

## **Terms of Reference (ToR)**

### **End-of-the Project Evaluation Consultancy – 11742**

#### **Livelihood support towards early recovery and resilience – Mingkaman**

##### **Introduction**

The purpose of this Terms of Reference is to provide a framework for planning and conducting the Final Evaluation for project 11742, Livelihood support towards early recovery and resilience – Mingkaman. The Final Evaluation will use both quantitative and qualitative methods to ascertain the impact of the project. It will also assess what factors enhanced and/or limited achievement of project targets as well as documentation of the results achieved and lessons learned for future programming.

##### **Background and description of the project**

Following massive displacements into the project area after the fighting that took place in South Sudan in 2013. The coping mechanisms of both IDPs and host communities living in the target area (Mingkaman, Awerial County), were eroded. Availability of food became an issue. Those host communities that welcomed IDPs also saw their food stocks diminish as a result of sharing the available stock with the IDPs. IDPs were forced to abandon their farms in their areas of origin only to be constrained to working in small gardens in their new area of refuge. At the same time, availability of food was primarily from general food distributions from the WFP. It was noticed that emphasis by intervening partners was placed on IDPs living in the camps and not those living outside the camps.

This project therefore chose to concentrate on those IDPs living outside the camps. Their main forms of livelihood are fishing, animal husbandry and agriculture. However, some of the IDPs moved without their livelihood assets, reason for which this project aims are rebuilding their assets. The project has been running for the last 3 years from 2016 providing the following assistance;

- 45 women milk sellers provided with training on milk processing and catering.
- 8 fishing camps composed of a total of 160 fishermen assisted with training and fishing kits.
- 7 farmers' groups composed of 125 farmers assisted with training and farming inputs.
- 1 agricultural extension office composed of 10 officials provided with training, logistical and administrative support.
- 20 youths provided with training in carpentry as well as start-up kits.

*Overall objective of the project:* To help communities rebound from crisis by enhancing access to livelihoods resources.

*Specific Objective:* To strengthen the community's capacity to protect restore and develop their livelihoods in sustainable ways.

### **Scope and focus of the evaluation.**

The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of the implementation strategy and the results. This will include the implementation modalities, beneficiary participation, replication and sustainability of the project. The evaluation will include assessing the project design.

Project management including the implementation strategies; project activities; it will assess the extent to which the project results have been achieved, its replicability to a larger scale and cross cutting issues of mainstreaming gender and environment. It will also assess whether the project implementation strategy has been optimum and recommend areas for improvement and learning. In order to achieve these objectives; the evaluation will focus on the key areas below (evaluation questions).

### **The evaluation questions**

#### **Relevance (access design and focus of the project);**

1. To what extent did the project achieve its overall objectives?
2. What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
3. To what extent were the results (outputs, outcomes and impacts) achieved?
4. Were the inputs and strategies used realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results?
5. Was the project relevant to the identified needs?

#### **Effectiveness (whether activities, outputs and outcomes have been achieved?);**

1. Was the project effective in delivering desired/planned results?
2. How effective were the strategies and tools used in the implementation of the project?
3. How effective has the project been in responding to the needs of the beneficiaries, and what results were achieved?
4. 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 have been improved/was there a better way of doing things?);**

1. Was the process of achieving results efficient? Specifically did the actual or expected results (outputs and outcomes) justify the costs incurred?
2. Were the resources effectively utilized?
3. What factors contributed to implementation efficiency?
4. Did project activities overlap and duplicate other similar interventions (funded nationally and/or by other donors)?
5. Are there more efficient ways and means of delivering more and better results (outputs and outcomes) with the available inputs?
6. Could a different approach have produced better results?
7. How efficient were the management and accountability structures of the project?
8. How did the project 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 interventions, 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 the capacity of participating beneficiaries developed to progressively meet the household needs in the targeted communities?
3. What positive changes are observed in the lives of the target group as a result of the implementation of the project?
4. Did the response reduce future vulnerabilities?
5. What are the unintended positive and 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 have been observed and addressed?
9. What lessons were learnt and recommendations for future project design.

**Sustainability**

1. To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to be sustained and can be scaled up?
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 outcomes and the potential for replication of the approach?
5. What are the main lessons that have emerged?
6. What are the recommendations for similar support in future?

**The proposed evaluation methodology.**

The end of project evaluation will be carried out in accordance with the OECD DAC evaluation principles and guidelines and with full compliance to the 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 is expected to start on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2019 for an estimated duration of 20 working days. This will include desk reviews, field work - interviews, and report writing.

Activity	Deliverable	Time allocated
Inception meeting Initial briefing with selected consultant.	Inception Report	2 days
Desk Review: Evaluation design, methodology and detailed work plan.	Draft Report	2 days
Field visits and data collection.		8 days
Data analysis, debriefing and presentation of draft Evaluation Report.		4 days
Draft report presentation and validation meeting with consultant.		1 day
Finalization of Evaluation Report incorporating additions and comments and submission to FCA.	Final Evaluation Report	3 days
<b>Total</b>		<b>20 days</b>

### Expected Deliverables:

**An inception report:** The consultant will prepare an inception report, which details the consultant and the FCA understanding of the evaluation and how the evaluation questions will be addressed. This is to ensure that consultant and FCA have a shared understanding of the evaluation. 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 by which each question will be evaluated. 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.

**The draft report:** The draft report prepared by the consultant and submitted to FCA for review and comments. Comments from the FCA will be provided within 5 days after the reception of the draft report. The report will be reviewed to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria.

**The final report:** This final report will be submitted within 5 days after receiving comments and will incorporate the comments from FCA. The content and the structure of the final analytical report with finding, recommendations and lessons learnt covering the scope of the evaluation should meet the requirements of the FCA M&E Policy 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.**

The consultant shall be paid the consultancy fee 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 will be subjected to income tax in accordance to the South Sudan Financial ACT 2017/18, section 53 of the Taxation Amendment ACT 2016.

**NOTE:** The contract price will be fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

### **Required expertise and qualification**

The consultant must have the following expertise and qualifications:

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

### **Selection Criteria**

The consultants will be evaluated by using the **Quality and Cost** approach (combined scoring method). The Technical Proposal will be evaluated and will account for 70% of the total score whereas the Financial Proposal will account for 30% of the total score.

### **How to apply**

Interested consultants and consultancy firms are required to complete the information in the consultancy application form below and submit a Technical and Financial proposal marked "Technical and Financial Proposal for End of Project Evaluation Consultancy - 11742" (see Annex 1 below) through email to [Procurement.Ssuco@kua.fi](mailto:Procurement.Ssuco@kua.fi) by **17:00** (East African Time) on **Friday, 30<sup>th</sup>, November 2018**.

Kindly attach your C.V. Incomplete and late submission will not be considered.

For inquiries regarding the advert, please contact [edison.munene@kua.fi](mailto:edison.munene@kua.fi)

## *End of Project Evaluation Consultancy Application*

Surname	
Given Names	
Email Address	
Telephone Number	
Current Address/ Location	
Gender	
Nationality	

1. Please indicate your highest level of education of the Consultant/Team Leader

PhD	
Masters' Degree	
Technical/ Specialized Postgraduate Diploma	
Bachelors' Degree	

2. Number of relevant experience in conducting end of project evaluations

> 8 years	
5 - 7 Years	
3 - 4 Years	
1 - 3 Years	
< 1 Year	

3. List the most recent and relevant experiences in monitoring and evaluation as follows;

Agency/NGO	Kind of Assignment	Month/ Year	Referee Name	Email	Phone

4. Have you worked with FCA or hired by FCA as consultant before?

5. Are you currently employed or engaged in consultancy assignment?

## Annex 1. Technical Proposal Template

**To be filled-in by the candidates, in compliance with the following instructions**

### 6. Rationale (max. 1 page)

Any comments on the Terms of Reference of importance for the successful execution of activities, in particular its objectives and expected results, thus demonstrating the degree of understanding of the contract. Any comments contradicting the Terms of Reference or falling outside their scope will not form part of the final contract.

An opinion on the key issues related to the achievement of the contract objectives and expected results

(Optional: An explanation of the risks and assumptions affecting the execution of the contract)

### 7. Evaluation questions (max. 2 pages)

Evaluation questions formulated on the basis of the criteria presented in the Terms of Reference's Sub-section 4.

### 8. Proposed Methodology (max. 3 pages)

An outline of the approach proposed for contract implementation;

A list of the proposed activities considered to be necessary to achieve the contract objectives;

The related inputs and outputs.

### 9. Timetable of activities (max 1 page)

The timing, sequence and duration of the proposed activities, taking into account mobilisation time

### 10. Financial proposal (max 1 page)

	Unit cost (in EUR)	Description/ Number of days	Total (in EUR)
Consultancy fees	(per day)		
Travel			
Incidentals			
Accommodation / DSA	(per day)		
Materials/Interpreter			
[Xx] (please fill in if needed)			