The project information is summarized in the below table.**

|  |
| --- |
| **PROJECT INFORMATION** |
| Project/outcome title | Uganda Host and Refugee Community Empowerment (UHRCE) |
| Atlas ID | 136223 |
| Related UNSDCF and CPD Outcomes (2021-2025) | ***UNSDCF (2021-2025)****Outcome 2.1: By 2025, people, especially the marginalized and vulnerable, benefit from increased productivity, decent employment, and equal rights to resources.**Outcome 2.2: By 2025, Uganda’s natural resources and environment are sustainably managed and protected, and people, especially the vulnerable and marginalized, have the capacity to mitigate and adapt to climate change and disaster risks.**Outcome 3.2: By 2025, gender equality and human rights of people in Uganda are promoted, protected, and fulfilled in a culturally responsive environment.* ***CPD (2021-2025)*** *Output 2.1.1: Strengthened capacity of institutions and people, especially the vulnerable and marginalized, to promote the delivery and adoption of integrated, innovative, equitable and inclusive strategies for improved productivity, value chain enhancement and market access.**Output 2.1.2: People, especially women and youth, have improved access to and utilize innovative practices, technologies, finances, natural and productive resources for decent employment and livelihoods.**Output 2.2.1: Strengthened capacity of public and private institutions and communities to sustainably manage natural resources and protect vital ecosystems.**Output 2.2.3: Increased and equitable access to and use of modern, renewable, and affordable energy sources and services.**Output 3.2.2: Strengthened capacity of government and non-government institutions to effectively plan, monitor and deliver public and private financing to social sectors in an equitable, gender responsive, accountable, and sustainable manner.* |
| Country | Uganda |
| Region | Africa |
| Date project document signed | 13 February 2019 |
| Project dates | Start | Planned end |
| January 2019 | December 2022 |
| Project budget | US$ 9,000,000 (UNDP TRAC: 2,000,000 KOICA: 7,000,000) |
| Project expenditure at the time of evaluation  | US $ (it will be updated during the evaluation) |
| Funding source | Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA) |
| Implementing party | UNDP Uganda |

1. **Project Objective, Outcomes and Outputs**

|  |
| --- |
| **Overall objective:** To improve the socio-economic empowerment of communities with emphasis on women and youth in refugee hosting communities**Outcome 1.** Socio-economic gender equality in the context of livelihood improved.* **Output 1.1** Strengthened economic capacities of women in refugees and host communities through livelihood opportunities

**Outcome 2.** Enhanced capacities for mainstreaming gender equity/GBV prevention among key sub-national government agencies, communities, livelihood actors, and private sector.* **Output 2.1** Capacity development of district-level officers, livelihood actors, and targeted communities to strengthen gender transformative programming
 |

1. **Evaluation Purpose, Scope and Objectives**

The main purpose of this mid- evaluation is to provide the project partners with an independent review of the status, relevance and performance of the project as compared to the project document, identify and assess the basic results as to their sustainability.

The consultant is expected to identify and describe the lessons learned, through measurements of the changes in the set indicators, summarize the experiences gained, technically and managerially, and recommend approaches and methodologies to correct any gaps in project implementation. After some constraints in the beginning period of its implementation, it is relevant to evaluate the direction of the project, the way forward and the lessons learned in the period of April 2019 to March 2021.

In addition, the evaluation would help to understand the possible impact of COVID 19 on the project and recommend ways and means to fast-track implementation of the remaining part of the phase and determine a possible second phase.

The evaluation will focus on project implementation during the period April 2019 – March 2021 focusing on how the results detailed in the RRF have been achieved or otherwise.

The scope of the evaluation will encompass the successful removal of barriers to project implementation and facilitate the effective project delivery strategy/approach in three project districts in the planned project areas; i) enhancement/vitalization of the host and refugee communities’ livelihood, ii) raising the awareness/capacity of the district local governments on community livelihood support and GBV prevention, iii) peaceful existence between host and refugee communities. The evaluation will provide substantial recommendations on the need to adopt internal measures to facilitate the project implementation, the appropriateness of these measures, as well as the impact and sustainability of activities and results.

To achieve the above objectives the interim evaluation is to address the following:

* Assessment of the project progress towards attaining its objectives and recommend measures (if any).
* Assessment of the relevance of these objectives to the UNDP Regional Programme Document for Africa.
* Review of the appropriateness and clarity of the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders and the level of coordination between them.
* Review of the project concept and design with respect to the clarity of the addressed problems by the project and soundness of the approaches adopted by the project to solve these problems.
* Assessment of the performance of the project in terms of timeliness, quality, quantity and cost effectiveness of the activities undertaken including project procurement: both experts and equipment, training programs, etc.
* Review of the logical framework matrix and the indicators to assess their appropriateness for monitoring the project performance and to what extent they are being used by the project management.
* Assess the prospects of the sustainability of the project outcomes and benefits and recommend measures for its further improvement.
* Identify and describe the main lessons learned from the project performance in terms of awareness raising, strengthening of technical and financial capacity, efforts to secure sustainability and approaches and methodologies used.
1. **Evaluation Criteria and Key Guiding Questions**

The mid-term evaluation seeks to answer the following questions, focused on the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability:

***Relevance:***

* To what extent is the project in line with the regional development priorities, the Regional programme’s outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
* To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant regional programme outcome?
* To what extent are lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project’s design?
* To what extent are perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, considered during the project design processes?
* To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
* To what extent is the project appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the region? Are there intended outputs and outcomes aligned with the key development strategies of the member states? Are they consistent with human development needs of the region and the intended beneficiaries? Do the outputs and outcome address the specific development challenges of the member states and the intended beneficiaries? Are there any unintended consequences (positive or negative) that have implications to the development goals of the countries?
* To what extent is the project selected method of delivery appropriate to the development context?

***Effectiveness***

* To what extent is the project contributing to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?
* To what extent are the project outputs achieved?
* What factors are contributing to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes?
* To what extent is the UNDP partnership strategy appropriate and effective?
* What factors are contributing to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
* In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
* In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What are the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
* What, if any, alternative strategies would be more effective in achieving the project’s objectives?
* Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame?
* To what extent are stakeholders being involved in project implementation?
* To what extent are project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
* To what extent is the project appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
* To what extent is the project contributing to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?

***Efficiency***

* To what extent is the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
* To what extent is the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution efficient and cost-effective?
* To what extent are the - financial and human resources being used economically? Are project approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework relevant to achieve the planned outcome? Are they sufficiently sensitive to the political and development constraints of the pilot countries (political instability, post crisis situations, etc)?
* Is project’s strategy and execution efficient and cost effective?
* Are the monitoring and evaluation systems that project has in place helping to ensure that programmes are managed efficiently and effectively for proper accountability of results?
* To what extent are the project funds and activities being delivered in a timely manner?
* To what extent is the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

***Sustainability***

* What is the likelihood that project interventions are sustainable?
* Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
* To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project’s contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
* Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
* What is the risk that the level of stakeholders’ ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
* To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development?
* To what extent do stakeholders support the project’s long-term objectives?
* To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
* To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?
* What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?
* How should the AU treaties project portfolio be enhanced to support central authorities, and partners in improving service delivery over the long term?
* What changes should be made in the current set of project partnerships in order to promote long term sustainability?

***Outcome/Impact***

• To what extent is the project succeeding in achieving its intended outcomes?

• Are there positive, negative, intended, and unintended outcomes of the program?

Based on the above analysis, the consultant is expected to provide overarching conclusions on project results in this area of support, as well as recommendations on how the project could adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, and capacities to ensure that the project portfolio fully achieves current planned outcomes and is positioned for sustainable results in the future. The evaluation is additionally expected to offer lessons for project support in member states and elsewhere based on this analysis.

1. **Methodology of evaluation**

The project evaluation will be carried out by an external evaluator and will engage a wide array of stakeholders and beneficiaries, including regional bodies, donors, governments where programme is been implemented.

The project evaluation is expected to take a “theory of change’’ (TOC) approach to determining causal links between the interventions that UNDP Uganda has supported and observed progress at national levels. The evaluator will interrogate the logic model of how UNDP Uganda project implementation and interventions are expected to achieve planned objective, outcomes, and outputs.

Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP Uganda support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, and other means as far as the current situation allows.

The steps in data collection are anticipated but not limited to the following:

***Desk reviews:*** The evaluation team will collect and review all relevant documentation, including the following:

1. Project document and budget
2. Project activity reports
3. Programme and project quality assurance reports
4. Annual workplans
5. Activity designs
6. Implementation and adaptive management
7. Risks to sustainability
8. Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities
9. Gender equity
10. Country ownership of projects and programmes
11. Theory of change and results framework
12. Consolidated quarterly and annual reports
13. Highlights of project board meetings
14. Technical/financial monitoring reports

***Stakeholder interviews:*** The evaluation firm will conduct face-to-face if applicable and/or telephone interviews with relevant stakeholders, including: i) UNDP staff (managers and programme/project officers) at the Country Office; and ii) policy makers, beneficiary groups, various relevant organs and donor.

All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals. A case study approach will be used to identify and highlight issues that can be further investigated across the programme.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the evaluation team.

1. **Expected deliverables from the evaluation**
2. **Inception Report**

One week after contract signing, the evaluator will produce an inception report (10-15 pages) containing the proposed theory of change for UNDPs work. The inception report should include an evaluation matrix presenting the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods to be used (See Annex 1). The evaluation will also propose a rating scale in order that Performance rating will be carried out for each evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. The inception report should detail the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables and propose specific stakeholders to be interviewed. Interview or survey Protocols for different stakeholders should be developed. The inception report will be discussed and agreed with the Senior Management of UNDP Uganda before the evaluators proceed with site visits.

**The inception report should include the following key elements:**

* Overall approach and methodology
* Key lines of inquiry & interview protocol
* Proposed sample sizes
* Data collection tools and mechanisms
* Proposed list of interviewees (key informants and respondents)
* A work plan and timelines to be agreed with relevant stakeholders.
1. **Presentation/validation of preliminary findings to relevant in-country stakeholders and KOICA**
* ***Evaluation debriefings*** immediately following an evaluation, UNDP may ask for a preliminarydebriefing and findings.
1. **Final evaluation report:**
* ***Draft evaluation report (within an agreed length)*[[2]](#footnote-2)** The programme unit and keystakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period, addressing the content required (as agreed in the TOR and inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in these guidelines.
* ***Evaluation report audit trail*** Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draftreport should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
* ***Final evaluation report including lessons***
* ***Presentations to stakeholders and/or the evaluation reference group through Zoom or Skype can be organized by project team***
* ***Evaluation brief and other knowledge products*** or participation in knowledge-sharing events,if relevant.
* ***A visual (video) output demonstrating the project progress***
* The Final Report must be approved by both the evaluation manager and the KOICA Project management.
1. **Timeframe for the Evaluation Process**
2. **Evaluation timeline**

The evaluation is expected to take 42 days, spread over a period of twelve (8) weeks starting 1st November 2021. A tentative date for the stakeholder workshop is 8th December 2021, and the final draft evaluation report is due on 17th December 2021. The following table provides an indicative breakdown of activities and delivery:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Deliverable** | **Workday allocation** |
| Review materials and develop work plan | Inception report and evaluation matrix(1st – 12 November  | 10 working days (excluding weekends)  |
| Participate in an Inception Meeting with project staff and M&E of the UNDP Uganda and relevant partners |
| Draft inception report |
| Review Documents and stakeholder consultations | Draft evaluation report Stakeholder workshop presentation(13th – 7th Dec 2021) | 25 days including weekends |
| Interview stakeholders |
| Conduct field visits  |
| Analyse data  |
| Develop draft evaluation & lesson Learned report to project  |
| Present draft Evaluation and lesson learned Report at Validation Workshop | Final evaluation report(17th December 2021) | 7 working days (excluding weekends) |
| Finalize and submit evaluation and lessons learned report incorporating additions and comments provided by stakeholders  |
|  |  | **42 days**  |

1. **Evaluation deliverables**

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Content**  | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| Inception Report | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method  | No later than 1 week before the evaluation mission.  | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO  |
| Presentation | Initial Findings  | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| Conduct Validation workshop | Present the initial findings at a workshop for validation | Within a week after end of field work | To project management, UNDP CO and KOICA |
| Draft Final Report  | Full report | Within 2 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by KOICA |
| Final Report\* | Revised report  | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft  | Sent to UNDP CO for uploading  |

*\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.*

1. **Requirements of the consultant**

The consulting firm shall provide a duo team comprised of a Lead senior consultant and a junior consultant. Each of the two (2) consultants should have a minimum of master’s degree economics, political science, public administration, regional development/planning, or other social science or related field with a bias or experience in evaluating Refugee programming, skilling, youth projects. Strong gender analysis and livelihood issues is desirable for at least the Lead consultant. In addition, the consultants should have the following requirements:

* Minimum 10-15 years of professional experience in public sector development, including in the areas of emergency/refugee response, resilience building, peace building, poverty reduction or livelihood support, democratic governance, human rights, gender equality – GBV prevention and social services.
* At least 5 years of experience in conducting evaluations of government, policies and international aid organizations, preferably with direct experience with resilience building on refugee support;
* Strong working knowledge of the UN and its mandate in the region, and more specifically the work of UNDP in support of peace building, emergency response, livelihood resilience;
* Sound knowledge of results-based management systems, Gender dimensions and monitoring and evaluation methodologies; including experience in applying SMART (Specific; Measurable; Achievable; Relevant; Time-bound) indicators.
* Excellent reporting and communication skills;
* Fluent in written and spoken English.

*CVs of the Duo including information about previous experience in similar projects / assignments with the respective links to the examples of desk studies, focus group studies, analytical reports and similar evaluations should be part of the documentation shared with UNDP.*

1. **Evaluation Ethics**

The evaluation must be carried out in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’ and sign the Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations. The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure

Consultant must be free and clear of perceived conflicts of interest. To this end, interested consultants will not be considered if they were directly and substantively involved, as an employee or consultant, in the formulation of project strategies and programming relating to the outcome and programme under review. The code of conduct and an agreement form to be signed by consultant will be part of this ToR.

1. **Implementation Arrangements**

The UNDP Uganda will select the evaluator and will be responsible for the management of the evaluator. The UNDP Uganda Regional Representative will designate a focal point for the evaluation that will work with the Evaluation Specialist and Project Manager to assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key informants, etc.). The UNDP Uganda Management will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report. The Project Manager will arrange introductory meetings within UNDP Uganda and will establish initial contacts with partners and project implementation staff. The consultant will take responsibility for setting up meetings and conducting the evaluation, subject to advanced approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report. The Management of Country Office/RBA will develop a management response to the evaluation within four weeks of report finalization.

The Project Task Manager of the Project will convene an Advisory Panel comprising of technical experts to enhance the quality of the evaluation. This Panel will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report to provide detail comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. The Panel will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards. The evaluation team is required to address all comments of the Panel completely and comprehensively. The Evaluation Team Leader will provide a detail rationale to the advisory panel for any comment that remain unaddressed.

It will be the responsibility of the evaluator to logistically and financially arrange their travel to and from relevant project sites (if the pandemic allows) and to arrange most interviews. Planned travels and associated costs will be included in the Inception Report and agreed with the UNDP Uganda if required.

1. **Payment**

Fee payments will be made upon acceptance and approval by the UNDP Uganda of planned deliverables, based on the following payment schedule:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Inception report  | 20% |
| Draft Evaluation Report and lessons learned report | 50% |
| Final Evaluation Report with annexed lesson learned report | 30% |

1. **Application submission process and criteria for selection**
2. **Evaluation Method and Criteria**

**Cumulative analysis:**

* The award of the contract shall be made to the Consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:
	+ Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and;
	+ Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation:
		- Technical criteria weight; - 70%.
		- Financial criteria weight; - 30%.

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

**Technical Criteria – Maximum 70 points**

Criteria

* Relevant degree: 10
* A minimum of 5 years’ relevant work experience: 15
* Relevant experience in the evaluation of humanitarian peace development nexus projects: 30
* Familiarity with integrated/humanitarian development in the field of peace, livelihoods, gender and development in Uganda: 15
1. **Application procedure**

|  |
| --- |
| Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications **in one single PDF document:**1. Duly accomplished **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP (Annex II).
2. **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and, telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.
3. **Technical proposal:**
	1. Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment
	2. A methodology, on how they will approach and complete the assignment. *[If applicable. A methodology is recommended for intellectual services, but may be omitted for support services]*
4. **Financial proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided (Annex II)
 |

ANNEXES *(to be downloaded from UNDP Uganda Website, procurement notices section:* [*www.undp.or.ug*](http://www.undp.or.ug)*):*

* ANNEX I- Individual Contractor General Terms and Conditions
* ANNEX II –Offers’ Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual Contractor Assignment.
* ANNEX III: Sample evaluation matrix below;

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevant evaluation criteria | Key questions | Specific sub questions | Data sources | Data collection methods/tools | Indicators/ success standards | Methods for data analysis |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**This TOR is approved by**: [*indicate name of Approving Manager*, *only for internal purposes.]*

Signature

Name and Designation: **Francesca Akello, Team Leader - PSSR**

Date of Signing

1. The 3x6 is an innovative UNDP Programme approach promoting sustainable livelihoods for vulnerable and crisis-affected groups, such as those affected by disasters or conflict. The 3x6 approach uses skills, resources, and local expertise to support crises affected people to become financially independent and thus able to contribute to local economic recovery and the transition from an emergency response to a sustainable development path. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A length of 40 to 60 pages including executive summary is suggested [↑](#footnote-ref-2)