International Action & Advocacy Division Emergency Department

Terms of Reference External evaluation

Project Name	*Resilient and Flourishing Communities* in Dethwok & Lul Payams of Fashoda County
Project Location	Dethwok & Lul Payams of Fashoda County, Upper Nile State
Project Duration	1 Year (May 2023 to May 2024)
Funded by	Caritas France Secours Catholique
Implementing Organization	CAFOD and Trócaire in partnership (CTP) in partnership with CDOM

INDEX

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and rationale

Secours Catholique – Caritas France, is a non-profit organization recognized by French law, is a service of the Catholic Church in France. Created in 1946, it helps the most deprived people “without distinction of race, religion or nationality”. Founded on the Gospel, the organization’s strategy is based on the social doctrine of the Church. Its driving force is its more than 68,000 volunteers and the essential dimension of giving. Every year, Secours Catholique – Caritas France welcomes and accompanies nearly 1.5 million people in regaining footing in society. Its many fields of action make it one of the first French charities: emergency situations, homeless and poorly housed people, literacy and school support, family and childhood, migrants and refugees, prisons and detainees, employment, inclusion, microcredit, solidarity and sustainable economy, social bond, human rights and citizenship, international solidarity and development, advocacy and expertise and cross-cutting and permanent spirituality.

CAFOD and Trócaire in Partnership (CTP), registered in South Sudan via CAFOD - CAFOD and Trócaire merged their programmes in South Sudan in 2015 to what is now called CAFOD and Trócaire in partnership or CTP. Both organizations form part of the international Caritas network. CAFOD registered in South Sudan, is the official overseas development agency of the Catholic Church in England and Wales. CAFOD works with poor and disadvantaged communities in the global south to overcome poverty and bring about sustainable development and well-being. CAFOD aims to protect lives and relieve suffering during emergencies and reduce the risks to vulnerable communities affected by conflict and/or natural disasters. CAFOD has in the last five years responded to humanitarian emergencies, of both rapid and slow onset, in approximately 50 countries around the world. Trócaire – registered in South Sudan via CTP - is the overseas development agency of the Catholic Church in Ireland, providing humanitarian assistance and long-term support to communities in 23 countries across Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East.

Caritas Diocese of Malakal (CDoM) is a Humanitarian and Development wing for the Catholic Diocese of Malakal. – CDoM fully shares the vision embraced by CTP in its strategic planning for South Sudan in the next decade, that is, to see *flourishing of all people, flourishing of communities and flourishing of the earth*. As the humanitarian and charitable wing of the Catholic Church in the Diocese of Malakal, when addressing the crises affecting the Greater Upper Nile region, CDoM tries to operate within the framework of the *Laudato Si* letter of Pope Francis. For CDoM, strategies for a solution demand an integrated approach to combating poverty, restoring dignity to the excluded, and at the same time protecting nature”. Thus, strengthening the resilience of the local population in Lul and Dethwok, improving their food security, their access to clean water and enhancing their awareness around human rights, especially to prevent gender-based violence, are key components of a comprehensive and integrated strategy aiming at the flourishing of the communities of Lul and Dethwok, hard hit by violence and natural disasters.

1.2. Purpose of the evaluation

a) The evaluation will assess the project's performance at its completion stage, examining whether it has met its proposed outcomes and goals. The assessment will centre on the six fundamental OECD DAC Evaluation criteria (Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, and sustainability) to thoroughly review the project's performance. Evaluation will touch on accountability and stakeholder engagement.

b) The Evaluation will compare the endline evaluation results with the baseline results and the Targets set for each indicator with clear comparative analysis explaining and clearly justifying the results of the comparative analysis.

c) The Evaluation shall clearly document the project's overall success, lessons learned, and provides actionable recommendations for similar future projects.

2. PRESENTATION OF THE ACTION TO BE EVALUATED

The project was delivered following the nexus approach, covering humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding. It focuses on four sectors: food security and livelihoods, water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH), protection, peacebuilding, and community-managed disaster risk reduction committees. The evaluation will focus on the five key project outcomes, as indicated in the table below.

Outcomes/Outcome	Indicator
Outcome 1: Enhance the capacity of returnees to increase food production and household incomes.	**Outcome Indicator 1.1:** Percentages of supported households who produced enough food to cover 12 months.
	Outcome Indicator 1.2: Percentage of supported households with acceptable food consumption score
	Outcome Indicator 1.3: Percentage of supported households who reports an increase in households' income
	Outcome Indicator 1.4: Number of targeted communities that have at least 80% of the approved activities in the community development action plan implemented within the project period.
	Outcome Indicator 1.5: Number of HHs supported with fishing equipment's and able to generate income
	Outcome Indicator 1.6: Number of women supported to start up IGAs and report an increase in ability to cover costs of household needs.
	Outcome Indicator 1.6: Number of people who are able to save and take loans through the VSLA groups.
Outcome 2: Reduction in diarrheal and communicable diseases among the returnees.	**Outcome Indicator 2.1:** Percentage of supported households who have access to safe/clean water for drinking.
	Outcome Indicator 2.2: Percentage of supported HHs practicing regular hands washing at critical times.
	Outcome Indicator 2.3: Percentage of supported HHs reporting reduction of prevalence of diarrhea.

Outcome:3: Women and older adolescent girls experience increased safety, psychosocial wellbeing, and meaningful participation in communities.	**Outcome Indicator 3.1:** Percentage of women and girls who improved their coping capacity.
	Outcome Indicator 3.2: Percentage of women and girls who indicated that they are satisfied with the GBV, and PSS services
Outcome 4: Communities in Fashoda co-existence peacefully.	**Outcome indicator 4.1:** Percentage of project participants who report reduction in violent conflict.
	Outcome indicator 4.2: Percentage of project participants who report that conflicts are satisfactory resolved.
	Outcome Indicator 4.3: Number of Conflict analysis conducted at Payam level.
	Outcome Indicator 4.4: Number of action plans that were identified during the conflict analysis implemented.
Outcome 5: Partner staff and communities have improved knowledge on feedback and complaint handling mechanisms and humanitarian principles are employed.	**Outcome indicator 5.1:** Percentage of complaints successfully resolved.
	Outcome indicator 5.2: Percentage of project participants satisfied with the feedback and complaints handling mechanism.
	Outcome Indicator 5.3: Number of Project participants engaged in Project planning, implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation with and active involvement with affected persons and community leaders.

3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND CRITERIAS

An evaluation of the project is proposed according to the following evaluation framework, in which the key questions will be analyzed in accordance with the following criteria, as well as any other aspects deemed relevant in the process of obtaining information and analyzing it. The criteria to be used will be the 6 OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria which was updated in 2019[1] and a seventh criterion added to measure accountability. The key questions to be used per criteria are taken from the Core Humanitarian Standard[2].

Criteria	**Key Questions (by CHS Commitment - Core Humanitarian Standard)**
Relevance The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to	<u>Commitment 1: Humanitarian response is appropriate and relevant.</u> 1. Was the intervention design and implementation based on an unbiased assessment of needs and risks, as well as an assessment of the vulnerabilities and capacities of the different groups?

[1] https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf
[2] https://corehumanitarianstandard.org/files/files/CHS_GN%26I_2018.pdf

beneficiaries',5 global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.	2. Was the intervention adapted to evolving needs, capacities, risks and context? 3. How have vulnerable groups been identified? 4. Does the response include different types of assistance and/or protection for different demographic groups? <u>Commitment 2: Humanitarian response is effective and timely</u> 5. Are constraints and risks regularly identified and analysed, and plans adapted accordingly? <u>Commitment 3: Does the humanitarian response avoids negative effects?</u> 6. Were the results of the community risk assessment and preparedness plan used to guide activities? 7. To what extent does the response strategy anticipate the risk of negative effects ("do no harm" approach)? 8. In what ways (both formal and informal) are local leaders and/or authorities consulted to ensure response strategies are in line with local and/or national priorities?
Coherence The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector, or institution	<u>General</u> 1. Is there internal coherence? (Synergies and interdependencies between the interventions carried out by the NGO, as well as coherence between the intervention and the international norms and standards to which the NGO adheres). 2. Is there external coherence (coherence between the intervention under consideration and those carried out by other actors in the same context). It encompasses complementarity, harmonization, and coordination with other actors, and verifies that the intervention brings added value while avoiding duplication of activities. <u>Commitment 4: Humanitarian response is effective and timely</u> 3. Have unmet needs been reported to organizations with the relevant expertise and mandate, or has advocacy been conducted to ensure that these needs are addressed? <u>Commitment 6: Humanitarian response is coordinated and complementary.</u>

	4. Are the programmes of other organizations and authorities considered when designing, planning and implementing the project? 5. Are gaps in coverage identified and addressed? 6. Has participation in relevant coordination structures and collaboration with other organizations been ensured so as to minimize demands on communities and maximize coverage and service delivery of the overall humanitarian response? 7. Has the necessary information been shared with partners, coordinating groups and other relevant actors using appropriate communication channels?
Effectiveness The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.	<u>General</u> 1. Was the specific objective correctly formulated and was it achieved? 2. Did the planned indicators allow to measure the achievement of the specific objective? Were they disaggregated by gender, age, or other vulnerabilities? 3. Are the sources of verification reliable, sound, and reasonably priced? <u>Commitment 2: Humanitarian response is effective and timely.</u> 4. Does planning consider optimal times for activities, accounting for factors such as climatic factors, season, or conflict? 5. Are early warning systems and contingency plans used? 6. Have relevant technical standards and good practices used in the humanitarian sector been used? 7. Is a program monitoring system used to adjust programs and address quality of work issues? <u>Commitment 3: Does the humanitarian response avoid negative effects?</u> 8. To what extent does the response strategy mitigate the risk of negative effects ("do no harm" approach)?
Efficiency The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.	<u>General</u> 1. Were the expected results and their indicators properly formulated and were they achieved? Were they performance indicators rather than activity indicators? Were they disaggregated by gender, age, or other vulnerabilities?

	<u>Commitment 8: Staff are supported to do their job effectively and are treated fairly and equitably.</u> 2. Is staff performance managed, under-performance addressed, and good performance recognized? 3. Are staff aware of support available for developing the competences required by their role and are they making use of it? 4. Do all staff have updated job descriptions and objectives, including specific responsibilities and objectives? 5. Was the composition of the project teams adequate to ensure the participation of all vulnerable groups? (Women, the elderly...) 6. Has the implementing partner put in place a system to ensure the well-being of the project teams? <u>Commitment 9: Resources are managed and used responsibly for their intended purpose.</u> 7. Has the project been designed, and processes implemented to ensure the efficient use of resources, balancing quality, cost, and timeliness of each phase of the intervention? 8. Have resources been managed and used to achieve the intended objective, minimizing waste? 9. Is expenditure monitored regularly and the reports shared across programme management? 10. Have the risks of corruption been managed and have appropriate measures been taken if such risks have been identified? 11. Are services and goods procured using a competitive bidding process? 12. Are potential impacts on the environment (water, soil, air, biodiversity) monitored, and actions taken to mitigate them?
Impact The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended, or unintended, higher-level effects.	<u>General</u> 1. What are the social, environmental, and economic effects over the long term or on a large scale? 2. What are the potential effects on people's well-being, human rights, gender equality and the environment? <u>Commitment 7: Humanitarian actors continuously learn and improve.</u> 3. Were lessons learned and past experiences used to design the project? 4. Did learning, innovation and implementation of change come from monitoring and evaluation, as well as feedback and complaints?

	5. As the learning and innovation been shared internally, with communities and individuals affected by the crisis, and with other stakeholders?
Sustainability The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.	<u>Commitment 3: Humanitarian response strengthens local capacities?</u> 6. Has a transition or exit strategy been planned from the early stages of the project to ensure longer-term positive effects and reduce the risk of dependency? 7. Was the project based on local capacities and designed to enhance the resilience of communities and individuals affected by the crisis? 8. Did the intervention contribute to the development of local leadership and local organizations in terms of their capacity as first responders in the event of future crises, while taking steps to ensure that marginalized and disadvantaged groups are adequately represented? 9. Resilience and Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus approach: have complementarities between humanitarian and development actors been established? 10. Climate change/environment: did the project strategy include minimizing the carbon footprint and increasing the climate resilience of the humanitarian response?
Accountability Set-up appropriate mechanisms through which affected populations can measure the adequacy of interventions, and address concerns and complaints.	<u>Commitment 4: Humanitarian response is based on communication, participation, and feedback.</u> 1. Has information been provided to communities and individuals affected by the crisis about the organization, the principles it upholds, the behaviors it asks of its staff, the programs it implements, and the assistance it seeks to provide? 2. Has this information been provided in languages, formats and media that are easily understood, respectful and culturally appropriate for different members of the community, especially vulnerable and marginalized groups? (Women, the elderly, etc.). 3. Has the inclusiveness of representation been ensured, involving the participation and commitment of communities and people affected by the crisis in all phases of the intervention? 4. Are equitable opportunities promoted for participation of all groups in the affected population, especially marginalized and vulnerable people? 5. Have communities and people affected by the crisis been encouraged and supported to report their level of satisfaction with the quality and effectiveness of the aid received, paying particular attention to the gender, age, and diversity of those giving their views?

	<u>Commitment 5: Complaints are welcomed and addressed.</u> 6. Have communities and individuals affected by the crisis been consulted on the design, implementation, and monitoring of the complaints processes? 7. Was there communication about how the mechanism was accessible and the scope of issues it could address? 8. Are the complaints handling process documented and in operation? This process should cover the project, sexual exploitation and abuse, and other forms of abuse of authority. 9. Have complaints been handled in a timely, fair, and appropriate manner that prioritizes the safety of the complainant and those affected at all stages? 10. Are there agreed and respected timeframes to investigate and resolve complaints? Is the time between a complaint is filed and its resolution recorded? 11. Are there specific policies and procedures in place to deal with situations of sexual exploitation, abuse, or discrimination? Are they known to staff? <u>Commitment 8: Staff are supported to do their job effectively and are treated fairly and equitably.</u> 12. Do staff sign a code of conduct or similarly binding document? If so, do they receive orientation on this and other relevant policies which allows them to understand it properly? 13. Are complaints received about staff or partners' staff? How are they handled? 14. Are suppliers asked to sign a code of conduct (including the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse) and is this code of conduct appropriately presented to them.

4. WORK APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The evaluation team will carry out a methodological proposal for the achievement of the objectives set in this evaluation. This proposal will be sent to Secours Catholique-Caritas France and to CAFOD & Trocaire in Partnership (CTP) for validation before the beginning of the field work. The work plan will include a cabinet phase and a fieldwork phase. The evaluation will be conducted over: **(20)** days and this will include

(inception report; design of tools; recruitment and training of data collectors; data collection exercise; data analysis; presentation of draft findings; report writing, feedback; report finalisation)

The consultant will be responsible for defining and implementing the overall approach of the evaluation. The consultant's work includes defining data collection and analysis techniques, structured field visits, and interactions with beneficiaries and the evaluation team. The tools, methodology and conclusions of the evaluation must be reviewed and validated with various stakeholders and approved by the person in charge of the evaluation at Secours Catholique-Caritas France.

The results of the evaluation must be presented, distinguishing between data, interpretations, and value judgments. The conclusions will be presented, as well as the lessons learned (cause and effect relationship between the activities carried out and the conclusions obtained) and the recommendations (proposal to improve the cause-and-effect relationship and the logic of the intervention, information systems that are recommended to be put in place, etc.).

5. STRUCTURE AND FORMAT OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

The evaluation team will be asked to provide:

- An interim report in English (electronic version in Word format). Concluding the evaluation fieldwork, this report will be submitted prior to the return within a reasonable period to allow the interested parties to familiarize themselves with all the documents.

- A final report in English (in electronic version in Word format, between 30-50 pages max, not including annexes). The latter will be accompanied by an executive summary of 3-4 pages maximum including the essential information of the report. The report will integrate the remarks made during the restitution meeting. It will be the property of the SSCF and CAFOD & Trocaire in Partnership (CTP) who may distribute it if necessary.

The evaluation report should contain the following index:

0. Executive Summary: (3-4 pages maximum): including main conclusions and recommendations.
1. Introduction:
   - ✓ Background and purpose of the evaluation.
   - ✓ Initial Questions and Criteria: Definition.
2. Summary description of the intervention evaluated, summary of the background, organization and management, actors involved and context in which the intervention takes place.
3. Methodology used in the evaluation.
   - ✓ Methodology and techniques applied.
   - ✓ Prerequisites and limitations of the study carried out.
4. Analysis of the information collected and answers to the key questions of the evaluation criteria.
5. Conclusions of the evaluation, in relation to the established evaluation criteria.
6. Lessons learned from the overall conclusions that illustrate good practice and can feed back into the intervention's actions or be used for future interventions.

7. Recommendations classified according to the criteria chosen by the evaluation team. If possible, mention the actors to whom the recommendation is addressed.

8. Appendices:

- ✓ ToRs,
- ✓ The work plan, composition, and description of the mission.
- ✓ Proposed methodology, techniques and sources used to collect information.
- ✓ Literature review: list of secondary sources used.
- ✓ Interviews: list of informants, interview plans, transcripts, and notes.
- ✓ Surveys: models, raw data collected and statistical analysis.
- ✓ Participatory workshops: report and products.
- ✓ Claims and comments from different stakeholders on the draft report if they are relevant, including any disagreements that were not reflected in the report.

6. EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team will be composed of one or two experts who should correspond to the desired profile:
The evaluation team will be composed of one or two experts who should correspond to the desired profile:
- Master's degree (Development Studies, Economics, statistics, MEAL, Agriculture, or assimilated disciplines),
- More than 7 years of professional experience with at least 5 years of experience in managing and conducting project evaluations,
- Solid and updated knowledge in Food Security and Livelihoods; WASH, Protection; DRR.
- Knowledge of results-based management principles,
- Knowledge of the Core Humanitarian Standard,
- Mastery of participatory techniques and other approaches to data collection and analysis,
- Advanced excel or Tableau skills in data analysis and management.
- Ability to put forward group dynamics, organize and propose discussion workshops and prepare capitalization documents.
- Knowledge of the local context.
- Ability to synthesize and be able to write documents in English.

The evaluation team will have to present the curriculum vitae of each of its members.

The evaluation team will have to appoint an evaluation coordinator who will have final responsibility for the work and who will serve as a contact with the evaluation management unit.

The evaluation will be carried out in (country) in close collaboration and with the participation and support of (partner).

7. PRESENTATION OF THE TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC OFFER AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

The technical proposals will have to respect the following characteristics:

- Cover showing:
  - Name of the firm or consultant
  - Contact information for the firm or consultant.
  - References, CV, and experience of the consultant(s),
  - Where applicable, the specific roles and responsibilities of the team leader, supervisory chain, and other key members of the evaluation team.
- Technical offer: indicating understanding of the ToR, the selected evaluation methodology, the evaluation matrix, and a detailed work plan.
- Financial offer: including the overall budget (excluding tax and all taxes if VAT is applicable) and detailed prices (fees, per diems, transportation, etc.). Field expenses (accommodation, food, transport, etc.) will not be included, as they will be paid after presentation of supporting documents.

Bids received will be evaluated according to the following criteria and scales:
CRITERION 1: Profile and experience of evaluators (40%)
CRITERION 3: Methodological proposal (40%)
CRITERION 4: Economic offer (20%).
Bidders must also indicate the country of which they are a national by presenting the usual proof in this respect according to their national law (registration number + copy of passport or national identity card).

Place and deadline for submission of tenders:

The technical, economic proposals, registration certificates, CAFOD Policies and CAFOD terms and conditions will be sent to the following e-mail addresses: ctpsupply@cafod.org.uk, indicating on the mail the reference "**CTP SCCF Final Evaluation Fashoda County**", accompanied by a letter of presentation and a photocopy of the identity card or passport.
The deadline for the submission of bids is **(10 May 2024)** at 4:00 pm (Juba time).
The contract will be signed with CTP.