

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) End of Project Evaluation Consultancy

Project: I1527 Enhancing Sustainable Peace and Intercommunal reconciliation in former Boma (GPAA) and Jonglei State

1. Service Summary

| | |
|---|---|
| Project: | Enhancing Sustainable Peace and Intercommunal reconciliation in Boma and Jonglei State |
| Project Locations: | Greater Pibor Administrative Area (Pibor, Gumuruk, Likuangule, Verteth, and Pochalla County) and CES (Juba) |
| Application Deadline: | 16 th December, 2021 by/before 5:00 pm (South Sudan Time) |
| Type of Contractor : | Open to National and International and International Consultancy firms |
| Languages Required : | English |
| Starting Date : | 20 th December 2021 |
| Expected Duration of Assignment: | 20 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 a Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) funded peacebuilding project implemented in Jonglei State, Greater Pibor Administrative Area, and supporting National Peace Structures in Juba. The Goal of the project was to contribute to achieving sustainable peace and stability in Greater Jonglei through supporting holistic conflict transformation processes and initiatives, and facilitating the strengthening of local peacebuilding structures and conflict resolution mechanisms. The consultant will conduct the final evaluation through quantitative and qualitative methods to ascertain the impact of the project. In addition, the consultant will seek to assess, and take into consideration; the challenges or constraints associated with implementation, and document the results achieved, good practices and lessons learned for future programming of FCA's peacebuilding works in South Sudan.

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 the 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.

3. Background and Description of the Project

Finn Church Aid is a faith-based organization founded in 1947. FCA is largest Finland development cooperation NGO and second largest in providing disaster relief aid through Right to Education,

Right to Livelihood, and Right to Peace. FCA is a professional, nonprofit, non-political neutral and faith-based humanitarian organization with head office in Helsinki, Finland. FCA established a local presence in South Sudan in 2010 implementing integrated humanitarian, education, peacebuilding and livelihoods projects in Lakes State, Central Equatoria, Jonglei State, Greater Pibor Administrative Area, Western Bahr-El-Ghazal, and Upper Nile State.

FCA has been implementing a three-year (2019 – 2021) peacebuilding project with funding from the Finnish MFA in Greater Pibor Administrative Area (Pibor, Gumuruk, Likuangule, Verteth, and Pochalla counties) and Jonglei State (Uror County), and Central Equatoria States (Juba – mainly support to national peace structures) aimed at contributing to achieving sustainable peace and stability in Boma and Jonglei state.

The overall objective of the project is to contribute to sustainable peace and stability in Boma and Jonglei state while its specific objectives is to support holistic conflict transformation processes and initiatives through facilitating the establishment and, or strengthening of local conflict resolution and peacebuilding mechanisms. The project focused on three main Results;

- Result 1: Inclusive and non-violent spaces for dialogue are created.
 - R1-A1: Facilitate intra/Intra-communal dialogues
 - R1-A2: Conduct program monitoring visits and stakeholders consultations
 - R1-A4: Organize youth sports events for trust and confidence building
 - R1-A5: Facilitate peace dialogue for women.
 - R1-A6: Document discussion points, action points and recommendations
- R1-A6: Document discussion points, action points and recommendations
 - R2-A1: Convene traditional leaders' forum
 - R2-A2: Convene religious leaders/interchurch committees forum
 - R2-A3: Providing Capacity Support processes for relevant state level government structures.
 - R2-A4: Provide need-based capacity strengthening for youth and engage them in peace processes.
 - R2-A5: Renovate Pibor Peace Hall for reconciliation conferences.
 - R2-A6: Support women led peace process.
- Result 3: National level peace structures are identified and supported.
 - R3-A2: 1 peacebuilding & conflict transformation training with the national level relevant structures, peace and reconciliation commission and ministry of Peace.
 - R3-A3: Provide capacity building training on Trauma awareness at ToT level for national/ state level peace structures.

During the project implementation, there was a general reduction in intra-communal clashes in Pibor particularly among the age sets. However, inter-communal clashes – especially among the Dinka, Murle, and Murle communities – in 2020 were recorded. The Project was designed not only to responded, but to strength, the capacity of local peace structures to develop strategies to reduce the likelihood of the re-occurrence of the intra/inter-communal clashes, through finding inclusive ways to address the roots causes of the conflict and seek sustainable solutions to ending the cycles of violence. Also, the project has been ensuring the broad adaptation of non-violent forms of conflict resolution, as well as supporting and capacitating the individuals and communities to take a more active and structural role and become agents of positive change in their state. To this effect, the project targeted

the primary stakeholders (traditional chiefs, youth, and women) and duty bearers as crucial owners of the problem and solutions. 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.

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

The end of project evaluation is in-built in the project implementation framework. The evaluation will cover the period from January 2019 to December 2021 focusing on Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA) and Jonglei state, and it will assess the effectiveness of the implementation strategy and the outcomes of the project. This will include the implementation modalities, the right holders and duty bearers' participation, replication and sustainability of the project. The evaluation will also include assessment of the project design, sustainability of the project, including assumptions and risks included in the design of the project. In addition, the evaluation will analyse the management of the project, implementation strategies and activities to ascertain the extent to which the project achieved its intended results.

The Final Evaluation will use different research methods including qualitative analysis to ascertain the impact of the project, taking into consideration what factors have enhanced and hindered the achievement of the project targets as well as documentation of achievements and lessons learnt for future programming of FCA's peacebuilding works or interventions. The 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 document the learnings and areas that require improvement in subsequent programs. In order to achieve these objectives; the evaluation will focus on the following key areas (proposed evaluation questions).

The overall objective of this end of project final evaluation is to assess:

- (i) **Relevance** (assess the design and focus of the project):
 - To what extent did the project achieve its overall objective?
 - What and how much progress was made towards achieving the outputs and outcome of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
 - Were inputs used realistically, appropriately and adequately to achieve intended outcome?
 - Was the project appropriate and relevant to the needs of the communities?
- (ii) **Appropriateness:**
 - To what extent have the project objectives been consistent with beneficiaries needs?
 - Was the project relevant to the targeted beneficiaries needs?
 - Was there a feedback mechanism in place to collect beneficiaries' complaints as well as addressing their complaints and provide feedback?
- (iii) **Effectiveness:**
 - The extent to which the project objectives were achieved (or are expected to be achieved) during the implementation process of the project.
 - To what extent did the project achieve its overall objectives?
 - What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs, and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?

- Where the inputs and strategies used effectively and realistically, appropriately and were adequate to achieve the project results?
 - How effective the M&E mechanism was and how much did it contribute in meeting the project results.
 - What recommendations in terms of project effectiveness are there for future peacebuilding similar intervention in the region or elsewhere in the country?
- (iv) **Efficiency:**
- Was the process of achieving results efficient? Specifically did the actual or expected results (outputs and outcome) justify the costs incurred?
 - To what extent (how) were resources or inputs converted into results.
 - Were project resources used effectively in the course of the implementation of the project? Was there value for money?
 - Were there issues of duplication or an overlap in project activities implementation?
 - What factors contributed to implementation efficiency?
 - Did project activities overlap with similar interventions (funded nationally and/or by other donors)?
 - Is there any efficient way & means of delivering more & better results (results/outcome) with the available inputs?
 - Could a different approach produce better results?
 - How efficient were the management and accountability structures of the project?
 - How did financial management processes and procedures affect project implementation?
 - What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the project implementation process?
- (v) **Sustainability:**
- Are the project benefits likely to continue after end of the project?.
 - Will the community members co-exist peacefully; resolve their differences through non-violent and peaceful means after the end of the project?
 - Will the established peace structures continue to function and continue to work in peacebuilding and conflict transformation even when the project has ended?
 - What recommendations can you give to FCA to ensure that there will be sustainability of project outcomes even when the project has ended?
 - How effective were the exit strategies, and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints?
 - 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?
 - What major lessons have emerged?
 - What are the recommendations for similar support in future?
- (vi) **Impact:**
- What are the long-term effects produced by the project? (This can be directly, indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally during the implementation process).
 - What are the changes produced by the project in the region, both negative and positive impacts?
 - Are the project beneficiaries or the community no longer susceptible to vulnerability in case of any future eruption of a violent conflict in the community?
 - What are the specific impacts on youth and women realised because of the intervention? Any lessons learnt and recommendations for future programming?

(vii) **Crosscutting Issues:**

- To what extent were crosscutting issues such as gender, protection and human rights, mainstreamed to and addressed during the implementation of the project?

5. Expected Deliverables:

- 1) **Inception report:** The consultant is expected to prepare a detailed inception report. The report must contain detailed understanding of both FCA and the consultant on how the evaluation and the evaluation questions will be addressed during the evaluation process to make sure that both FCA and the consultant have a common understanding of the evaluation process. The inception report should include summary of the evaluation design, methodology, evaluation questions, data sources, data collection and analysis tools 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 or schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables.
- 2) **Draft report:** The consultant will prepare a draft evaluation report that will be submitted to FCA for review and comments. This is to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality and standards. The consultant will incorporate comments from FCA into the report to produce the final evaluation report.
- 3) **Submission of final report:** The final report a maximum of 25-30 pages excluding annexes will be submitted within 5 days after receiving feedback from FCA and will incorporate the comments into the final report. The report should be written in Arial font size 11, with a 1.15 spacing. The content and the structure of the final evaluation report with findings, recommendations and lessons learned covering the scope of the evaluation should meet FCA M&E Policy and requirements and should include the following:
 1. Executive summary
 2. Introduction
 3. Description of the evaluation methodology
 4. Situational analysis with regards to the outputs and outcome.
 5. Analysis of opportunities to guide future programming
 6. Key findings, including best practices and lessons learned
 7. Conclusion and recommendations
 8. Appendices: including charts, Aggregated respondents by gender, field visits, primary and secondary references, etc

Note: The consultant will submit the final report to FCA's Peacebuilding Advisor

6. Methodology and Duration of the 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 documents including project proposal, annual work-plans, project progress report, PDM reports 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).

The evaluation starts on **20th December 2021** for an estimated duration of **20** days. This includes desk review and visit to the project locations in Pibor, Likuangule, Gumuruk, Pochalla, and Juba for interviews, FGDs, Observations, and report writing.

| Activity | Deliverable | Time allocated |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Inception Meeting Initial briefing with selected consultant. | Inception Report | 1 day |
| Desk Review-Evaluation design, methodology detailed work plan. | Draft Report | 1 day |
| Field visit and data collection (travel to Greater Pibor, and Pochalla County), and interviews in Juba | | 10 days |
| Data analysis, debriefing & preparation of draft Evaluation report | | 4 days |
| Submit draft report to FCA for comments, and feedback | | 2 days |
| Incorporate comments, finalize report and submit to FCA. | Final Evaluation Report | 2 day |

7. Required expertise and qualification

The Lead consultant must have the following expertise and qualifications:

1. Master's degree in Peace and Conflict Studies, or Monitoring and Evaluation or Development Studies or in relevant field.
2. First level Bachelor's degree with substantial hands on experience in project evaluation maybe considered.
3. Extensive expertise, knowledge, and experience in evaluation of similar Peacebuilding projects. Demonstrated by evidence. e.g. recommendation letters or accessible publications
4. Fluency in English. Working knowledge of the local languages of the project locations is an added advantage.

6. Evaluation and Selection Criteria

The evaluation and selection of the successful consultant will be based on the following criteria as presented in the below table:

| Evaluation Criteria: | % | Required Information/evidence |
|-----------------------------|------------|---|
| Education/Qualification | 10 | Academic certificates from a reputable institution. Lead Consultant must be a holder of Master Degree in M&E/Project Management/Social Research |
| Skills & Expertise | 20 | A minimum of 3 recommendation letters from INGOs for similar assignment conducted and successfully completed. One sample signed evaluation report in a similar or related field is a requirement. |
| Methodology | 30 | A proposed methodology that aligns with the requirements under Section 6 Proposed Methodology of Evaluation |
| Availability/Timeliness | 10 | Immediate availability of qualified consultant receives a full score of 10 points |
| Consultancy fee | 30 | Professional billing/fees that are guided by best pricing model for an assignment of similar nature and scope as defined above and other logistical and enabling costs e.g. airfares etc. |
| TOTAL | 100 | |

8. Proposed Schedule of Payments.

The consultant shall be paid the consultancy fee upon completion of the following milestones.

- 1) 20 % after adoption of the inception report.
- 2) 30 % after presentation of the draft report.
- 3) 50 % 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. Current withholding tax rate is 20% on professional or technical fees. Other logistical and enabling costs such as airfares, stationeries and enumerators fees should be clearly marked as such.

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

9. How to SUBMIT TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL PROPOSAL.

Interested Applicants who meets the above requirements should submit their Technical and Financial proposals (Technical and Financial + annexes listed above) through email to Procurement.Ssuco@kua.fi with the heading “**END OF PROJECT EVALUATION - 11527**”. **Deadline for submission is 16th December 2021 at 5:00 pm.**

Note:

- I. Technical Proposal (maximum 10 pages) must include an interpretation of the TOR, design and conceptualization of the assignment, proposed methodology, and work plan.

- II. The financial proposal (maximum 1 Page) should be in USD Only. The proposal should clearly include Technical fees, Airfare/ local transport, and other associated costs relevant to the consultancy. **FCA shall withhold 20% of the Consultancy fees per South Sudan taxation policy.**
- III. Detailed Curriculum Vitae of the Lead Consultant(s) with at least 3 professional referees (official emails ONLY)
- IV. One approved sample of evaluation reports from previous consultancy work with reputable organizations.

Note:

FCA has zero tolerance concerning aid diversion and illegal actions and may screen potential applicants, contractors, suppliers, consultants, etc. against international lists to ensure due diligence and compliance with Anti-money laundering and combating the Financing of Terrorism requirements