Terms of Reference
for the External End Evaluation (EEE)
of the Addressing Root Causes Programme
in South Sudan

September 2021

1 Addressing Root Causes

1.1 Background

The Addressing Root Causes (ARC) programme in South Sudan is part of a funding scheme set up by the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, aimed at tackling the root causes of armed conflict, instability and irregular migration in a number of countries including South Sudan. The ARC programme has a duration of 5 years, and started in September 2016. The ARC programme seeks to increase community resilience to conflict-related and economically-induced shocks in 19 payams in Jonglei State and the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA), by working on increasing economic resilience, capacities for peaceful conflict resolution and stimulating social cohesion in the intervention areas. Section 2 provides more detail about the programme's Theory of Change.

While the programme originally focused on Pibor, Twic East, Duk and Uror, a relocation to Bor county took place in December 2017 after hostilities broke out in Uror in February 2017. A complementary survey was conducted early in 2018 to collect data informing the interventions in Bor. A Midterm Review (MTR) was conducted in 2019, to asses progress against baseline and provide recommendations for the remainder of the programme.

1.2 Programme Theory of Change

The overall objective of the ARC programme is to address the root causes of armed conflict and instability in South Sudan, by building the resilience of communities to withstand economic and conflict-induced shocks.

In order to achieve the long-term change, CARE and the local partner NGO Humanitarian and Development Consortium (HDC) have distinguished three key intermediary outcomes areas:

- **Outcome 1: Economic Resilience**
  Vulnerable women, men and youth in targeted communities engage in income-generating activities and micro-enterprises and have market linkages with traders across different ethnic communities
- **Outcome 2: Peaceful Conflict Resolution**
  Citizens in targeted communities use peaceful mechanisms to mitigate conflict and reconcile past grievances in a just, effective and inclusive way
- **Outcome 3: Social Cohesion**
  Citizens collaborate with each other, have positive relationships and experience trust within and beyond their communities.

These three outcome areas are mutually reinforcing and together contribute to more resilience and a culture of peace; when all are combined and strengthened, the beneficial effects can address the root causes of conflict and instability and

foster an enabling environment for positive peace. This translates in the following programme ToC:

If women and youth in targeted communities engage in IGA and micro-enterprises and have market linkages with traders across different ethnic **communities (Outcome 1: Economic Resilience)**;

and if citizens in targeted communities use peaceful mechanisms to mitigate conflict and reconcile past grievances in a just, effective and inclusive way **(Outcome 2: Peaceful Conflict Resolution);**

and if citizens collaborate with each other, have positive relationships and experience trust within and beyond their communities (**Outcome 3: Social Cohesion);**

then the ability of communities to mitigate and address negative effects of conflict will increase**,**

because successful engagement on economic initiatives builds incentives to seek peaceful cooperation and vice versa

and because increased contact and interdependence across conflict divides for mutually beneficial purposes leads to peace, increased social cohesion and trust.

Proposed start and end dates for Study:	01- November – 2021 to 01-December - 2021
Final report submission date:	01- December - 2021

2 The assignment

2.1 Objective and scope

The objectives of the assignment are:
1. To **establish the situation at endline** as compared to baseline and midterm using the indicators as defined in the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning plan (see Annex 1. ARC South Sudan Indicators).
2. To **test the validity of key assumptions** (five at minimum) of the Theory of Change (see Annex 2. Overview of assumptions and available data).
3. To **establish the added value** of the programme, in particularly looking at cooperation with local authorities, community structures and with other organisations with similar programmes (including UN).
4. To **identify key lessons learned** in relation to the programme interventions in the different counties and **formulate actionable recommendations** to guide the development of future programming

focussing on resilience to economic or conflict induced shocks.

Scope of the assignment:
The endline evaluation should focus on the targeted communities in Jonglei State and the GPAA namely Twic East, Duk, Bor and Pibor counties. Differences between counties should be analysed.

2.2   Evaluation questions

1.   Establish situation at endline
   1.1   To what extent were the ARC programme objectives as defined in the ToC (at impact and outcome level) achieved?
   1.2   What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
   1.3   What is the progress over time when comparing baseline, midterm and endline results?

2.   Test the validity of key assumptions
   2.2.   What is the available evidence, supporting the 11 programme assumptions?
   2.3.   For which selection of assumptions does additional evidence need to be gathered to assess the validity during the endline evaluation?
   2.4.   To what extent are these selected key assumptions underlying the programme Theory of Change valid?

3.   Establish the added value of the programme
   3.1   Which other actors were active in the programme intervention areas with similar interventions and/or programmes?
   3.2   To what extent did CARE, HDC and partners align their programme interventions and/or cooperate with other INGOs/UN agencies that were active in programme interventions areas?
   3.3   To what extent did CARE, HDC and partners align their programme interventions and/or cooperate local authorities and existing community structures that were active in programme interventions areas?
   3.4   What was the added value of the ARC programme taking into consideration the activities of other relevant actors in the programme intervention areas?

4.   Lessons learned and recommendations
   4.1   Which interventions worked well, which interventions did not work well, which interventions failed and why?
   4.2   What are the main lessons learned for each of the intermediary outcome areas?
   4.3   What are the main recommendations that can guide the development

of future programming and donor policies focussing on resilience to economic or conflict induced shocks?

2.3   Focus and methodology

Focus
For Outcome 1, the EEE should focus on the economic situation of women and youth and community attitudes towards their economic participation and livelihood opportunities. For Outcome 2, the EEE should focus on existing traditional and formal conflict resolution mechanisms and on the actors involved in these processes including elders, traditional and religious leaders and justice and security actors. Also, community perceptions of these mechanisms and actors and their inclusiveness and effectiveness need to be assessed. For Outcome 3, the EEE should focus on inter and intra-communal relations (i.e. between neighboring communities and withing communities) and on perceptions of others in terms of trust and cooperation. Furthermore, progress at impact level should be assessed. The indicators that should be used to track progress are provided in Annex 1. Note that for indicators related to outcomes 1-3 and the impact level indicators, differences between counties should be assessed

Methodology
A mix of quantitative and qualitative methods should be applied. Sprockler, combining quantitative and qualitative methods (story telling) could be a suitable methodology for this end evaluation.

Note that for each of the indicators survey questions were designed based on methodological notes that were provided by the donor. The indicators should be measured using the same survey questions that were used during the Midterm Review. For perception indicators relating to social norms (indicators 1.5, 1.10, 1.19, 3.2, 3.6 and 3.7) the vignettes developed for the MTR as part of the SNAP (Social Norms Analysis Plot) framework should be applied and results at endline should be compared with MTR resuls, <u>in addition to</u> the more quantitative methodology specified in the methodological notes. More information about the SNAP framework can be found here: http://www.care.org/sites/default/files/care-social-norms-paper-web.pdf.

When it comes to the the validity of the assumptions in the Theory of Change, the consultant should suggest a suitable methodology using availabe data where possible and collecting additional data where needed. Note that the validity of some assumptions was assessed in the knowledge activities throughout the programme and the products resulting from those activities should be taken into consideration when answerring evaluation question 2.1.

2.4 Deliverables

In view of the above, the deliverables are (all in English):
1. **An inception report in English** (deadline 1 October 2021) in preparation of the field work, in which the consultant establishes:
   - a detailed methodology for implementation of the baseline (including data-collection tools, samples size, enumerators, etc.);
   - a detailed schedule for the Endline Evaluaiton;
   - a work plan that sets out the preparatory activities and specific deliverables as well as timeline related to the Endline Evaluation.
2. **A validation workshop** (November 2021) where the preliminary results of the Endline Evaluation are presented to the CARE-HDC consortium and other interested stakeholders.
3. **A draft report in English adhering to the format provided in Annex 3** (deadline 17 December 2021**)** addressing the aforementioned consultancy objectives. The draft report is to be no more than 30 pages, excluding cover page and annexes.
4. **A final report in English adhering to the format provided in Annex 3** (deadline 21 January 2022) not exceeding 30 pages (excluding cover page and annexes).
   - Annexes
     - Relevant maps and photographs of the study areas
     - Bibliography of consulted secondary sources
     - Finalized data collection tools (in English)
     - List of key informants
5. The **raw data** should be provided in Excel, in addition to the analytical notes.

3 Consultant profile

The consultant engaged to conduct the MTR studies should have the following qualifications:
- Master's degree in relevant field (e.g. International Development, Peace/Conflict Studies);
- Proven quantitative research skills;
- Proven qualitative research skills;
- Proven professional expertise and experience in the area of monitoring and evaluation, in particular in working with a Theory of Change;
- Experience and expertise in the fields of economic resilience and peacebuilding in fragile contexts, preferably in South Sudan;

- • Strong communicative skills and cultural sensitivity;
- • A high standard of professionalism;
- • Willingness to travel to South Sudan;
- • Ability to work under challenging conditions;
- • Fluency in English.

4 Evaluation and Award of Consultancy

CARE South Sudan will evaluate the proposals and award the assignment based on technical and financial criteria. CARE reserves the right to accept or reject any proposal received without giving reasons and is not bound to accept the lowest, the highest or any bidder. Only the successful applicant will be contacted.
The evaluation criteria associated with this TOR is split between technical and financial as follows:
- – 70 % -Technical
- – 30 % -Financial

Technical Evaluation Criteria

Technical Criteria	Description
General understanding of the TOR.	Does the proposal demonstrate a clear understanding of the TOR ? Does the consultant make an effort to interpret the objectives?
Methodology	To what extent is the methodology clear and detailed? Is the sampling method and sample size compuatation scientifically acceptable? Are all the relavent methods of data collection included in the proposal?
Team composition	Does the consultant (or proposed team) have the necessary competencies and experiences as described in the TOR to undertake this study?
Experience	Experience of conducting baseline and evaluation surveys in South Sudan, preferably within proposed geographical area has competitive advantage. Experience with similar assignments with INGOs/ other organization
Workplan	Is an action plan part of the proposal? Is it reasonable or realistic? Does it meet the expected deadlines? Is it flexible to accomodate any changes without compromising the deadline and quality of products
Budget	To what extent is the presented budget reasonable. Is the budget clearly aligned with the planned amount?

5 Payment Terms and Conditions

Payment will be effected as follows; First installment (30%) of the total cost on submission and acceptance of inception report. Final payment (70%) upon completion and approval of the final report. Additional information on payment terms and conditions will be included in the contract.

6 Budget

Cost of the Evaluation*:* should be summarised as follows with a detailed breakdown attached:

No.	Details	Unit	Rate (US$)	# of Units (Quantity)	Cost (US$)
1	Consultant's fees (excluding data enumerators' costs)				
2	Transport cost				
3	Subsistence costs (e.g. accommodation, communication, meals, etc)				
4	Any other costs that are critical, but not provided for by CARE				
5					

Logistical support (scheduling of interviews, arrangement of field accommodation during data collection, access to official facilities including internet, documentation—printing, photocopying of tools etc.) will be provided by CARE/HDC. The consultant will work with and report to CARE South Sudan MEAL Coordinator and the coordination of overall evaluation work will be supported by the ARC Programme Manager. All communications related to this assignment will be copied to CARE South Sudan DCP Programs, CNL Project Manager and CNL MEAL Lead.

Please note that CARE will bear the cost for Air tickets, airport pickup and drop off, ground transport and accommodation while in Juba and field locations. CARE will also bear the accommodation cost for Q7 (if required for international consultants). Whereas visas are obtainable on arrival at Juba international airport, travellers are advised to obtain visas in countries where they reside. An introduction letter may be provided on request to support processing of visas.

The consultant will be responsible for the cost of meals and other incidentials their

cost per day for the period of the consultancy will be regulated by CARE per diem policy

Note:
The consultant is responsible to pay printing and data entry and analysis cost.
The consultant is also responsible for COVID expenses and adherence to regulations including testing, evacuation and quaratine as per the relvant national authorities' guidance applicable at the time. CARE shall facilitate the process of compliance with COVID regulations.
CARE South Sudan shall withhold relevant taxes as per the Taxation Act, 2009.
The payments will be in one instalment after the completion of the task and submission of final acceptable report to CARE

7 The application process

Interested Parties are requested to submit a proposal explaining their comprehension of the proposed consultancy, and how they would approach this assignment with a summary of their methodology especially in terms of how the party plans to meet the objectives. Additionally, they should submit one or two examples of similar evaluations (including a combination of quantitative and qualitative methodologies) conducted previously. The application should include a team composition with Lead Consultant and at least 2-3 experienced evaluators who must be South Sudanese citizens. International consultants/firms must show proof of in-country capacity to carry out the evaluation within the context of COVID 19 restrictions. The application should include minimum three CVs of the persons to be involved in the assignment, relevant experience, a detailed budget in USD and time availability.

The deadline for submission of proposals from interested parties is **September 25th, 2021.**

Proposals must contain a proposed methodology, work plan and budget.
Proposals can be submitted to Richard.Matale@care.org and copy
Francis.Mette@care.org and Gloria.Poni@care.org

Guiding Principles and Values:
Adherence to CARE Code of conduct, PHSEA, Child Safeguarding practices and confidentiality when interviewing or photographing children.

Only shortlisted candidates will be notified.
NB: The consultancy is for a period of 22 days spread from october 1st, 2021 to February 28th, 2022.

8 Annexes

Annex 1 – ARC South Sudan indicators[1]

ARC impact level and CARE international indicators
ARC 1. Number and % of programme beneficiaries who report that they have real plans to emigrate within the next 12 months. 2. Number and % of programme beneficiaries who report that they see a safer/more secure future for themselves in the area where they currently live. 3. Number and % of programme beneficiaries who report that they see a socio-economic future for themselves in the country where they currently live. CARE International 4. Number and % of people of all genders who have meaningfully participated in formal (government-led) and informal (civil society-led, private sector-led) decision-making spaces 5. Number and % of women who (report they) are able to equally participate in household financial decision-making 6. Number and % of people implementing practices/actions that reduce vulnerability and increase resilience, disaggregated by climate-related, economic, social or environmental events

Outcome 1: Economic Resilience: women and youth in targeted communities engage in IGAs and micro-enterprises and have market linkages with traders across different ethnic communities	
1.a	Relevant indicators: 1.11: Number and % of programme beneficiaries who reported a reduction of negative social/economic interaction across intra-societal divides over the last 6 months *as a result of economic activities of VSLAs* 1.20: Number and % of programme beneficiaries (i.e. women and youth) who report ability to meet current and future (12m) household needs 1.21: Number and % of programme beneficiaries (i.e. women and youth) who report reduced grievances (e.g. those related to conflict, instability or irregular migration) regarding income/livelihoods
1.1.b	Sub-Outcome 1.1 **Women and youth are confident to participate economically and possess relevant tools and skills** 1.5 Percentage of women and youth with positive attitudes towards IGAs and micro-enterprises[2] 1.12: Number (%) of trained women and youth (including VSLA members) who indicate they have a higher income than before their participation in the programme (disaggregated by gender and age) 1.13: Number (%) of trained women and youth (including VSLA members) who indicate they are more confident about meeting their household needs (disaggregated by gender and age) 1.14 Number and % of programme beneficiaries (i.e. women and youth) who started a business/self-employment activity and sustained it six months after they started 1.15 Number (%) of programme beneficiaries (i.e. women and youth) who indicate that their business-self-employment activities (which existed already before the grantees intervention) have grown over the last 6 months (disaggregated by gender and age) 1.17: Number of community members (in communities with livelihood strategies) with income above livelihood protection threshold
1.2.b	Sub-Outcome 1.3 **Men, boys and influential community leaders endorse conflict and gender transformational activities/roles in the economic sphere** 1.4 Number of men/boys and formal/informal leaders that commit to endorse conflict- and gender

---

[1] Note that for each of the indicators survey questions were designed based on the methodological notes that were provided by the donor. The above indicators represent a subset of the full list of indicators to be reported on as part of the ARC Final Narrative in July 2022. The decision was made to focus the EEE on a subset of indicators in order to allow the Consultant the scope to include relevant qualitative analyses in the EEE.

[2] Note that this indicator should be measured using the SNAP (Social Norms Analysis Plot) framework developed by CARE should <u>in addition to</u> the more quantitative methodology specified in the methodological note.

	transformational roles/activities
	1.10 Perceptions by men/boys on the role of women and youth in VSLAs/IGAs and micro-enterprises[3]
Outcome 2 Peaceful Conflict Resolution: Citizens in targeted communities use peaceful mechanisms to mitigate and resolve intra and – inter community conflict and reconcile past grievances in a just, effective and inclusive way	
2.a	Relevant indicators: 2.14: Number and % of programme beneficiaries (i.e. women and youth) who feel they have the ability to contribute to conflict resolution 2.15: Number and % of female programme beneficiaries who participate in and/or lead local peace processes 2.16: Number and % of programme beneficiaries who report a reduction in violent conflicts in the area where they live (disaggregated by gender, age and boma/payam level) 2.17: Number and % of programme beneficiaries who feel secure in the area where they live (disaggregated by gender, age and boma/payam level)
2.1.b	Sub-Outcome 2.1 **Peace clubs show the benefits of reconciliation and non-violent conflict resolution** 2.4B Number of peace clubs in place that manage and prevent conflicts, promote cooperation and reduce security risks 2.6. Number of activities organised by peace committees and peace clubs to promote reconciliation and non-violent conflict resolution
2.2.b	Sub-outcome 2.2 **Peace committees are recognized in and beyond their communities and are well linked to local authorities and legal structures** 2.4A. Number of peace committees in place that manage and prevent conflicts, promote cooperation and reduce security risks 2.5 Number and % of conflicts that are addressed and resolved by community structures (i.e. peace committees **and** peace clubs) that are supported through the programme 2.7. Number (%) of community members that value the work of peace committees and peace clubs 2.8 Number (%) of community leaders who feel that peace committees and peace clubs effectively resolve conflicts 2.11 Level of satisfaction of community members with local security and justice actors (specified per type of actor)

Outcome 3 Citizens collaborate with each other and have positive relationships and experience trust within and beyond their communities	
3.a	Relevant indicators: 3.13 Number and % of communities and civil society groups that demonstrate increased capacity to influence formal and/or informal human security authorities 3.14 Number and percentage of programme beneficiaries who report an increase in trust and cooperation **between** communities
3.1.b	Sub-Outcome 3.1 **Community members focus on commonalities and understand the benefits of peaceful co-existence (peace dividend)** 3.5 Number (%) of community members that report to have personal relations with individuals from other communities/clans 3.10 Number and percentage of programme beneficiaries who report an increase in trust and cooperation **within** the community (disaggregated by gender and age)
3.2 b	Sub-outcome 3.2 **Key influencers (including local authorities) promote intra- and inter-community cooperation and endorse positive non-violent social norms** 3.7 Community perceptions on masculinity and social norms (aggregated by age and gender)[4]
3.3 b	Sub-outcome 3.3. **Community development projects sustainably help to resolve community challenges, with an emphasis on economic opportunities and livelihood security** 3.9. Number (%) of community members who feel ownership over local PRA programmes and their Level of

[3] Note that this indicator should be measured using the SNAP (Social Norms Analysis Plot) framework developed by CARE should in addition to the more quantitative methodology specified in the methodological note.
[4] Note that this indicator should be measured using the SNAP (Social Norms Analysis Plot) framework developed by CARE in addition to the more quantitative methodology specified in the methodological note.

satisfaction in participating with PRA projects

Annex 2 - Overview of assumptions and available data

Outcome 1

Assumption 1
*If at-risk youth are engaged in training, mentoring, and market driven income generating opportunities, **then** the likelihood that they will participate in cattle raids or criminality, or join armed forces decreases, **because** they will have prospects for sustaining their livelihoods, enhanced social status through increased income and a purpose in their daily activities.*
  - ➢ Was discussed in 2019, 2018 and 2017 Annual Report.
  - ➢ Evidence mostly anecdotal due to sensitivity of data collection.

Assumption 2
*If women and youth, through their micro-enterprises, create linkages across clans and ethnic groups, **then** positive non-violent inter-clan and inter-ethnic interactions and exchange will increase, **because** there is mutual economic benefit and thus stronger incentives to cooperate and maintain peace.*
  - ➢ The VSLA research that is currently being conducted will contribute to substantiate this assumption
  - ➢ Was discussed in 2018 and 2017 Annual Report.

Assumption 3 (accidentally omitted during the MTR)
*If we engage men and influential leaders in a dialogue on social and gender norms **and if** we raise awareness about the positive role women (and youth) can play in economic activities, **then** they will become supportive of this idea and promote it in relevant community fora.*
  - ➢ Was discussed in 2017 and 2018 Annual Report and there is ample quantitative data also on perceptions to support this assumption.

Outcome 2

Assumption 4
*If representatives of peace committees and local customary law actors demonstrate benefits of reconciliation and non-violent conflict resolution, **then** communities' security increases, **because** citizens are more likely to use peaceful means to resolve conflict*
  - ➢ Part of MTR (very generic). Sufficient evidence from annual data collection
  - ➢ Was discussed in 2019 and 2018 and 2017 Annual Report.

Assumption 5
If youth are engaged in community reconciliation and conflict resolution processes, **then** they are *less likely to participate in a culture of revenge, **because** they have a social identity and social role that is part of the community identity*
  - ➢ Part of MTR, but produced limited data. Links to assumption 1, could be researched together, as also the peace building manual that has targeted interventions for cattle camp youth.
  - ➢ Was discussed as part of 2018 Annual Report.

Assumption 6

*If communities reconcile and resolve conflict through peaceful means, **then** opportunities for trade and commerce increase, **because** communities are more willing to cooperate and have more trust*
- ➢ Part of MTR, rather limited data. Very similar to assumption 10.
- ➢ Was discussed in 2018 Annual Report

Assumption 7

*If security and justice processes are more inclusive, just and effective, **then** economic activities will increase, **because** citizens perceive a diminution of conflict- related risks that could affect their Income Generating Activities*
- ➢ ARC achieved relatively little in this regard as Community Scorecard didn't really take off and ARC didn't really address the enabling environment for markets.

Assumption 8

*if formal and customary law actors receive training and develop their skills on conflict resolution and justice processes, **then** they will apply these skills (as they feel accountable to their communities as peace makers), **because** security and justice processes are more inclusive, just and effective.*
- ➢ Part of MTR. Indicator data suggests good use of skills (number of referrals, local rulings) but would be good to collect qualitative data as well.
- ➢ Was discussed in 2019 and 2018 Annual Report.

Outcome 3

Assumption 9

*If individuals in and across communities interact with each other in positive and mutually beneficial ways, **then** trust and cooperation within and between communities will increase, **because** personal relations enable people to focus on commonalities instead of differences*
- ➢ Limited quantitative data available.

Assumption 10

*If trust and cooperation within and between communities is strengthened, **then** opportunities for trade and commerce increase, **because** individuals recognize mutual challenges and also benefits of working together to achieve greater economic resilience.*
- ➢ Included in MTR, with limited data.
- ➢ Was discussed in 2019 and 2018 Annual Report.
- ➢ The VSLA research being currently conducted will contribute to substantiate this assumption. Links to assumption 6, could be researched together.

Assumption 11

*If trust and cooperation within and between communities is strengthened **then** the utilization of conflict resolution through peaceful means increases, **because** individuals are better able to identify and appreciate commonalities over differences.*
- ➢ Quantitative data from annual reports suggests good uptake of peaceful conflict resolution mechanisms and their effectiveness.

Annex 3 – Outline evaluation report

Title page	Including: • Title of report • Date of submission • Names of consultants
Table of contents	
Abbreviations	
Executive summary	No longer than 2 pages Including: • Introduction • Methodology • Situation at Endline • Validity of ToC assumptions • Added value of the programme • Conclusions & recommendations
1. Introduction	Including: • **1.1. Background ARC programme** • **1.2 Objectives and scope of evaluation** • **1.3 Current context**

2. Methodology	Including:
	• **2.1 Timeline/process**: Briefly address the timeline and locations of data collection, analysis. Any further information on the team can go in the annex.
	• **2.2 Data collection methodologies**: Brief description of quantitative and qualitative methodologies used in relation to the evaluation questions.
	   - *2.2.1 Documentation review*: Briefly describe the types of documents that were studied for the endline evaluation. Address sampling, if relevant.
	   - *2.2.2 Interviews and FGDs*: Briefly describe the sampling and methods used for interviews and FGDs. Also describe the profile of respondents (demographics etc.).
	   - *2.2.3 Survey and demographics*: Describe the sampling method used for the survey. Also describe the profile of respondents (demographic data of survey respondents) surveyed in the different locations.
	   - *2.2.5 Other methods:* Briefly describe any other data-collection methods you may have used
	• **2.4 Analysis process**: Describe the analysis process you followed, addressing triangulation, analysis of outcomes (via analysis workshop?), and describing the discussion and feedback process (ex. working-meetings with CARE CO, feedback on the report, etc.).
	• **2.5 Ethical considerations and challenges**: Brief description on how ethics were considered, and which challenges were faced in the process (including how these were addressed and/or how it has possibly affected findings/analysis).

3. Situation at endline	**3.1 Outcome 1 - Economic Resilience:** - Results sub-outcome 1.1 Women and youth are confident to participate economically and possess relevant tools and skills. - Results sub-outcome 1.2 Inclusive VSLAs are operational and starting to generating income. - Results sub-outcome 1.3 Men, boys and influential community leaders endorse conflict and gender transformational activities/roles in the economic sphere. - Results overall outcome 1: Economic Resilience. *Please describe differences between counties. Also describe how results relate to the baseline situation, midterm situation and to programme activities. If programme activities did not lead to expected results, please explain why.* **3.2 Outcome 2 - Peaceful Conflict Resolution** - Results sub-outcome 2.1 Peace clubs show the benefits of reconciliation and non-violent conflict resolution. - Results sub-outcome 2.2 Peace committees are recognized in and beyond their communities and are well linked to local authorities and legal structures. - Results sub-outcome 2.3 Formal and customary justice and security actors apply justice processes in line with the existing legal framework and practices of good governance and accountability. - Results sub-outcome 2.4 Community Score Card processes with justice and security actors and community members (service users) are inclusive and effective. - Results assumptions 3, 4 and 5 and 7. - Results overall outcome 2: Peaceful conflict resolution. *Please describe differences between counties. Also describe how results relate to the baseline situation, midterm situation and to programme activities. If programme activities did not lead to expected results, please explain why.* **3.3 Outcome 3: Social Cohesion** - Results sub-outcome 3.1 Community members focus on commonalities and understand the benefits of peaceful co-existence (peace dividend) - Results sub-outcome 3.2 Key influencers (including local authorities) promote intra- and inter-community cooperation and endorse positive non-violent social norms. - Results sub-outcome 3.3. Community development projects sustainably help to resolve community challenges, with an emphasis on economic opportunities and livelihood security. - Results assumption 9. - Results overall outcome 3 Citizens collaborate with each other and have positive relationships and experience trust within and beyond their communities. *Please describe differences between counties. Also describe how results relate to the baseline situation, midterm situation and to programme activities. If programme activities did not lead to expected results, please explain why.*

	3.4 Impact level results Results on impact level indicators 1, 2 and 3. *Please describe differences between counties. Also describe how results relate to the baseline situation and to programme activities. If programme activities did not lead to expected results, please explain why.* **3.5 In conclusion: based on the analysis presented in this chapter, describe** - the situation at midterm as compared to baseline - whether progress that has taken place over time as a result of the ARC programme. - if programme activities did not lead to expected results, please explain why.
4. Validity of ToC assumptions	**4.1 Validity of assumptions 1-11** **4.2 Conclusion**
5. Added value of the porgramme	**5.1 Alignment and cooperation with other actors** **5.2 Added value ARC programme**
6. Conclusions and recommendations	**6.1 Main conclusions** **6.2 Lessons learned** **6.3 Recommendations for future programming and policies**
Annexes	Including: • **An annex on methods**, which should include: - Finalised data collection tools (mandatory) - Detailed description of sampling methods (e.g. sampling formula), detailed final composition of samples, disaggregated by gender and location. - Any remarkable changes from design of data-collection x actual implementation • **Bibliography:** Include a full list of consulted programme documents and other relevant literature. • **List of respondents:** Provide an overview of respondents for the interviews/FGD and validation workshop participants. - For the KII interview list, please include name, organisation, and position of respondents, and date/location of interview. If anonymity was asked, please indicate that on the list. - For the FGD with community members, please inform the profile of participants (gender and age, if they belong to some organisation), date and location where it happened. If you held FGD with public authorities or leaders, please follow the guidance of the KII list (bullet above) - For other methods please include profile of particpantes, date and location wher it happened. - For the validation workshop, please inform date and location and the position/organisation of participants. • **Relevant maps and photographs of the study areas**

Annex 4 - IOB Evaluation quality criteria

The EEE shall follow the requirements and quality criteria as set out by The Netherlands' Ministry of Foreign Affairs' Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB). The IOB Evaluation Quaility Criteria (Short version, 10 December 2020) are as follows:

Introduction

Since long IOB uses evaluation quality criteria to assess the quality of evaluation reports. At the same time, these criteria are useful when designing an evaluation, during the formulation of the Terms of Reference and the elaboration of the methodology, as well as during the evaluation itself. Over the years, IOB made some modifications in the evaluation quality criteria, resulting in this latest set of December 2020. The evaluation quality criteria are grouped around subjects that are usually followed in this order in an evaluation report.

Quality control of the evaluation

1. **A reference group oversees the evaluation.** This group is composed of the commissioner of the evaluation, members with both thematic and evaluation experience, including at least one independent member. The role of the reference group is to assure evaluation quality and independence. It advises the commissioner on the Terms of Reference and evaluation questions, the selection of evaluators, the elaborated methodology (inception report), and the draft evaluation report.
2. **Evaluators are independent**. The evaluators and affiliated organisations have not been involved in the design or implementation of the intervention (project, programme, policy) under evaluation, and have no interest in the outcome of the evaluation.

Description and background of the intervention

3. **Description of the context of the intervention.** This can include the national, sector, and political context, and explains the rationale of the intervention.
4. **Description of the intervention.** Preferably in a theory of change (ToC), otherwise an intervention logic or result chain. The evaluator may need to reconstruct a ToC, using whatever is available in project documentation, but with a critical reflection from the evaluator's point of view.
5. **Validation of the assumptions underpinning the ToC.** The evaluator validates the ToC assumptions, which may refer to cause effect relations with in the result chains, to the context, or to broader world views on development. The evaluator makes use of broader literature (reviews) to reflect on the validity of the ToC.

Objective and delimitation of the evaluation

6. **Description of the objective of the evaluation**. Clarify what the evaluation results will be used for. There may be several objectives and it helps to distinguish:
   a. a knowledge objective (knowing what works, how it works); this can be translated into knowledge questions that will result in conclusions.
   b. an action objective (recommending what to do); this can be translated into policy questions that will result in recommendations.

7. **Delimitation of the evaluation.** Clarify what part of the intervention, expenditure, period, or even what part of the ToC, is of interest for this evaluation.

Evaluation questions

8. **Choice of OECD-DAC evaluation criteria to be covered.** Based on the evaluation objectives and limitations, it may turn out that not all evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact sustainability and coherence) are needed. This in turn will be reflected in the evaluation questions. (See OECD DAC revised evaluation criteria 2019).[5]
9. **Clear set of evaluation questions.** The evaluation questions follow logically from the intervention under evaluation, evaluation objective and delimitation, and chosen evaluation criteria. Evaluation questions should not be too general or vague, but also not be a too many and too detailed, losing focus. In line with the distinction between the knowledge and policy objectives (see criterion 6), it helps to distinguish:
    a. knowledge questions, resulting in conclusions
    b. action questions, resulting in recommendations

Evaluation methodology

A note of caution, our objective is to assess the evaluation methodology *as it has been conducted*, not as it has been intended. This means that for example good intentions in the methodology chapter or an inception report will have to be verified in the actual results and conclusions chapters.

10. **The research design is clearly elaborated and shows how the research results will contribute to answers to the evaluation questions.** The design may consist of several quantitative and / or qualitative methods. If more than one method is used, the quality assessment looks both at the individual methods and the combination of methods.

    a. Quantitative methods include three main research designs: survey, time series and experiment / quasi-experiment (see explanation under 11).
    b. Qualitative methods are mainly based on elements of the Case Study approach and the Grounded Theory approach. Methods include many research designs, some of which are more suitable for evaluating effectiveness, and less susceptible for bias, than others[6] (see explanation under 11).

Under the following five criteria, 11-15, a distinction is made between qualitative and quantitative methods, acknowledging that an evaluation often uses several methods.

11. **The methods are appropriate to evaluate effectiveness: attribution and / or contribution (if effectiveness is an evaluation criterion/question).**

    a. Quantitative methods can make a firm claim on the effect that can be attributed to the project. Attribution is best assessed in an experiment that combines a before-after comparison with a with-without comparison. Second best options include a quasi-experimental design, a with-without comparison with matching techniques, and time series or before-after comparison without a control.

---

[5] Also cross cutting subjects to be considered in the evaluation can be mentioned here, such as gender, poverty reduction, inclusiveness or climate smartness.
[6] A good overview is provided by White and Pillips, 2012. They made an inventory of eight evaluation methods and distinguished four that make a more plausible claim of effectiveness: Realist Evaluation, Contribution Analysis, Process Tracing, and General Elimination Methodology.

   b. Qualitative methods can make a plausible claim about the effect that the project has contributed to. The qualitative evaluation methods that allow a plausible claim have the following steps in common[1]: (i) formulate the cause-effect contribution question; (ii) reconstruct an intervention theory; (iii) formulate an alternative theory; (iv) collect data along intervention and alternative theory; (v) validate the theories step by step.

12. **The methods are appropriate to evaluate efficiency (if this is an evaluation criterion/question).** The evaluation needs to specify what aspect of efficiency is considered[7].
   a. Quantitative methods: e.g. calculation of cost-effectiveness, timeliness of implementation, overhead costs, etc.
   b. Qualitative methods: e.g. assessment of demonstration or leverage effects and scaling, etc.
13. **The indicators or result areas are appropriate to capture the planned results along the different levels in the ToC.**
   a. Quantitative methods: indicators are defined at different levels (e.g. output, outcome, impact; context and other assumptions) in the ToC. Indicators should be SMART and valid to measure the planned results.
   b. Qualitative methods: result areas and processes, including assumptions that are part of the ToC, are defined at and between different levels (e.g. output, outcome, impact; context and other assumptions) in the ToC, and are valid to assess the planned results.
14. **Justified choice of sample, cases and information sources (e.g. choice of countries, projects, organisations and persons)**
   a. Quantitative methods: Well justified choice of sampling (e.g. random, stratified), (type of respondents, external validity), sample size (power calculation, response rate), and discussion of the limitations.
   b. Qualitative methods: Well justified choice of the selection of cases and / or qualitative sample (based on strategic, theoretical or practical considerations), number of cases (internal validity, saturation), and discussion of the limitations.
15. **The analyses are appropriate, given the chosen research design.**
   a. Quantitative methods: appropriate statistical analyses, given the research design, chosen indicators and sample size; appropriate comparisons: e.g. difference in difference, analyses of variance, regressions analyses, matching techniques.
   b. Qualitative methods: the data analyses methodology is clear, given the research design, and includes e.g. theory construction, coding, comparing cases.
16. **Summary of the methodology in an evaluation matrix.** This matrix shows how (i) evaluation questions are translated into (ii) sub-questions / indicators / result areas, and (iii) methodologies and (iv) information sources.
17. **Sufficient independent information sources.** Besides information sources among project implementers, direct beneficiaries and other local stakeholders, the evaluator should also independently select and consult sufficient independent sources, e.g. the opinion of other experts or non-beneficiaries that can critically reflect on the intervention, objective observations, or validated secondary data.
18. **Triangulation of results from different information sources.** This includes a comparison and critical reflection by the evaluator of results from different sources

---

[7] The OECD-DAC evaluation criteria for efficiency considers the aspects (i) cost-effectiveness and (ii) operational efficiency, but there are more aspects of efficiency.

and results from different research methodologies (i.e. quanti and/or quali), data collection methods (i.e. interviews, surveys, observations) and data sources (i.e. persons, documents, sites).

19. **Discussion and avoidance of bias.** The evaluator provides a critical reflection of different forms of bias (sample bias, respondent bias, evaluator bias) and addresses these as much as possible.
20. **Systematic, complete and transparent description of the data collection and analysis.** In principle, if another evaluator would apply the same methodology, this should result in the same findings and conclusions (replicability).
21. **Discussion of the limitations of the evaluation.** The evaluator is self-critical and discusses the limitations of the study, including reliability, internal and external validity, relative contribution of the intervention and other external factors to the observed changes.

Results and conclusions

22. **Conclusions answer research questions.** Although conclusions may be organised or grouped differently than the original research questions, in principle all research questions are answered, or accompanied by an explanation why they could not be answered.
23. **Conclusions follow logically from the research findings.**

    a. Complete and transparent presentation of the results of each method, to avoid jumping to conclusions. Detailed results can be presented in an annex.
    b. Discussion of the limitations and validity of the conclusions (in line with C21)

24. **Validation of draft conclusions.** To strengthen the validity of the conclusions, the draft conclusions are discussed, e.g. in a validation workshop, with project implementers, independent experts, and compared with findings in earlier evaluations and broader literature.

Usefulness an readability of the evaluation report

25. **Recommendations should be useful and practical, given the evaluation objectives and its intended users**
26. **The report is well readable, consistent, and includes a clear summary with evaluation objective, evaluation questions, conclusions and recommendations.**