**Consultancy Assignment for a Midterm Review in South Sudan**

**for the Addressing Root Causes project**

**1. Background**

The Addressing Root Causes (ARC) project in South Sudan is part of a funding scheme set up by the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, aimed at tackling the root causes of armed conflict, instability and irregular migration in a number of countries including South Sudan.

The ARC project has a duration of 5 years, and started in September 2016. The ARC project seeks to increase community resilience to conflict-related and economically-induced shocks in 19 payams in Jonglei state, by working on increasing economic resilience, capacities for peaceful conflict resolution and stimulating social cohesion in the intervention areas. Section 2 provides more detail about the project’s Theory of Change.

While the project originally focused on Pibor, Twic East, Duk and Uror, a relocation to Bor county took place in December 2017 after hostilities broke out in Uror in February 2017. A complementary survey was conducted early in 2018 to collect data informing the intervention in Bor. In Pibor, Twic East, and Duk, progress against the target indicators was tracked through an elaborate M&E system set up and by means of a survey, carried out in 2018 by project staff.

**2. Project Theory of Change**

The long-term objective of the project is:

*To increase the ability of communities in 19 payams in 4 counties in Jonglei state to withstand economic or conflict induced shocks.*

In order to achieve this, CARE and HDC have distinguished three key intermediary outcomes areas:

1. Economic Resilience,
2. Peaceful Conflict Resolution, and
3. Social Cohesion.

These three outcome areas are mutually reinforcing and together contribute to more resilience and a culture of peace; when all are combined and strengthened, the beneficial effects can address the root causes of conflict and instability and foster an enabling environment for positive peace. Which translates in the following project Theory of Change (ToC) and assumptions:

**Outcome 1: Economic Resilience**

Vulnerable women, men and youth in targeted communities engage in income-generating activities and micro-enterprises and have market linkages with traders across different ethnic communities

*Assumption 1*

**If** at-risk youth are engaged in training, mentoring, and market driven income generating opportunities,

**then** the likelihood that they will participate in cattle raids or criminality, or join armed forces decreases,

**because** they will have prospects for sustaining their livelihoods, enhanced social status through increased income and a purpose in their daily activities.

*Assumption 2*

**If** vulnerable women, men, and youth participate in solidarity savings and loan groups (VSLAs)

**then** they are more likely to trust and cooperate with each another and opportunities for peaceful resolution of conflict increase (link between outcome 1 and outcome 2),

**because** they build and strengthen relationships with others.

**Outcome 2: Peaceful Conflict Resolution**

Citizens in targeted communities use peaceful mechanisms to mitigate conflict and reconcile past grievances in a just, effective and inclusive way

*Assumption 3*

**If** representative peace committees and local customary law actors demonstrate benefits of reconciliation and non-violent conflict resolution,

**then** communities’ security increases,

**because** citizens are more likely to use peaceful means to resolve conflict

*Assumption 4*

**If** youth are engaged in community reconciliation and conflict resolution processes,

**then** they are less likely to participate in a culture of revenge,

**because** they have a social identity and social role that is part of the community identity

*Assumption 5*

**If** communities reconcile and resolve conflict through peaceful means,

**then** opportunities for trade and commerce increase

**because** communities are more willing to cooperate and have more trust

*Assumption 6*

**If** security and justice processes are more inclusive, just and effective,

**then** economic activities will increase,

**because** citizens perceive a diminution of conflict- related risks that could affect their IGAs

*Assumption 7*

**If** local authorities apply conflict- and gender-sensitive knowledge and skills,

**then** the communities and women in particular will have an enhanced sense of security,

**because** security and justice processes are more inclusive, just and effective.

**Outcome 3: Social Cohesion**

Citizens collaborate with each other, have positive relationships and experience trust within and beyond their communities.

*Assumption 8*

**If** individuals in and across communities interact with each other in positive and mutually beneficial ways,

**then** trust and cooperation within and between communities will increase,

**because** personal relations enable people to focus on commonalities instead of differences

*Assumption 9*

**If** trust and cooperation within and between communities is strengthened,

**then** opportunities for trade and commerce increase,

**because** individuals recognize the benefits of working together to achieve greater economic resilience

*Assumption 10*

**If** trust and cooperation within and between communities is strengthened,

**then** the utilization of conflict resolution through peaceful means increases,

**because** individuals are better able to identify and appreciate commonalities over differences

**3. Objective of the midterm review**

The objectives of the baseline are:

* To establish the situation at midterm as compared to baseline, using the indicators as defined in the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) plan and to assess the progress that has taken place over time as a result of the ARC project.
* To test the validity of assumptions 3, 4, 5, 7 and 9 of the Theory of Change.
* To identify key lessons learned in relation to the project interventions in the different counties and provide recommendations to guide and improve planning and implementation for the remaining years of the project.
* Establish the added value of the ARC program so far, in particularly looking at cooperation with local authorities and with other organisations with similar programs (including UN)

**4. Scope of the Evaluation**

The MTR shall be limited to assessing the targeted communities in Jonglei states namely Twic East, Duk, Bor and Pibor counties. Differences between counties should be analysed.

**5. Focus and methodology**

*Progress over time*

For Outcome 1, the midterm review should focus on the economic situation of women and youth and community attitudes towards their economic participation and livelihood opportunities.

For Outcome 2, the midterm review should focus on existing traditional and formal conflict resolution mechanisms and on the actors involved in these processes including elders, traditional and religious leaders and justice and security actors. Also, community perceptions of these mechanisms and actors and their inclusiveness and effectiveness need to be assessed.

For Outcome 3, the midterm review should focus on intercommunal relations within and between neighbouring communities and perceptions of others in terms of trust and cooperation.

Furthermore, progress at impact level should be assessed. The indicators that should be used to track progress are provided in Annex 1. Note that for indicators related to outcomes 1-3 and the impact level indicators, differences between counties should be assessed.

*Validity of assumptions*

It should be assessed whether assumptions 3, 4, 5, 7 and 9 of the Theory of Change are valid by answering the following questions.

1. In how far does communities’ security increase because citizens are more likely to use peaceful means to resolve conflict if representative peace committees and local customary law actors demonstrate benefits of reconciliation and non-violent conflict resolution?
   1. What kind of conflicts are addressed by the Peace Committees, and in how far are they related to general notions of insecurity?
   2. How can the effectiveness and inclusiveness of the peace committees be improved?
2. In how far are youth less likely to participate in a culture of revenge because they have a social identity and social role that is part of the community identity if they are engaged in community reconciliation and conflict resolution processes? What are the triggers to relapse in a culture of revenge, and does the *depth* of youth’ involvement in local peacebuilding processes affect their participation in revenge activities?
3. How have opportunities for trade and commerce increased because communities are more willing to cooperate and have more trust if they reconcile and resolve conflict through peaceful means?

7. In how far do communities and women in particular have an enhanced sense of security because security and justice processes are more inclusive, just and effective if local authorities apply conflict- and gender-sensitive knowledge and skills?

9. How have opportunities for trade and commerce increased because individuals recognize the benefits of working together to achieve greater economic resilience if trust and cooperation within and between communities is strengthened?

*Key lessons learned*

An important element of the MTR is to identify key lessons learned. It should be made clear, which interventions worked well, which interventions did not work well, which interventions failed and – if possible – explain why, and what could be done to improve planning and implementation during the remaining years of the project. This should also include in how far adaptive programming approaches contributed to the results achieved.

*Methodologies*

A mix of quantitative and qualitative methods should be applied. Note that for each of the indicators survey questions were designed based on the methodological notes that were provided by the donor. The indicators should be measured using the same survey questions as used during baseline, except for indicators 1.18 and 1.19. For perception indicators relating to social norms (indicators 1.5, 1.10, 1.19, 3.2, 3.6 and 3.7) the SNAP (Social Norms Analysis Plot**)** framework developed by CARE should be used in addition to the more quantitative methodology specified in the methodological notes. More information about this methodology can be found here:

<http://www.care.org/sites/default/files/care-social-norms-paper-web.pdf>.

Regarding the validity of the assumptions listed above, the consultant should suggest in his/her offer a suitable methodology for arriving at answers to the questions posed.

**6. Deliverables**

The following products are to be delivered at the end of this assignment:

1. **An inception report in English** in preparation of the field work, in which the consultant establishes:

* a detailed methodology for implementation of the baseline (including data-collection tools, samples size, enumerators, etc.);
* a detailed schedule for the MTR;
* work plan that sets out the preparatory activities and specific deliverables as well as timeline related to the MTR.

1. **A draft report in English** **adhering to the format provided in Annex 2** addressing the aforementioned consultancy objectives. A soft copy of the draft report will be shared with relevant programme staff within 10 days after completing field site visits. The draft report is to be no more than 20 pages, excluding cover page and annexes.
2. **A final report in English adhering to the format provided in Annex 2** not exceeding 20 pages (excluding cover page and annexes).

* Annexes
  + Relevant maps and photographs of the study areas
  + Bibliography of consulted secondary sources
  + Finalized data collection tools (in English)
  + List of key informants

1. The **raw data** should be provided in Excel.
2. **A validation workshop** where the preliminary results of the MTR are presented to the CARE-HDC consortium and other interested stakeholders

The aforementioned deliverables will be accompanied by regular communication with and feedback to the Programme Team.

The assignment should be completed **by March 24th 2019.** The table below gives an indicative planning.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timeline** | **Est. # of days** |
| Desk review of relevant documents, development of MTR design with detailed methodology and data collection tools, and writing inception report | Early February 2019 | 3 |
| Integrate feedback from CARE/HDC inception report |  | 1 |
| Finalise data collection tools[[1]](#footnote-1) |  | 1 |
| Traveling to the field and training of enumerators[[2]](#footnote-2) |  | 2 |
| Data collection (5 days by enumerators) |  |  |
| Data entry, cleaning and analysis |  | 5 |
| Validation workshop with CARE/HDC |  | 1 |
| Report writing |  | 2 |
| Integrating feedback first draft |  | 0,5 |
| Report finalisation |  | 1 |
| Submission of final report | 24 March 2019 | - |
| **Total est. number of days** |  | **16,5** |

**7. Consultant profile**

The consultant engaged to conduct the MTR studies should have the following qualifications:

* Master’s degree in relevant field (e.g. International Development, Peace/Conflict Studies);
* Proven quantitative and qualitative research skills;
* Proven professional expertise and experience in the area of monitoring and evaluation and MTR research, in particular working with a Theory of Change;
* Experience and expertise in the fields of economic resilience and peacebuilding in fragile contexts, preferably in South Sudan
* Strong communicative skills and cultural sensitivity;
* A high standard of professionalism;
* Willingness to travel to South Sudan
* Ability to work under challenging conditions;
* Fluency in English

1. **Cost of the Evaluation*:*** should be summarised as follows with a detailed breakdown attached:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Details** | **Unit** | **Rate (US$)** | **# of Units (Quantity)** | **Cost (US$)** |
| 1 | Consultant’s fees (excluding data enumerators’ costs) |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Transport cost |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Subsistence costs (e.g. accommodation, communication, meals, etc) |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Any other costs that are critical, but not provided for by CARE |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Logistical Support**

Logistical support (scheduling of interviews, arrangement of field accommodation during data collection, access to official facilities including internet, documentation—printing, photocopying of tools etc.) will be provided by CARE/HDC.

The consultant will be working primarily with the Project Manager in consultation with the DM&E Coordinator and in the field with the programme managers.

**Note:**

The consultant is responsible to pay printing and data entry and analysis cost.

The consultant will be responsible of any tax or other fees related.

The payments will be in one instalment after the completion of the task and submission of final acceptable report to CARE

**Guiding Principles and Values:**Adherence to CARE Code of conduct, Child Safeguarding practices and confidentiality when  
interviewing or photographing children.

**Application process:**Interested Parties are requested to submit a proposal explaining their comprehension of the proposed consultancy, and how they would approach this assignment with a summary of their methodology especially in terms of how the party plans to meet the objectives. Additionally, they should submit one or two examples of similar evaluations conducted previously. The application should include a team composition with Lead Consultant and at least 2-3 experienced evaluators. The application should include minimum three CVs of the persons to be involved in the assignment, relevant experience, a detailed budget in USD and time availability.

The deadline for submission of proposals from interested parties is **18 January 2019**.

Proposals must contain a proposed methodology, work plan and budget.

Proposals can be submitted to [Killron.Dembe@care.org](mailto:Killron.Dembe@care.org), [Richard.Koma@care.org](mailto:Richard.Koma@care.org); [John.Aborozingi@care.org](mailto:John.Aborozingi@care.org), [Betty.Gune@care.org](mailto:Betty.Gune@care.org) and [dewinterplatz@carenederland.org](mailto:dewinterplatz@carenederland.org).

Questions regarding this ToR can be sent to [dewinterplatz@carenederland.org](mailto:dewinterplatz@carenederland.org) but will be answered only from January 7th onwards.

**Only shortlisted candidates will be notified.**

**Annex 1 – ARC South Sudan indicators[[3]](#footnote-3)**

|  |
| --- |
| **ARC impact level and CARE international indicators** |
| ARC   1. Number and %of programme beneficiaries who report that they have real plans to emigrate within the next 12 months. 2. Number and % of programme beneficiaries who report that they see a safer/more secure future for themselves in the area where they currently live. 3. Number and % of programme beneficiaries who report that they see a socio-economic future for themselves in the country where they currently live.   CARE International  Number and % of people of all genders who have meaningfully participated in formal (government-led) and informal (civil society-led, private sector-led) decision-making spaces  Number and % of women who (report they) are able to equally participate in household financial decision-making   1. Number and % of people implementing practices/actions that reduce vulnerability and increase resilience, disaggregated by climate-related, economic, social or environmental events |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome 1: Economic Resilience: women and youth in targeted communities engage in IGAs and micro-enterprises and have market linkages with traders across different ethnic communities** | |
| 1.a | Relevant indicators:  1.11: Number and % of project beneficiaries who reported a reduction of negative social/economic interaction across intra-societal divides over the last 6 months *as a result of economic activities of VSLAs*  1.20: Number and % of project beneficiaries (i.e. women and youth) who report ability to meet current and future (12m) household needs  1.21: Number and % of project beneficiaries (i.e. women and youth) who report reduced grievances (e.g. those related to conflict, instability or irregular migration) regarding income/livelihoods |
| 1.1.b | Sub-Outcome 1.1 **Women and youth are confident to participate economically and possess relevant tools and skills**  1.5 Percentage of women and youth with positive attitudes towards IGAs and micro-enterprises[[4]](#footnote-4)  1.12: Number (%) of trained women and youth (including VSLA members) who indicate they have a higher income than before their participation in the project (disaggregated by gender and age)  1.13: Number (%) of trained women and youth (including VSLA members) who indicate they are more confident about meeting their household needs (disaggregated by gender and age)  1.14 Number and % of project beneficiaries (i.e. women and youth) who started a business/self-employment activity and sustained it six months after they started  1.15 Number (%) of project beneficiaries (i.e. women and youth) who indicate that their business-self-employment activities (which existed already before the grantees intervention) have grown over the last 6 months (disaggregated by gender and age)  1.16 Number and % of communities in project area that have adopted and are implementing livelihood strategies through functioning VSLA groups  1.17: Number of community members (in communities with livelihood strategies) with income above livelihood protection threshold |
| 1.2.b | Sub-Outcome 1.2 **Inclusive VSLAs are operational and starting to generating income**  1.7. Total amount of money saved by community savings groups (i.e. VSLAs)  1.8. Number of loans provided through VSLAs for IGAs and micro-enterprises  1.9. Number of VSLAs actively engaging in IGAs and micro-enterprises |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1.2.b | Sub-Outcome 1.3 **Men, boys and influential community leaders endorse conflict and gender transformational activities/roles in the economic sphere**  1.4 Number of men/boys and formal/informal leaders that commit to endorse conflict- and gender transformational roles/activities  1.10 Perceptions by men/boys on the role of women and youth in VSLAs/IGAs and micro-enterprises[[5]](#footnote-5)  1.18 Number (%) of youth participating in cattle raids/criminal activity (disaggregated by gender) was changed to number of cattlekeepers participating in ARC  1.19 Number of inter-communal raids within project communities was changed to reduction in inter-communal raids within project communities[[6]](#footnote-6) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome 2 Peaceful Conflict Resolution: Citizens in targeted communities use peaceful mechanisms to mitigate and resolve intra and – inter community conflict and reconcile past grievances in a just, effective and inclusive way** | |
| 2.a | Relevant indicators:  2.14: Number and % of project beneficiaries (i.e. women and youth) who feel they have the ability to contribute to conflict resolution  2.15: Number and % of female project beneficiaries who participate in and/or lead local peace processes  2.16: Number and % of project beneficiaries who report a reduction in violent conflicts in the area where they live (disaggregated by gender, age and boma/payam level)  2.17: Number and % of project beneficiaries who feel secure in the area where they live (disaggregated by gender, age and boma/payam level) |
| 2.1.b | Sub-Outcome 2.1 **Peace clubs show the benefits of reconciliation and non-violent conflict resolution**  2.4B Number of peace clubs in place that manage and prevent conflicts, promote cooperation and reduce security risks  2.6. Number of activities organised by peace committees and peace clubs to promote reconciliation and non-violent conflict resolution |
| 2.2.b | Sub-outcome 2.2 **Peace committees are recognized in and beyond their communities and are well linked to local authorities and legal structures**  2.4A. Number of peace committees in place that manage and prevent conflicts, promote cooperation and reduce security risks  2.5 Number and % of conflicts that are addressed and resolved by community structures (i.e. peace committees **and** peace clubs) that are supported through the project  2.7. Number (%) of community members that value the work of peace committees  2.8 Number (%) of community leaders who feel that peace committees and peace clubs effectively resolve conflicts  2.11 Level of satisfaction of community members with local security and justice actors (specified per type of actor) |
| 2.3.b | Sub-outcome 2.3 **Formal and customary justice and security actors apply justice processes in line with the existing legal framework and practices of good governance and accountability**  2.9 Number (%) of local rulings in line with existing frameworks, state constitutions and practices of good governance and accountability  2.10 Number of referrals from local courts to relevant higher courts |
| 2.4.b | Sub-outcome 2.4 **Community Score Card processes with justice and security actors and community members (service users) are inclusive and effective**  2.12 Number (%) of CSC actions plans that have been successfully implemented  2.13Number (%) of women and youth taking part in CSC processes |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome 3 Citizens collaborate with each other and have positive relationships and experience trust within and beyond their communities** | |
| 3.a | Relevant indicators:  3.9. Number (%) of community members who feel ownership over local PRA projects and their Level of satisfaction in participating with PRA projects  3.12 Number of (and % of reduction in) retaliatory attacks within communities that participate in a project  3.13 Number and % of communities and civil society groups that demonstrate increased capacity to influence formal and/or informal human security authorities  3.14 Number and percentage of project beneficiaries who report an increase in trust and cooperation **between** communities |
| 3.1.b | Sub-Outcome 3.1 **Community members focus on commonalities and understand the benefits of peaceful co-existence (peace dividend)**  3.5 Number (%) of community members that report to have personal relations with individuals from other communities/clans  3.10 Number and percentage of project beneficiaries who report an increase in trust and cooperation **within** the community (disaggregated by gender and age)  3.11 Number of inter-ethnic dialogues in communities |
| 3.2 b | Sub-outcome 3.2 **Key influencers (including local authorities) promote intra- and inter-community cooperation and endorse positive non-violent social norms**  3.2 Number of key influencers that commit to endorse positive social norms regarding masculinity and act as role models[[7]](#footnote-7)  3.6 Number of publicly spread messages by key influencers that promote positive masculinity and peaceful social norms[[8]](#footnote-8)  3.7 Community perceptions on masculinity and social norms (aggregated by age and gender)[[9]](#footnote-9) |
| 3.3 b | Sub-outcome 3.3. **Community development projects sustainably help to resolve community challenges, with an emphasis on economic opportunities and livelihood security**  3.8. Number of youth, women and traditional leaders and local authorities that participate in PRA projects  3.9. Number (%) of community members who feel ownership over local PRA projects and their Level of satisfaction in participating with PRA projects |

**Annex 2. Table of Contents MTR**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title page | Including:   * Title of report * Date of submission * Names of consultants |
| Table of contents |  |
| Abbreviations |  |
| Executive summary | No longer than 2 pages  Including:   * Introduction * Methodology * Main findings * Conclusions & recommendations |
| 1. Introduction | Including:   * 1.1. Background ARC project * 1.2 Objectives and scope of evaluation * 1.3 Current context * A brief (a couple paragraphs) description of the locations where MTR data was collected, including information about population, main economic activities, education and work for women and girls (are they included? How so?). If the location is a big city, explain the profile of the population ARC is particularly working with. |
| 1. Methodology | Including:   * **2.1 Timeline/process**: Briefly address the timeline and locations of data collection, analysis. Any further information on the team can go in the annex. * **2.2 Data collection methodologies**: Brief description of quantitative and qualitative methodologies used in relation to the evaluation questions...   + ***2.2.1 Documentation review***: Briefly describe the types of documents that were studied for the MTR. Address sampling, if relevant.   + ***2.2.2 Interviews and FGDs***: Briefly describe the sampling and methods used for interviews and FGDs. Also describe the profile of respondents (demographics etc.).   + ***2.2.3 Survey and demographics***:Describe the sampling method used for the survey. Also describe the profile of respondents (demographic data of survey respondents) surveyed in the different locations.   + ***2.2.5 Other methods:*** Briefly describeany other data-collection methods you may have used (optional) * **2.4 Analysis process**: Describe the analysis process you followed, addressing triangulation, analysis of outcomes (via analysis workshop?), and describing the discussion and feedback process (ex. working-meetings with CARE CO, feedback on the report, etc.). * **2.5 Ethical considerations and challenges**: Brief description on how ethics were considered, and which challenges were faced in the MTR process (including how these were addressed and/or how it has possibly affected findings/analysis). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Main findings | * 1. **Outcome 1 - Economic Resilience:** * Results sub-outcome 1.1 Women and youth are confident to participate economically and possess relevant tools and skills. * Results sub-outcome 1.2 Inclusive VSLAs are operational and starting to generating income. * Results sub-outcome 1.3 Men, boys and influential community leaders endorse conflict and gender transformational activities/roles in the economic sphere. * Results overall outcome 1: Economic Resilience.   *Please describe differences between counties. Also describe how results relate to the baseline situation and to project activities. If project activities did not lead to expected results, please explain why.*   * 1. **Outcome 2 - Peaceful Conflict Resolution** * Results sub-outcome 2.1 Peace clubs show the benefits of reconciliation and non-violent conflict resolution. * Results sub-outcome 2.2 Peace committees are recognized in and beyond their communities and are well linked to local authorities and legal structures. * Results sub-outcome 2.3 Formal and customary justice and security actors apply justice processes in line with the existing legal framework and practices of good governance and accountability. * Results sub-outcome 2.4 Community Score Card processes with justice and security actors and community members (service users) are inclusive and effective. * Results assumptions 3, 4 and 5 and 7. * Results overall outcome 2: Peaceful conflict resolution.   *Please describe differences between counties. Also describe how results relate to the baseline situation and to project activities. If project activities did not lead to expected results, please explain why.*   * 1. **Outcome 3: Social Cohesion** * Results sub-outcome 3.1 Community members focus on commonalities and understand the benefits of peaceful co-existence (peace dividend) * Results sub-outcome 3.2 Key influencers (including local authorities) promote intra- and inter-community cooperation and endorse positive non-violent social norms. * Results sub-outcome 3.3. Community development projects sustainably help to resolve community challenges, with an emphasis on economic opportunities and livelihood security. * Results assumption 9. * Results overall outcome 3 Citizens collaborate with each other and have positive relationships and experience trust within and beyond their communities.   *Please describe differences between counties. Also describe how results relate to the baseline situation and to project activities. If project activities did not lead to expected results, please explain why.*   * 1. **Impact level results**   Results on impact level indicators 1, 2 and 3.  *Please describe differences between counties. Also describe how results relate to the baseline situation and to project activities. If project activities did not lead to expected results, please explain why.*   * 1. **In conclusion**: based on the analysis presented in this chapter, describe * the situation at midterm as compared to baseline * whether progress that has taken place over time as a result of the ARC project. * if project activities did not lead to expected results, please explain why. |
| 1. Conclusions and recommendations | Including:   * **4.1 Main conclusions** * **4.2 Lessons learned** * **4.3 Recommendations for the remainder of the project** |
| Annexes | Including:   * **An annex on methods**, which should include: * Finalised data collection tools (mandatory) * Detailed description of sampling methods (e.g. sampling formula), detailed final composition of samples, disaggregated by gender and location. * Any remarkable changes from design of data-collection x actual implementation * **Bibliography:** Include a full list of consulted project documents and other relevant literature. * **List of respondents:** Provide an overview of respondents for the interviews/FGD and validation workshop participants. * For the KII interview list, please include name, organisation, and position of respondents, and date/location of interview. If anonymity was asked, please indicate that on the list. * For the FGD with community members, please inform the profile of participants (gender and age, if they belong to some organisation), date and location where it happened. If you held FGD with public authorities or leaders, please follow the guidance of the KII list (bullet above) * For the validation workshop, please inform date and location and the position/organisation of participants. * **Relevant maps and photographs of the study areas** |

1. The consultant will advise on the measurement of indicators 1.18. and 1.19 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The Enumerators will be selected, contracted and paid by CARE. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Note that for each of the indicators survey questions were designed based on the methodological notes that were provided by the donor. All indicators should be measured using the same survey questions as used during baseline, except for indicators 1.18 and 1.19. We expect the consultant to advise on the measurement of indicators 1.18. and 1.19. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Note that this indicator should be measured using the SNAP (Social Norms Analysis Plot**)** framework developed by CARE should in addition to the more quantitative methodology specified in the methodological note. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Note that this indicator should be measured using the SNAP (Social Norms Analysis Plot) framework developed by CARE should in addition to the more quantitative methodology specified in the methodological note. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Note that this indicator should be measured using the SNAP (Social Norms Analysis Plot) framework developed by CARE should in addition to the more quantitative methodology specified in the methodological note. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Note that this indicator should be measured using the SNAP (Social Norms Analysis Plot) framework developed by CARE should in addition to the more quantitative methodology specified in the methodological note. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Note that this indicator should be measured using the SNAP (Social Norms Analysis Plot) framework developed by CARE should in addition to the more quantitative methodology specified in the methodological note. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Note that this indicator should be measured using the SNAP (Social Norms Analysis Plot) framework developed by CARE should in addition to the more quantitative methodology specified in the methodological note. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)