

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

End of Project Evaluation in Yei County, Pibor County, Tonga, Panyikang County, Fangak County (Old and New Fangak).

1. SUMMARY OF CONSULTANCY

Project Title: Integrated Multi-Sectoral (Education, CBI, Food Security & Livelihood) Support for Returnees and Vulnerable Populations in Jonglei, Upper Nile and Central Equatoria State, South Sudan (FCA Project code 12079) funded by Ministry for Foreign Affairs Finland (MFA)

Project Locations: Yei County (CES), Pibor County (GPAA), Tonga (UNS), Old and New Fangak (Jonglei State)

Application Deadline: 1st September 2021, Midnight- South Sudan Time

Type of Contract : Consultancy

Post Level: Open to National and International Consultancy Firms/Individual teams

Languages Required: English Language (Advanced language skills level)

Starting Date: 10th September 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 the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) funded humanitarian project implemented in Central Equatoria, Jonglei, Upper Nile and (GPAA). The Goal of the project was to Contribute to Strengthened Community Coping Capacity through Access to Education, Improved Food Security & Livelihood Opportunities for Returnees and Host Populations in former Jonglei, Upper Nile & Central Equatoria, South Sudan. 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 the challenges or constraints associated with implementation, and document the results achieved, good practices and lessons learned for future programming.

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

FCA has completed the implementation of a humanitarian project in Central Equatoria, Jonglei, Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA) and Upper Nile State (Yei County, Fangak County, Pibor County & Panyikang County – Tonga). The MFA funded project started in May 2020 and ended in June 2021. The multi-sectoral project focused on food security, livelihoods and education in emergencies support for returnees and vulnerable host communities. The overall goal of the response was to contribute to strengthened community coping capacity through improved food security, livelihood opportunities and basic education for returnees and vulnerable host families. The project focused on two main outcomes – **Outcome 1** aimed at increasing equitable access to safe and quality education for children and adolescents

aged 3-18. Under **Outcome 2** aimed at securing access to safe, life-saving assistance and livelihood opportunities for returnees and vulnerable host populations

Outcome 1: Increase equitable access to safe and quality education for children and adolescents aged 3-18

By close of the project in June 2021, FCA had established six (6) temporary learning spaces and latrines in Tonga, Panyikang County. The project targeted three (3) schools for the 6 learning spaces construction in Tonga, including Papwoji (2), Nyibodo (2) and Dhok Alla primary school (2). Alongside each learning space, FCA established one latrine block (each latrine block with two stances). The project distributed learning materials to all the 10 schools supported under this project. In addition, FCA also rolled out awareness raising campaigns, including dissemination of lifesaving messages about Covid-19 pandemic. These campaigns targeted school environments including children, parents, teachers and the communities living around schools. However, due to the effects of the unprecedented COVID 19 pandemic that culminated into the closure of schools from March 2020 to May 2021, the project was unable to implement all activities planned under this outcome. –These activities included capacity building through training of 40 teachers in basic teaching methodologies, psychosocial support and mentorship, paying monthly incentives to the 40 teachers supported at the targeted schools and capacity building of 110 PTA members and 40 county education staff through training in planning, implementation and maintenance of school infrastructure

Outcome 2: Secure access to safe, life-saving assistance and livelihood opportunities for returnees and vulnerable host populations

The project improved access to food and basic household needs through distribution of unconditional cash assistance. The purpose of the cash assistance was to enable beneficiaries' address their immediate household needs such as food. The quarterly distribution targeted 1400 vulnerable households (Yei-700 HHs, Old Fangak-350 HHs and New Fangak-350 HHs). In Yei County, the cash program targeted seven centers including Sobe, SPC, Jigomoni, St. Peters, AIC, Lizira and Christ the King center. In Old Fangak, the program targeted 12 villages including Hai 44, Hai Malakal, Nonimach, Pultuni, Patai, Mayiek, Hai Neem, Kuonylow, Wanglel, Chotbora, Nyatuat and PulPajok village. In New Fangak, the program targeted villages such as Bathare, Kunkier, Keria, Kuer Thiani, Hai Muli Mia, Koat Nyakong, Hai Door, and Hai Tuong Diak two. FCA selected the beneficiaries for the cash program through community-based targeting, an approach that was aimed at increasing community participation, ensuring transparency and ownership of the process. As part of the program, FCA provided awareness raising and sensitization to all beneficiaries about their right/entitlement, selection criteria; cash transfer modality, voucher value, timing and duration. In addition, the project designed vouchers or tokens that were used for identification and control purposes. The details on the vouchers included the name of the beneficiary, a unique code, age, village and the amount of cash assistance each beneficiary received.

This outcome also contributed to strengthening the coping capacity of food insecure returnees and vulnerable host families to sustainably produce and access food through agriculture based livelihoods activities and fisheries management. The agriculture support aimed at increasing access to food for the 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 beneficiaries. The Fisheries component aimed at increasing access to fisheries based livelihood opportunities through provision of fishing gear and technical training in fisheries management. Inputs provided included fishing gear and small canoes, aimed at supporting production and productivity.

FCA supported 6,280 households (37,680 individuals) under outcome 2 as follows,

1. Unconditional cash assistance beneficiaries - 1,400 HHs (Yei-700, Old Fangak-350 and New Fangak-350 HHs).
2. Agriculture based livelihoods beneficiaries - 3,800 HHs (Yei-600, Fangak-1900, Pibor-700, Tonga-600 HHs).
3. Fisheries based livelihoods beneficiaries - 1080 HHs (Old Fangak-520 HHs, Tonga-280 HHs, Pibor-280 HHs)

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 project results. This will include implementation modalities, beneficiary selection, and participation. 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 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 (evaluation questions).

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Relevance (assess the design and focus of the project);

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

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? Was there value for money?
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 & means of delivering more & better results (results/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. Did the learning spaces and latrines established under the project conform to the technical specifications, design and drawings, and in accordance to the minimum standards of education in emergencies?
6. What are the unintended negative impacts of the project?
7. To what extent has the intervention improved the condition of affected communities?
8. How satisfied are the communities with the response?
9. What gender specific issues did the project observe and address?
10. Did the cash transfer program affect the local markets in any way? Has it influenced the availability of food in markets? How has it generally affected the local trade system?
11. 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?

5. 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 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).

Duration of the evaluation and time schedule.

The evaluation starts on 10th of September 2021 for an estimated duration of 20 days. This includes desk review and visit to the project locations in Yei River County, New/Old Fangak, Pibor and Tonga in Panyikang County - interviews, 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 Yei River County, New/Old Fangak, Pibor and Tonga in Panyikang County)		12 days
Data analysis, debriefing & preparation of draft Evaluation report		2 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

Expected Deliverables:

Inception report: The successful consultant will prepare an inception report, with details of the evaluation process and the proposed methodology of evaluation. This is to ensure that the consultant and FCA have a common 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 will prepare the draft report and submit to FCA for review and comments, and will subsequently receive feedback from FCA within 2 days after submission of the draft report. The objective of reviewing the draft report is to ensure that the evaluation and report meets the required quality criteria.

Final report: The consultant will submit the final report within 2 days after receiving comments from FCA. The content and structure of the final analytical report including the 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.

Proposed Schedule of Payments.

The consultant receives payment upon completion of the following milestones.

1. 20 % after adoption of the inception report.
2. 20 % after presentation of the draft report.
3. 60 % 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. 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 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. 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 humanitarian projects. Demonstrated by evidence. e.g. recommendation letters
4. Fluency in English. Working knowledge of the local languages of the project locations is an added advantage.

Vendor 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	15	Academic certificates from a reputable institution. Lead Consultant must be a holder of Master Degree in M&E/Project Management/Social Research
Skills & Expertise	15	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.
Methodology	30	A proposed methodology that aligns with the requirements under <i>Section 5 Proposed Methodology of Evaluation</i>
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	

The consultant will submit the final report to FCA Humanitarian Coordinator by **10th October 2021**.

Additional Guidelines.

- The consultant may suggest a modified methodology of evaluation besides the methodology proposed in this TOR, but based on past experience with a similar humanitarian project.
- FCA will cover in country transport (UNHAS flight) costs to project locations, including basic accommodation in FCA compounds at project locations in New/Old Fangak, Pibor and Yei.

HOW TO SUBMIT TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL PROPOSAL.

Applicants should submit their proposals (Technical and Financial + annexes listed above) through email to **Procurement.Ssuco@kua.fi**. Deadline for submission is **1st September 2021**