

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

End of Project Evaluation in Old Fangak and Toch Payam.

1. SUMMARY OF CONSULTANCY

Title:	End of Project Evaluation
Location :	Old Fangak and Toch Payam, Jonglei Sate, South Sudan
Application Deadline :	7 th April 2019, Midnight- South Sudan Time
Type of Contract :	Consultancy
Post Level :	Open (National and International Consultancy Firms)
Languages Required :	English Language (Advanced language skills level)
Starting Date :	15 th April 2019
Expected Duration of Assignment :	15 days

2. PURPOSE OF THE CONSULTANCY:

The purpose of this ToR is to provide a framework for planning and conducting the Final Evaluation (FE) for the Finnish MFA funded humanitarian project implemented in Central and Southern Fangak County. The Goal of the project was to restore food security and livelihood coping capacities in conflict-affected populations in Fangak County, Jonglei State, South Sudan. The consultant will conduct the final evaluation through quantitative and qualitative methods to ascertain the impact of the project. In addition, assess the challenges or constraints associated with implementation, and document the results achieved and lessons learned for future programming.

3. BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs funded the Food Security and Livelihood Support Project. The overall objective of the project was to save lives and strengthen capacity of food insecure and conflict-affected households in Fangak County South Sudan. The project targeted IDPs and vulnerable host community families in Old Fangak and Toch Payam.

The project targeted 2,510 households (15,060 individuals) through unconditional cash transfers, agriculture and fisheries based livelihoods. The project objectives were achieved through the following outputs;

1. Emergency cash for food intervention, targeting 1,000 vulnerable, conflict-affected households in Old Fangak.
2. Provision of agriculture inputs (seeds and tools) and training in agronomic practices for 1,000 HHs in Old Fangak and Toch payam, establishment of 20 informal farmer groups.
3. Provision of fishing gear, technical training in fish processing and management for 500 fisher folks, provision of 20 small canoes to increase productivity, and establishment of 10 informal fisher folk group to encourage knowledge sharing.

The purpose of the cash intervention was to enable beneficiaries address their immediate needs. FCA identified beneficiaries through Community Based Targeting and Distribution (CBTD) guidelines that ensured wider participation and vetting during the beneficiary selection process.



The agriculture support aimed at increasing access to agriculture based livelihood opportunities for selected households through provision of agricultural inputs (seeds and tools), and appropriate training in agronomic practices and post-harvest management to enhance coping capacities of food insecure populations. In addition, 20 informal farmer groups were established to promote knowledge sharing, and supported with peddle pumps to support production.

The Fisheries component aimed at increasing access to fisheries based livelihood opportunities through provision of inputs and technical training. Inputs provided included fishing gear and small canoes, aimed at supporting production and productivity.

FCA is committed to quality programming, and is accountable to rights holders and duty bearers, the need for end of project evaluation is key for assessing project contribution, outcome and impact. The end of project evaluation is forward looking, captures project design, scope and provides information on the nature, extent and where possible the potential impact and sustainability of the project. It will collate and analyse lessons learnt, challenges faced and best practices obtained during implementation, which will inform programming strategy in the next phase or response in a humanitarian context that is always evolving.

4. SCOPE AND FOCUS OF THE EVALUATION.

The end of project evaluation is in-built in the project implementation framework. The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of the implementation strategy and results. This will include implementation modalities, beneficiary participation, replication and sustainability of the project. The evaluation will include assessment of the project design, including assumptions made during the development phase of the project.

Project management, implementation strategies and activities will be analysed to ascertain the extent to which the project achieved its results. In addition, analysis will include cross cutting issues i.e. gender, environmental impact, prevention and reduction of disaster risks. The evaluation will also assess whether project implementation strategy was optimum, and recommend areas for improvement and learning. In order to achieve these objectives; the evaluation will focus on the following key areas (evaluation questions).

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Relevance (access design and focus of the project);

1. To what extent did the project achieve its overall objective?
2. What and how much progress made towards achieving the results and outcome of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
3. Were inputs used realistically, appropriately and adequately to achieve intended results?
4. Was the project relevant to the needs?

Effectiveness (whether activities, outputs and outcome were achieved?);

1. Was the project effective in delivering desired/planned results?
2. To what extent did the project's M&E mechanism contribute in meeting project results?
3. How effective were the strategies and tools used in the implementation of the project?
4. How effective was the project in response to the needs of beneficiaries?
5. What are the future intervention strategies and issues?

Efficiency (were inputs (staff, time, money, equipment) used in the best possible way to achieve outputs; could implementation be improved/were there better ways of doing things?);

1. Was the process of achieving results efficient? Specifically did the actual or expected results (outputs and outcome) justify the costs incurred?
2. Were resources utilised effectively?
3. What factors contributed to implementation efficiency?



4. Did project activities overlap with similar interventions (funded nationally and/or by other donors)?
5. Is there any efficient way and means of delivering more and better results (results and outcome) with the available inputs?
6. Could a different approach produce better results?
7. How efficient were the management and accountability structures of the project?
8. How did financial management processes and procedures affect project implementation?
9. What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the project implementation process?

Impact (the consultant/evaluator will assess the positive and negative changes produced by the project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

1. Is there an improvement in household food security and assets of vulnerable households in target communities?
2. Has capacity of beneficiaries improved to meet food needs in the targeted communities?
3. What positive changes observed in the lives of beneficiaries, resulting from implementation of the project?
4. Did the response reduce future vulnerabilities?
5. What are the unintended negative impacts of the project?
6. To what extent are the interventions improving the condition of affected communities?
7. How satisfied are the communities with the response?
8. What gender specific issues did the project observe and address?
9. Did the cash transfer program affect the market in any way? Has it influenced the availability of food in markets? How has it generally affected the local trade system?
10. What were the lessons learnt and recommendations for future programming?

Sustainability

1. How sustainable are the benefits of the project?
2. What is the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of project outcomes and benefits thereafter?
3. How effective were the exit strategies, and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints?
4. What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability of project outcome and the potential for replication of the approach?
5. What major lessons have emerged?
6. What are the recommendations for similar support in future?

PROPOSED METHODOLOGY OF EVALUATION.

The end of project evaluation should comply with OECD DAC evaluation principles and guidelines, and consistent with OECD DAC Evaluation Quality Standards (206). This is a summative evaluation involving qualitative and quantitative methods to evaluate the referenced project implementation and performance and to make recommendations for the next programming cycle.

The quantitative and qualitative data will be collected through the following methods:

1. Desk study and review of all relevant project documentation including project proposal, annual work-plans, project progress report and annual project report.
2. In depth interviews to gather primary data from key stakeholders using a structured methodology.
3. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders.
4. Interviews with relevant key informants.
5. Observations (field visits using checklist).



Duration of the evaluation and time schedule.

The evaluation start is expected to start on 15th April 2018 for an estimated duration of 15 days. This includes desk review, visit to the field location of implementation - interviews, and report writing. This period maybe adjusted taking into account any public or national holidays of which the successful consultant shall be notified.

Activity	Deliverable	Time allocated
Inception Meeting Initial briefing with selected consultant.	Inception Report	1 day
Desk Review: Evaluation design, methodology and detailed work plan.	Draft Report	1 day
Field visit and data collection.		6 days
Data analysis, debriefing and preparation of draft Evaluation report		2 days
Submit draft report to FCA for comments, and feedback		3 days
Incorporate comments, finalize evaluation report and submit to FCA.	Final Evaluation Report	2 day

Expected Deliverables:

Inception report: The consultant prepares an inception report, with details of the evaluation process and methods to address evaluation questions. This is to ensure the consultant and FCA have a shared understanding of the evaluation process. The inception report will include the evaluation matrix summarizing the evaluation design, methodology, evaluation questions, data sources, data collection and analysis tool for each data source and the measure for evaluation of each question. The report will include the scope of work, agreed work plan, agreed timeframe/ schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, with clear responsibilities for each task or product.

Draft report: The consultant prepares the draft report and submits to FCA for review and comments. Consultant receives feedback from FCA within 3 days after submission of draft report. The objective of reviewing the draft report is to ensure the evaluation meets the required quality criteria.

Final report: Consultant submits final report within 2 days after receiving comments. The content and structure of the final analytical report including findings, recommendations and lessons learnt should meet the requirements of FCA M&E guidelines and should include the following:

1. Executive summary
2. Introduction
3. Description of the evaluation methodology
4. Situational analysis with regard to the outputs and outcome.
5. Analysis of opportunities to provide guidance for future programming
6. Key findings, including best practices and lessons learned
7. Conclusion and recommendations
8. Appendices: including charts, terms of reference, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.

Proposal Schedule of Payments.

Payment shall be made upon completion of the following milestones.

1. 30 % after adoption of the inception report



2. 30 % after presentation of the draft report
3. 40 % after the approval of the final report

The consultancy fee is subject to statutory deduction (income tax) in accordance with South Sudan Financial ACT 2017/18, section 53 of the Taxation Amendment ACT 2016.

NOTE: The amount agreed in the contract does not change regardless of changes in cost components.

Required expertise and qualification

The consultant must have the following expertise and qualifications:

1. Master's degree in Monitoring and Evaluation or Agriculture/Rural Development, International Development, Development Studies or in relevant field.
2. Bachelor's degree with substantial hands on experience in project evaluation added advantage.
3. Extensive expertise, knowledge, and experience in evaluation of similar humanitarian projects.
4. Experience of programme design/ formulation, monitoring and evaluation.
5. Fluency in English. Working knowledge of the local languages of the project area is an added advantage.

Selection Criteria

Evaluation and selection based on **Quality and Cost** approach (combined scoring method). Technical proposal evaluated at 70% score whereas the financial proposal at 30% score.

Note: Please submit technical proposal and financial proposal separately.

Consultant submits the final report to SSUCO Humanitarian Coordinator by Not later than 30th April 2019. An extended delivery time frame shall be agreed upon in writing with the Humanitarian Coordinator taking into account all factors that have led or contributed to delays.

General Guidelines.

- Consultant may suggest a modified evaluation approach keeping in view past experience along with the proposal.
- FCA covers fully transport (flight) costs and accommodation for the consultant(s).

HOW TO SUBMIT TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL PROPOSAL.

Submit by email to Procurement.Ssuco@kua.fi However, applicants are encouraged to hand deliver their proposal to Finn Church Aid (FCA) office in Juba located at Juba Na Bari Area, Behind Midan Rembo on Bilpham Road. Deadline for submission is **7th April 2019**.

Please note - hand delivered applications only possible during weekdays. **Applications received after the deadline will not be admitted for consideration.**

