

**RFQ Advertisement for credible consultant/consultant Firms at DKH/VSF – Reference: DKH
SSD/FIN/AUDIT/VSF/02/18-001**

Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe (DKH) is the humanitarian emergency department of the Protestant Agency for Diakonia and Development (PADD) of the protestant churches in Germany. DKH is an International Non-Governmental Organization providing humanitarian aid worldwide, working through local faith based and secular Partner organisations. We would like to invite your firm to quote for School Feeding Programme Impact Assessment/Evaluation services for the aforementioned project as per the TOR below;

Timelines and Reports:

You will be expected to reply to this RFQ not later than **16th February 2018**, commence **Evaluation period from 1st – 30th March 2018** and the anticipated Evaluation report release dates **5th April 2018**

How to apply:

If interested, please send your financial offer, company profile, qualifications and previous experience relevant to the tasks mentioned as per the TOR attached by email.

Any request for clarification must be received by DKH by email : representation.ssudan@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.org at least 4 days before the deadline for submission of RFQ. DKH will reply to bidders' questions at least 3 days before the deadline for submission of bid offers. Costs incurred by the bidder in preparing and submitting the bid proposals will not be reimbursed.

Note: The service requested above is not a contract/commitment from DKH and DKH only requires your financial proposal by your firm to undertake the above reviews.

Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe does not bind itself to award the contract to the lowest service provider or any bid and reserves the right to accept the whole or part of the financial proposal

The deadline for submission of financial proposal is 19th February 2018 before 3pm (Juba – South Sudan time) Your financial proposal be submitted to us by email to reference: **DKH SSD/FIN/AUDIT/VSF/02/18-001** to:

tender.ssd@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.org

**Terms of Reference for School Feeding Programme
 Impact Assessment/Evaluation**

Project location: Gok State (formerly Cueibet County)

South Sudan

Funding Partners and Implementation Phases:

<i>Duration</i>	<i>Donor</i>	<i>Implementing Agency</i>
11/2013 to 12/2015	German Federal Foreign Office (AA)	Health Link South Sudan (HLSS)
11/2015 to 08/2016	Canadian Food Grains Bank (CFGB) & Mennonites Central Committee (MCC)	Action Africa Help International (AAH-I)
11/2016 to 6/2019	Protestant Agency for Diakonie and Development and German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)	Vétérinaires sans Frontières (VSF)

Feb 2018

Glossary

DKH	Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FS	Food Security
GOSS	Government of the Republic of South Sudan
HH	Household
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organization
KII	Key Informant Interview
QA	Quality Assurance
ROSS	Republic of South Sudan
RRC	Relief and Rehabilitation Commission
TOR	Terms of Reference
VSF G	Veterinaries San Frontiers

Project Summary

Contract Beneficiary	Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe (DKH)
Project Title	School Feeding Programme (SFP) in Cueibet
Location	Former Cueibet County, now Gok State, South Sudan
SFP Duration	November 2013 to June 2019
Project Phase	Four years
Evaluation Type	Impact Assessment/Evaluation
Evaluation Purpose	To assess evidence of impacts (both intended and unintended) of the school feeding programme, attribute the impacts to the programme and measure the magnitude of the impacts.
Evaluation Objectives	<p>To establish evidence that the school feeding programme improved/sustained children's nutritional/health status</p> <p>To establish evidence that the school feeding programme increased enrolment, increased/sustained retention and attendance</p> <p>To establish evidence that the school feeding programme improved learning outcomes; and life outcomes.</p> <p>To provide actionable, context appropriate and innovative recommendations for project improvement and future programming</p>
Evaluation scope	51 months – Nov 2013 to Jan 2018; 47 schools in 47 villages
Methodology	<p>Programme performance analysis using OECD-DAC criteria</p> <p>Participatory Impact Assessment</p> <p>GPS mapping</p> <p>Anthropometry</p> <p>Case/tracer studies/Most significant change stories</p>
Evaluation period	1 st – 30 th March 2018
Anticipated Evaluation report release dates	5 th April 2018

Background and context

1.1. Overall description

a) Background

Cueibet County of Lakes State of South Sudan has since been upgraded to Gok State. Cueibet communities are habitually involved in localized violent conflicts largely related to cattle raids and counter revenges. The culture of cattle raiding is found across all the clans. Other than cattle raids, competition for natural resources, particularly pasture has been a key driver in the local conflict. With the emerging political administrative boundaries, what used to be communal grazing grounds (swamps, water points and salt licks) are now often allocated to only one community, leading to contests over ownership and access. These localized conflicts usually result in loss of human life, the displacement of thousands of families and the loss of their means of livelihood. Coupled with weak state authorities in terms of human resource capacity, limited budget allocations from national government, as well as a very poor infrastructure especially feeder roads, this has made service provision from the government next to non-existent. No viable policing exists to restore security specially to curb the cattle raids, to strengthen basic education services, and to support essential agricultural extension services amongst others.

The local context has been compounded by the breakout of civil war in December 2013. After an interlude of peace brokered in 2014, conflict again erupted in July 2015 driving the national food inflation from a record low of -17.77 percent in November of 2013 to an all-time high of 1002.20 percent in October of 2016.

While supporting 14 health stations in Cueibet County in 2013, Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe and its partner organization established that more and more children were either turning up at school hungry, or not turning up at all, and responded by jointly introducing school meals for malnourished children beginning November 2013 with funding from the German Federal Foreign Office. Despite frequent outbreaks of inter-communal armed violence, enrolment and attendance rapidly increased by 60%. Within one year, 17,000 children aged between 7 and 15 in 47 schools were receiving a daily school meal of nutritious fortified Corn Soya Blend (CSB+).

b) Food security in Cueibet

Staple crop farming (93%) is the main livelihood source among the population of Cueibet. Complementary options include livestock keeping (74%), petty trade (27%), lulu oil extraction/sale (18.4), harvesting of grass (17.7%), harvesting of firewood (13%), employment (7.3%), vegetable farming (4.6), bee keeping (3%) and bamboo and palm tree craft (3%). Sale of livestock (51%) and sale of staple crops (28%) provided main income sources. Own production is only sufficient to cover about 49% of household food needs and the balance has to be acquired from the market. Although staple is sold to earn income, this is only to enable households procure essential non-food items rather than surplus crop, leaving a significant proportion of households in stressed food situation for several months and a follow-on period of crisis food situation. As mentioned

above, the situation is aggravated by the impact of conflict, natural hazards and overall economic situation in the country.

Integrated Phase classification (IPC) for Cueibet¹

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
2012	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red
2013	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
2014	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
2015	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
2016	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
2017	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Dark Red	Red	Red	Red
2018	Red	Red	Red	Red								

- IPC 2 - Stressed: Minimally adequate food consumption, Acute Malnutrition 5-10%
- IPC 3 - Crisis: Food consumption gaps, Acute Malnutrition 10-15% OR > usual & increasing
- IPC 4 - Emergency: Large food consumption gaps, Acute Malnutrition 15-30%; or increasing

The interpretation of the IPC coding is that even with any humanitarian assistance at least one in five HHs in the area exhibit the food and malnutrition characteristics described under the applicable phase. In each of the phases, households employ coping strategies that erode their livelihood and production resources/assets. Recommended actions under IPC 2 is Disaster Risk Reduction and to protect livelihoods, under IPC 3 protection of livelihoods, reduction of food consumption gaps, and reduction of acute malnutrition, and under IPC 4 saving of lives and livelihoods.

c) SFP phases

<i>Duration</i>	<i>Donor</i>	<i>Implementing Agency</i>
11/2013 to 12/2015	German Federal Foreign Office (AA)	Health Link South Sudan (HLSS)
11/2015 to 08/2016	Canadian Food Grains Bank (CFGB) & Mennonites Central Committee (MCC)	Action Africa Help International (AAH-I)
11/2016 to 6/2019	Protestant Agency for Diakonie and Development and German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)	Vétérinaires sans Frontières (VSF)

Total estimated budget for all phases approximately 2 Million Euros.

¹ IPC South Sudan Jan 2012- Dec 2017

Right from the initial launch of the school feeding programme, children, parents, teachers and the Department of Education were mobilized to take up responsibilities according to designed and agreed mandates. Teachers and parents were empowered to manage the feeding programme at school level, and the Ministry of Education for the relevant policy and procedures. Children were supported to participate appropriately in the programme, monitoring and reporting their respective welfare. The school was to become a centre of learning and practice for children, parents, teachers and the community at large. However, as the humanitarian crisis in South Sudan kept escalating and the needs of the children and their parents remained high, in 2016 it became necessary to revise the SFP strategy to enable parents, teachers, the local authorities and the line ministry to sustain the school feeding programme and nourishment of their children in the future in order to sustain school attendance and reduce dropout rates.

“The effectiveness of this on-going intervention will be evaluated in a planned mid-term evaluation separately from this assignment, which focusses on the school feeding component only but across time.

2. Evaluation purpose and target audience

2.1. Evaluation type

The evaluation design should be based on the OECD-DAC criteria, adjusted for humanitarian interventions and with particular emphasis on participatory outcome and impact measurement. In addition, selected evaluation criteria responding to Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS) commitments 3-6 should be applied.

2.2. Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to provide evidence-based information on achievements and impacts (both intended and unintended) of the school feeding programme on the lives of the beneficiary children, girls and boys of different age groups, the parents, the families, and on the capacity of the beneficiary local institutions – community and government. It should carefully analyse attribution of the impacts to the programme and measure the magnitude of the impacts.

Assessing the relevance/appropriateness and efficiency of the programme will guide further decisions on programme design and implementation modalities. The adjusted and expanded DAC criteria on “connectedness”, “coverage” and “coordination” will help decision-makers to understand how well the project is embedded into existing structures and institutions, how comprehensively it covers the needs of the target group, and how well it coordinates within the relevant sectors of education, health, and humanitarian action.

Integrating key CHS commitments in particular with respect to “strengthening of local capacities and avoidance of negative effects” (commitment 3), “communication, participation and feedback” (commitment 4), “welcoming feedback and complaints” (commitment 5) should provide insights on the level of participation, accountability,

and do-no-harm/protection awareness reached and potential avenues to strengthen these elements if required.

3. Evaluation objectives and scope

3.1. Evaluation objectives

a. To establish evidence if and to what extent the school feeding programme improved/sustained children’s nutritional/health status

Child malnourishment is a key factor among the higher level hierarchy of objectives in the SFP programme in respect of child survival, growth and development. The evaluation shall establish if and to what extent the SFP led to the improvement of beneficiary children nutritional/health status, or sustenance of the same in the face of the prevailing circumstances. Further, the evaluation shall quantify the evidence.

b. To establish evidence if and to what extent the school feeding programme increased enrolment, increased/sustained retention and attendance

The evaluation will determine evidence of increased enrolment, increased or sustained retention as well as attendance in the supported schools. Further, the evaluation shall establish whether any of the evidenced changes are attributable to the programme results chain. The evaluation shall then endeavour to qualify and quantify the attributed evidence.

c. To establish evidence if and to what extent the school feeding programme improved learning outcomes; and life outcomes

Learning outcomes are good indicators of these while life outcomes resulting from school attendance are further desirables. The evaluation shall determine evidence of learning and associated life outcomes attributed to the programme and thereafter qualify and quantify them accordingly.

d. To determine the achievements or gaps with regards to applicable humanitarian standards (Sphere and CHS)

The evaluation shall provide insights into the attainment of key quality and accountability standards with regards to food and nutritional security, hygiene as it pertains to school feeding, and key commitments of the CHS as mentioned above in section 2.

e. To provide actionable, context appropriate and innovative recommendations for project improvement and future programming

The evaluation shall with reference to the historical and prevailing context of Gok State and South Sudan in general propose innovative programme review and design actions that will support upholding of children’s right to education, survival and development, at household, community, local government levels as well as within national and international humanitarian action circles.

f. To assess programme performance against general OECD-DAC criteria for humanitarian interventions

The evaluation shall establish the performance of the programme using the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria as elaborated below – relevance, appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, connectedness, coverage, coherence, coordination.

3.2. Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation period will focus on the past 51 months of project implementation from November 2013 to January 2018 in Gok State (formerly Cueibet County of Lakes State). The evaluation will cover the supported 47 schools, community and governments institutions in their respective villages and counties within Gok State.

4. Evaluation tasks and questions

The evaluation tasks relate directly to the evaluation objectives and should be comprehensively addressed with reference to one another. In all instances, data and information should be disaggregated by gender, age, and location as much as possible.

4.1. Improved/sustained children’s nutritional/health status

- a. How have FSP meals impacted on the above parameters for the beneficiary children?
- b. What proportion of daily food intake by beneficiary children does the school meal make?
- c. What proportion of daily nutrient and energy requirement by beneficiary children does the school meal make?
- d. What proportion of daily nutrient and energy intake by beneficiary children does the school meal make?
- e. How many days per year did the school feeding make food available to children each year and on average?
- f. What is the average difference between the nutritional and health status of beneficiary children and non-beneficiary children of the same sex and age group at the same location incl. intra-HH comparison?
- g. What is the difference in hygiene knowledge, attitudes and behaviour between beneficiary children and non-beneficiary children?

4.2. Increased enrolment, increased/sustained retention and attendance

- a. In this context, how can we best define enrolment, retention and attendance?
- b. How and to what extent have these parameters changed in the presence and absence of humanitarian food aid in the past 4 years?
- c. Which are the contextual factors that influence these parameters? Where possible, quantify their contribution?
- d. How do the above demonstrate gender and age differences?

- e. What is the difference in terms of enrolment, attendance, retention between beneficiary and non-beneficiary schools?

4.3. Improved learning outcomes; and life outcomes

- a. What is the difference between beneficiary and non-beneficiary schools in respect of tested performance?
- b. What is the difference between beneficiary and non-beneficiary schools in respect of transition to upper school (gender disaggregated)?
- c. What is the difference between beneficiary and non-beneficiary schools in respect of teacher pupil ratio?
- d. What is the difference between beneficiary and non-beneficiary schools in respect of teacher presence?
- e. What is the difference between beneficiary and non-beneficiary schools in respect of parent participation in educational matters?
- f. To what extent has the programme influenced school curriculum?
- g. How has the school feeding contributed to the psychosocial wellbeing of girls and boys in terms of teacher and parent observations and on school children's own account? (incl. e.g. feeling strengthened, improved perception of own body, soul and spirit; confidence in the future; sharing and caring practices related to the school feeding; ability to concentrate; relief (decreased stress) for parents; improved interaction between teachers, PTA, school feeding committees and pupils, etc.)

4.4. Institutional capacity

- a. What is the difference between beneficiary and non-beneficiary schools in respect of PTA capacity?
- b. Is there any effect on school supervision from the side of the government?
- c. Has the inclusion of the schools into relevant coordination mechanisms and government policies been strengthened in any regard?
- d. Has there been any adverse effect on non-beneficiary schools in the project region and if yes, how could these effects be mitigated?

4.5. Core Humanitarian Standard (specifically commitments 3-5)

a. Commitment 3:

- The high value of aid resources and the powerful position of aid workers and even some community stakeholders can lead to exploitation and abuse, competition, conflict, misuse or misappropriation of aid. Aid can undermine livelihoods and amplify unequal power relations between different groups and/or between men, women and children. Are there any negative effects observed in this regard, are monitoring, feedback and complaints mechanisms in place to effectively prevent and detect them?

- Has a transition and/or exit strategy been developed in consultation with affected people and other relevant stakeholders?
- b. Commitment 4:**
- Are schools, communities, HHs/families, and children well informed about their rights and entitlements in an appropriate and accessible way which also fosters transparency, ownership and social control?
 - Do all groups within affected communities feel they have equitable opportunities to participate in decisions about the response that affect them?
- c. Commitment 5:**
- Are stakeholders and beneficiaries, including vulnerable and marginalised groups, aware of complaints mechanisms established for their use?
 - Do stakeholders and beneficiaries, including vulnerable and marginalised groups, consider the complaints mechanisms accessible, effective, confidential and safe?
 - Are complaints investigated, resolved and results fed back to the complainant within the stated timeframe?

4.6. Programme performance

a. Relevance

- Did the program plan the right thing? Is the programme doing the right thing? To what extent are our objectives, planned activities and planned outputs consistent with the intended outcome and impact? Are there differences between the time when the project was planned and designed and today?
- To what extent did the objectives of the project / program still valid?
- How are the relief measures contributing to recovery and the livelihood strategies of HHs?

b. Appropriateness (adequate compared to the needs and priorities)

- To what extent has the SFP activities met and are tailored to local needs, increasing ownership, accountability and cost-effectiveness accordingly.

c. Effectiveness (achieving the purpose)

- To what extent are the objectives achieved?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- How timely was the assistance?
- To what extent were the selected target groups reached?

d. Efficiency

- How cost-efficient were the results achieved?

- Were there any delays?
 - Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives, especially assessing alternatives based on cash transfers instead of in-kind?
- e. Impact**
- What has happened as a result of the project? (Intended and unintended impacts on individuals, HHs/families, communities, institutions, improvement of social and economic indicators, health, poverty reduction, resilience, capacities, assets, cross-sectoral impact, impact on Gender and equal opportunities for women and men, age-groups, or other relevant cross-cutting issues)
 - What real difference/changes has the activity brought about for the beneficiaries? (What would have happened without the activity?)
 - How many people have been affected? Planned target group vis à vis really addressed?
- f. Sustainability**
- To what extent will the positive impacts or changes of the project (are likely to) continue?
 - Which measures are implemented in order to support sustainability?
 - To what extent did the benefits of this or similar other projects/activities persist after donor funding ceased?
 - What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?
- g. Connectedness**
- Was the intervention aligned to existing systems, policies, structures?
 - Was the intervention supportive of local capacities?
- h. Coverage**
- To what extent have the identified target groups been reached?
 - How relevant and appropriate was this outreach as compared to the needs and potential support by other actors (government and NGOs)?
 - Were all identified “vulnerable” groups/households reached effectively?
 - Were there any complaints about inclusion or exclusion errors from beneficiaries or non-beneficiaries?
- i. Coherence**
- How coherent are the interventions with regards to humanitarian standards?
 - Are the approaches applied in the different components of the interventions coherent?
 - Are these approaches coherent with environmental standards, protection principles, and humanitarian principles as well as human rights considerations?
- j. Coordination**

- How well coordinated was the response in this sector across the region, with what consequences?
- How well did the projects participate in coordination meetings (with whom)?
- Were there any synergies identified between different actors and what was the result?

5. Approach and methodology

The assessment methodology proposed by the consultant(s) should include participatory tools and a mix of quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. Data needs to be differentiated into sex, age, diversity, location, and any other relevant markers to allow precise analysis as to the impacts of the school feeding on girls and boys, in different locations, and on different age groups and stakeholders.

5.1. Literature review

The evaluation will commence with consultative meetings between the survey team, and DKH and VSF programme personnel to clarify any issues and build consensus on perceptions in the backdrop of specific terms of reference/expectations. The survey team will then review all the available relevant literature on the project and carry out an analysis of existing qualitative and quantitative information/data, including published and unpublished literature, project documents, population and sectoral censuses and surveys.

5.2. Formulation of evaluation framework & tools, and data collection in inception report

The results of the literature review will be included into the inception report and entail a review and analysis of the programme outcomes and impact statements – as stated in the project documents, implied therein or elaborated by key programme personnel. The inception report will determine the various information and data needs, development of the final list of evaluation questions and their sub-questions, the indicators for the same and sources of information or data. Further, the framework will guide on the methodology to be employed in collection of the data and information.

The evaluation questions shall guide development of the evaluation tools or data collection instruments. As mentioned above, a mixed methodology shall be applied – quantitative and qualitative. As is required for impact evaluations, counterfactual analysis will be applied, using beneficiary and non-beneficiary schools and households and using households where school-going and non-school going children will be found. Additionally, case and tracer studies, along with the collection of sample Most-Significant-Change Stories will be employed to capture longer time changes in beneficiary lives.

At each school location visited and where the situation allows, photos or separate GPS tag data should be collected to allow mapping of the data collected at each location.

a. Anthropometry

The malnutrition status of children in sample supported schools will be determined using the Body Mass Index Methodology of anthropometry (unless otherwise agreed during inception phase).

This will be compared with measures from non-supported schools (excluding WFP supported schools).

- *Weight:* Use a step-scale to measure the weight of school children (in Kg) and adjusted before weighing each child by setting it to zero. Children shall be without shoes and in light cloths, step scale placed on a firm/flat ground, two readings taken for each child (to nearest 100 grams) and average recorded on an anthropometric form. The same scale shall be used throughout the survey.
 - *Height:* Measure height of the child with inelastic measuring tape, without shoes with the child standing erect and looking straight so that inferior orbital margin and tragus of the ears fall in a horizontal plane parallel to the ground. Two readings (to nearest 0.1cm) are taken and their average recorded on the form.
 - *Child age:* This shall be taken from school records, verified by intuitive judgement of teachers and also local calendars of events.
 - *Body Mass Index:* This shall be calculated from height and weight, and expressed in standard deviation units (Z scores) from reference median (based on WHO) provided index of nutritional status of children.
 - *Recent illnesses:* Through recall, the child and teachers will give recent sickness in the four weeks prior to survey.
- b. *Structured and semi-structured interviews* will be administered at group, individual and household level to obtain both general and specific information on the SFP evaluation parameters. The exact scope and depth of household-level interviews shall be determined jointly during preparation stage. Individuals will include key informants, beneficiary children (boys and girls), parents, project personnel, teachers, and government officials. For the household survey data collection, the use of mobile data collection (e.g. KoboToolbox, GPS devices) is highly recommended and smartphones can be made available.
- c. *Focus Group discussions* with key persons and groups: these will be held with school feeding committees, project management committees, children, parents, PTA members, community members. Where relevant, separate FGDs will be held with female and male participants.
- d. *Visits to schools and transect walks* with key informants to view/observe the interaction between the school physical environment and human activities.
- e. *Historical profiling* will help in identifying trends in food security, livelihood strategies and vulnerability characteristics. Methods used include group discussions, life histories, and historical tracing.
- f. *Seasonal calendars* are used to identify times of stress, hazard occurrence, disease, hunger, school calendar, gaps in school feeding.
- g. *Social and Gender Analysis* should be an inherent part of all these techniques to obtain information on particular gender issues in regard to school feeding and livelihood activities.

5.3. Pre-test and training

Enumerators will be selected by the programme personnel and trained by the survey team in data and information collection, and on administration of the survey tools. The survey tools will be tested on a sample population and be refined using feedback from the enumerators and results of analysis on the performance of the tools.

5.4. Sampling

The general rule related to acceptable margins of error (5%) in social research will apply to the study. Sampling criteria should be agreed upon with DKH, a 30 x 30 cluster sampling is recommended, however, the Consultant may have the discretion to employ any other sampling methodology upon giving appropriate justification which will then be reviewed by DKH programme team before being adopted. As mentioned above, a control group of non-beneficiary school children will be required and this can be applied at school level and household level as will be deemed fit.

5.5. Data analysis

The analysis procedures to be used are those appropriate to the type of data that will be generated. The study will generate field notes and transcripts of interviews and quantitative information. As a principle, all data collected and analysed shall be made available in digital form. The use of digital data collection methods is therefore highly encouraged.

Qualitative information will be analyzed and validated within the evaluation team on a daily basis, allowing collective reflection on the information gathered. The daily analysis will also help to triangulate data from different sources and to offset any tendency towards biases and fragmented data at the end of the field exercises.

The quantitative data collected through questionnaires and observation check lists will be summarized and analyzed using Excel and SPSS after cleaning and coding. Important findings shall be presented in visual form (charts). A report will be generated using MS-Word. Where possible the qualitative data will be quantified.

For better transparency of results, conclusions, and recommendations, it is important that data, findings, triangulation, analysis, and conclusions and recommendations shall be explicitly linked. It must be transparent to the reader of the final report, on which data and analysis certain conclusions and recommendations are based.

6. Timing and deliverables

6.1. Inception report

The inception report shall provide a detailed description of the methodology to answer the evaluation questions as well as the proposed source of information and data collection procedure. The inception report shall outline the contents of all the deliverables. The inception report will be shared beforehand and reviewed in a joint face-to-face meeting. It is the central document, together with these ToR to guide the evaluation. Besides all other elements, it is important that Gender and data disaggregation is also made explicit in all sections of the inception report.

6.2. Debriefing and draft impact evaluation report

Upon completion of the field exercise, the survey team will make a brief summary of their impression of the observations and present the same in a debriefing session with DKH staff in Cueibet and Juba.

After writing the preliminary findings of the evaluation, the report (including recommendations and way forward) will be presented in a feedback forum to DKH. This forum will provide an opportunity to further verify and validate findings and to incorporate key issues raised before production of the final draft of the evaluation report.

The report will include the Executive summary, Intervention description, Evaluation purpose, Evaluation methodology, Findings, Conclusions (answers to the Evaluation Questions), and Recommendations.

6.3. Structure of final impact evaluation report

The lead consultant shall develop the final report and present the output in an electronic format to Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe for final approval and adoption. The final report (Word, Excel files to be put in PDF as well) will be submitted according to the evaluation timeline. The report will have the following structure:

1. Cover page (1 page)
2. Table of Contents (1 page)
3. Acknowledgements (1 page)
4. Glossary (1 page)
5. Introduction (1 page)
6. Projects' components being evaluated (1 page)
7. Executive summary (2 Pages)
8. Evaluation introduction/Background (max 2 pages)
9. Methodology and sampling (max 2 pages)
10. Findings and analysis (max 10 pages)
11. Conclusions and recommendations (max 2 pages)
12. Lessons learnt from the evaluation process (max 1 pages)
13. Appendices (to include copies of all tools, list of enumerators, survey timeline including all KII and FGD participants and discussion transcripts, (as many pages as necessary - please reference the annexes in the report, but include them in a zip file as separate documents).

The final report will be accompanied by the following deliverables:

- A 2 page evaluation fact sheet and soft copy of dataset. This is to include relevant findings from the evaluation, key points and recommendations.
- An Indicator Summary Sheet, giving status of all indicators measured in the HH questionnaire compared against baseline values

- Learning dossier - Lessons learnt by the entire evaluation team shall be documented and shared with DKH so that they may be taken into consideration for future studies. The documentation of these lessons will be vital for reflection, growth and continued improvement. The lessons will be drawn from the process and the actual house hold surveys, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, study observations and secondary data reviews.

It is expected that the recommendations are based on evidence and that a clear explicit connection exists and is presented between observations, findings, and recommendations.

Further, Triangulation of data is important and comparisons with the baseline have to be presented.

6.4. Roles and responsibilities

Each member of the evaluation team shall have designated roles and responsibilities for the delivery of the evaluation.

Scope of Work and responsible parties

a) Evaluation tools are properly developed and in line with Impact Evaluation standards

- Review of the available relevant project documents i.e. project proposal, log frames.
- Development of HH survey tool (mobile data collection strongly preferred)
- Development of (semi-structured) interview guides for KIIs
- Coordinate HH Interviews of sampled respondents during the evaluation study.
- Training of enumerators.
- Conduct interviews with selected partners, staff and other
- Visit selected project sites.
- GPS tagging each area and schools visited

Responsible: Consultant, Program Manager

b) Coordination of the household interviews and guidance to the focus groups discussions

- Household interview and FGD participants are properly selected
- Development of FGD topic/content guide and note-taking templates
- Guide the FGD and interviewers on proper data entry and documentation/filing
- Sound qualitative and comparative analysis of key categories discussed during the FGDs with different group compositions
- Prepare the summary reports of each FGD and the aggregate analysis as per agreed upon format.
- Ensure completeness of the survey instruments questionnaires

Responsible: Consultant, Programme coordinator

c) Apply effectively the quantitative and qualitative tools

- Obtain consent from the household or FGD members to conduct the evaluation.
- Record household data on questionnaire as per training instructions.
- Record all key notes related to issues arising while interviewing.
- Review and submit the survey data to survey team leader in accordance with the schedule

Responsible: Lead Consultant

d) Provide overall coordination, logistics, and technical oversight in the Evaluation process.

- Approval of inception report and data collection tools developed by the consultant.
- Brief stakeholders about the purpose of the evaluation.
- Brief stakeholders about the purpose of the evaluation.
- Provide technical oversight and monitoring of the Survey and ensure timely completion and compliance with international evaluation standards.
- Avail all project related secondary data.
- Avail all the required logistics including vehicles for the Evaluation.
- Assist in organizing meetings with stakeholders.
- Avail all the required logistics including vehicles for the Evaluation.
- Recruit and pay the evaluation enumerators.
- Provide structured feedback during the field-debriefing and on the draft evaluation report.
- Supervise adequate utilization of the resources allocated for the study.
- Budget preparation and management during the evaluation period/ensuring that all expenses are properly documented.
- Budget preparation and management during the evaluation period/ensuring that all expenses are properly documented.
- Oversee accommodation and meals for data collection teams.

Responsible: Project Manager and Consultant

6.5. Tentative itinerary

Event	Responsible Persons	days
Preparation phase		
Desk phase – secondary data review, tools development		
Review – secondary data, information	Consultant	2
Data Collection tools Development	Consultant	2
Share Data Collection tools with DKH programs	Consultant	
Field phase – data collection		
Enumerators selection and Training	Consultant	2

Pretesting, refining and printing of evaluation tools	Consultant & project staff	2
Data collection and interviews	Consultant and Evaluation team	10
Synthesis phase		
Data Analysis and validation	Consultant	4
Draft Report of Evaluation	Consultant	6
Final Report with Feed back	Consultant	2
Total Number of days excluding preparation and planning days		30

7. Evaluation team composition and required competencies

The evaluation team shall compose of members with a comprehensive mix of relevant technical competencies, experience and gender. These will be complemented with at least five years' experience in related programming and programme research. The qualification of the lead consultant is a strong criterion of the bid analysis. Extensive experience in the specific fields in the Horn of Africa and South Sudan in particular will be required. Excellent communication skills and well as demonstrated writing and presentation skills are requisite. Experience in application and training of enumerators on digital data collection is a strong plus.

8. Management arrangements

The management of the logistics of the consultancy will be supported by VSF South Sudan at field level.

- a. **Travel:** DKH will facilitate travel to and within the study location, and also back to the home country. DKH will cover the cost of all internal flights and transport.
- b. **Accommodation:** Consultants will be housed in hotels in Juba. In Cueibet they will be housed at the VSF compound lodgings. Internet access will be available at VSF offices and in the hotels.
- c. **Data entry** Consultants are responsible for all data entry and management. All hard copies of tools will need to be transported by consultants to the place where data entry will be done. All data sets must be provided to DKH in soft copy at the time of submission. They are the property of DKH and the communities from which the data will be collected and may be used for future analysis. Electronic data collection smartphones and GPS devices will be provided by DKH.
- d. **Operation arrangement**
 - Accommodation and transport will be facilitated by DKH up to field level then taken over by VSF;
 - Translators, and enumerators will be facilitated by VSF;
 - The contact persons in South Sudan will be the DKH Head of Mission;
 - The focal person in the field will be the Project Coordinator;

- Security advisory issues will be provided by VSF;

e. Reference materials

Relevant documents will be availed for the consultant to support during the secondary information desk reviews. The consultant will be encouraged to identify any other sources for appropriate additional information that may be required to supplement what is provided by the project.

The Project Team will share the following documents with the Consultants for reference.

1. Full project proposals
2. Project agreement contracts
3. Baseline reports
4. Project log frames
5. Project activity reports
6. Any other relevant reports or assessment data
7. Sudan Population and Housing Census report 2008
8. National Baseline Household Survey 2009
9. FAO/WFP food security assessment/survey reports
10. IPC South Sudan updates

9. Budget and payment

The evaluation budget will take care of the expenses such as the consultant’s charges, international travel, in country travel, accommodation full board, and fuel for vehicles to be used during the survey period, enumerators’ fees and lunches, stationery and communication costs. DKH will take care of the following:

- a) Flights (internal and international for the consultant)
- b) Accommodation in South Sudan
- c) Field transport (fuel and car rentals)
- d) Enumerators fees
- e) Stationeries

The following costs will not be covered by the organization and should be factored into the consultancy and related fee which the consultant will submit with the application:

- Costs for data handling, entry and processing
- Communication cost.
- Report writing and printing.
- Any medical expenses and insurance by the consultant during the assignment

10. Proposal submission

The proposals will be evaluated according to the following criteria;

- a) Formal compliance
- b) Technical and financial proposal

- c) Proposed personnel for the assignment
- d) Profile of the applicant - corporate or individual including one work sample.

Email address for proposal submission:

tender.ssd@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.org with

Subject line: "IMPACT SFP" followed by the **applicant's name**.

The closing date for receiving proposals is **16th Feb 2018**. For any clarification requests please contact: representation.ssudan@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.org

Selection will be done on a rolling basis. Only short-listed candidates will be contacted for interviews.

Annex

OECD-DAC Criteria for Evaluations in the Humanitarian Sector

In 1991, the OECD-DAC, focusing on the most common problems noted in development projects, proposed four quality criteria – relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and impact – and the value criterion of efficiency (OECD-DAC, 1991).

A few years later, it adapted these criteria for EHA in complex emergencies (OECD-DAC, 1999), adding coverage and coherence, suggesting appropriateness as an alternative to relevance and connectedness as an alternative to sustainability, and proposing two new criteria: coordination and protection. These criteria reflected the biggest problems seen in humanitarian action in the 1990s.

Understanding the different OECD-DAC criteria:

Relevance

- Did we plan the right thing? Do we do the right thing? To what extent are our objectives, planned activities and planned outputs consistent with the intended outcome and impact? Are there differences between the time when the project was planned and designed and today?
- To what extent are the objectives of the project / program still valid?

Appropriateness (adequate compared to the needs and priorities)

- The extent to which humanitarian activities met and are tailored to local needs, increasing ownership, accountability and cost-effectiveness accordingly.

Effectiveness (achieving the purpose)

- To what extent are the objectives achieved?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- How timely was the assistance?
- To what extent were the selected target groups reached?

Efficiency

- How cost-efficient were the results achieved?
- Were there any delays?
- Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?

Impact

- What has happened as a result of the project?
(Intended and unintended impacts on individuals, communities, institutions, improvement of social and economic indicators, health, poverty reduction, resilience, capacities, assets, cross-sectoral impact, impact on Gender and equal opportunities for women and men, age-groups, or other relevant cross-cutting issues)
- What real difference/changes has the activity brought about for the beneficiaries?
(What would have happened without the activity?)
- How many people have been affected? Planned target group vis à vis really addressed?

Sustainability

- To what extent will the positive impacts or changes of the project (are likely to) continue?
- Which measures are implemented in order to support sustainability?

- To what extent did the benefits of this or similar other projects/activities persist after donor funding ceased?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?

Connectedness

- Was the intervention aligned to existing systems, policies, structures?
- Was the intervention supportive of local capacities?

Coverage

- To what extent have the identified target groups been reached?
- How relevant and appropriate was this outreach as compared to the needs and potential support by other actors (government and NGOs)?
- Were all identified “vulnerable” groups/households reached effectively?
- Were there any complaints about inclusion or exclusion errors from beneficiaries or non-beneficiaries?

Coherence

- How coherent are the interventions with regards to humanitarian standards?
- Are the approaches applied in the different components of the interventions coherent?
- Are these approaches coherent with environmental standards, protection principles, and humanitarian principles as well as human rights considerations?

Coordination

- How well coordinated was the response in this sector across the region, with what consequences?
- How well did the projects participate in coordination meetings (with whom)?
- Were there any synergies identified between different actors and what was the result?

Note:

It is important to use the DAC criteria intelligently rather than mechanistically. DKH expects consultants to identify and cross-check a relevant number of evaluation questions with DKH, that are realistic to address, taking into account the context, data availability, and the scope and resources available to the evaluation.

Evaluation Ethics

The evaluation process shows sensitivity to ethnic groups, gender, beliefs, manners and customs of all stakeholders and is undertaken with integrity and honesty. The rights and welfare of participants in the evaluation are protected. Anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants should be protected when requested and/or as required by law.

Evaluation team members should have the opportunity to dissociate themselves from particular judgements and recommendations. Any unresolved differences of opinion within the team should be acknowledged in the report.

Stakeholders are given the opportunity to comment on findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. The evaluation report reflects these comments and acknowledges any substantive disagreements. In disputes about facts that can be verified, the evaluators should investigate and change the draft where necessary. In the case of opinion or interpretation, stakeholders` comments should be reproduced verbatim, such as in an annex, to the extent that this does not conflict with the rights and welfare of participants.