

Terms of Reference (ToR)

End-of-the Project Evaluation Consultancy

Food Security Support for Most Vulnerable Communities in Lakes and Central Equatorial States, South Sudan.

Introduction

The purpose of this Terms of Reference is to provide a framework for planning and conducting the Final Evaluation (FE) for the food security support for most vulnerable communities in Lakes and Central Equatorial States, South Sudan. 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.

The Food Security Support Project in Lakes and Central Equatorial States, funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Office of Finland (MFA Finland) and has since April 2017 been responding to the food insecurity situation resulting from conflicts and consecutive seasons of below average production due to weather adverse effects. The project is implemented directly by Finn Church Aid (FCA), South Sudan Program in Yei (Central Equatoria) and Awerial/ Mingkaman (Lakes State).

The overall goal of the project is to meet the immediate life-saving food needs of 3,120 most vulnerable conflict affected households, while improving food security conditions, community livelihood and assets. According to the IPC report (January - June 2016 projection), the project target locations of Lakes and Central Equatoria States were reported to be food insecure with alarming rates of malnutrition, large food consumption gaps, with some households reducing consumption to as little as one meal per day consisting of only fish and water lilies. The projected 38.6%, 45,000 people in Phase 4 (Central Equatoria State) and 40.9%, 100,000 people in phase 4 (Lakes State) are in crisis emergency humanitarian catastrophe.

The project aimed to achieve the above objective through;

1. Emergency cash for food intervention, targeting 1,620 most vulnerable conflict affected households in Yei (Central Equatorial).
2. Provision of agriculture inputs (seeds and tools) and agriculture based trainings for 1,000 HHs in Lakes States (Awerial County), establishment of 20 Demo plots and 20 informal farmer groups.
3. Provision of fishing kits/ inputs, fisheries related trainings to 500 fisher folks, provision of 20 small canoes to support productivity, and establishment of 10 informal fisher folks group.

The cash for food intervention is to meet the immediate food access and nutritional needs of the most vulnerable households in the target locations. The project target households were identified using Community Based Targeting and Distribution (CBTD) guidelines that ensured public participation and vetting during the beneficiary selection process.

The agriculture support intervention aims to increased access to agriculture based livelihood opportunities by supporting selected households through provision of agriculture inputs (seeds and tools). Appropriate trainings on agriculture practices, post-harvest management, and food processing/preservation to increase

the target community coping capacities for food insecurity situations. In addition, 20 demonstration plots established and 20 informal farmer groups established.

Fisheries production intervention aims to increased access to fisheries based livelihood opportunities through provision of inputs and trainings. Fisheries inputs such as fishing gears and small canoes provided to increase the fisheries production and productivity.

As a measure of quality programming embraced in the FCA's County Programme strategic framework, the need for end of project evaluation is crucial to inform the stakeholders and documentation of the project contribution, outcome and impact. The end of project evaluation is forward looking and will capture project design, scope and provide 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 the programming strategy in the next programming phase in response to the humanitarian aid priorities.

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 the results. This will include the implementation modalities, beneficiary participation, replication and sustainability of the project. The evaluation will include assessing the project design and assumptions made at the beginning of the project development process.

Project management including the implementation strategies; project activities; it will assess the extent to which the project results have been achieved, and cross cutting issues of mainstreaming gender, protection issues and human rights have been addressed. 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. 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 has the project been in responding to the needs of the beneficiaries, and what results were achieved?
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 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 food 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. Did the cash for food transfer intervention affect the market and context in any way? Has it impacted inflation? Has it influenced the availability of food in markets? How has it generally affected the local trade system?
10. 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?
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 in April 2018 for an estimated duration of 22 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 day
Desk Review: Evaluation design, methodology and detailed work plan.	Draft Report	2 days
Field Visits and data collection.		10 days
Data analysis, debriefing and presentation of draft Evaluation report		4 days
Draft report presentation and validation meeting with the lead consultant.		1 day
Finalization of Evaluation report incorporating additions and comments and submission to FCA.	Final Evaluation Report	3 days

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). Technical proposal will be evaluated on 70% score whereas the financial proposal will be evaluated on 30% score.

How to apply

Interested consultants and consultancy firms are required to complete the information in this link <https://ee.humanitarianresponse.info/::YzFE> and submit a technical and financial proposal marked “Technical and Financial Proposal for End of Project Evaluation Consultancy” through email. admin.ssuco@kua.fi and CC denis.drichi@kua.fi and moses.habib@kua.fi by **5:00 pm** (East Africa Time) on **Saturday, 16th, March 2018**.

For inquiries regarding the advert, please contact denis.drichi@kua.fi

Incomplete and late submission will not be considered.