



THE
LUTHERAN
WORLD
FEDERATION

World Service

member of **actalliance**

Diakonie 
Katastrophenhilfe

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR END-LINE EVALUATION CONSULTANCY IN MAGWI
AND TWIC EAST COUNTIES IN SOUTH SUDAN – PROJECT NO. K-SSD-2021-4079

Organization	Lutheran World Federation
Project Title	Response to Complex Humanitarian Situation in Magwi and Twic East Counties in South Sudan
Sector(s)	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Food Security2. Livelihoods3. Shelter4. Protection
Project period	15 th November 2021 to 14 th November 2022
Period covered by the evaluation	15 th November 2021 to 14 th November 2022
Assignment	Conduct End-line Evaluation
Specific Location(s)	Assignment Magwi County (Eastern Equatoria State); Magwi Payam, Obbo Payam, Pajok Payam, Pageri Payam and Nimule Payam Twic East County(Jonglei State); Pakeer Payam, Ajuong Payam, Nyuak Payam, Lith Payam and Kongor Payam
Reporting To:	Program Coordinator based in Juba with support from Deputy Program Coordinator, Area Coordinators(Magwi & Twic East) and PMER Manager
Duration	30 days
Possible start date	10 th November 2022
Possible end date	9 th December 2022

1.0 INTRODUCTION

LWF South Sudan Program with financial support from Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe is implementing a project that **responds to the complex humanitarian situation in Magwi and Twic East Counties in South Sudan**. The project aims to reach out to at least **5,300** Vulnerable Households through Multipurpose cash; 430 vulnerable households through conditional cash for shelter; **10** community-based protection networks and **150** women leaders through training; and **1400** women at risk through various GBV-related interventions. The project started on the 15th of November 2021 and will end on the 14th of November 2022.

2.0 COMMISSIONING ORGANISATIONS/ OWNER'S TEAM

The Lutheran World Federation (LWF) as an implementing partner is an International NonGovernmental Organization with its headquarters in Geneva and represented by a Country office in South Sudan. The Country office is further developed into LWF's four sub-offices of Jonglei (since 2004), Maban (since 2012), Ajuong-Thok (Jamjang, since 2012); and Magwi (since 2019). The LWF South Sudan Program focuses on three programmatic areas, namely Livelihoods, Quality Services, and Protection and Social Cohesion. LWF South Sudan program generally targets the most vulnerable rights holders, including refugees, IDPs, returnees, refugee-hosting communities, and other at-risk local communities.

On the other hand, Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe (DKH) as the financial partner is the humanitarian assistance agency of the Protestant Agency for Diakonie and Development (EWDE). It forms part of the Protestant Churches in Germany with its headquarters in Berlin and is represented by its Country Office in South Sudan with support from the Regional Office for Eastern and Southern Africa in Nairobi. Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe provides humanitarian aid worldwide through partner organisations. As a donor to this project, DKH will review and approve crucial project parts such as planning and procurement; and will monitor the execution closely.

3.0 AIM OF THE CONSULTANCY

This consultancy aims to assess the performance of the project and capture project achievements, challenges, best practices, lessons learned and recommendations to inform future similar programming. It will also review the recommendations of the project Mid Term Review, monitoring/field visit reports, and assess the extent to which they were implemented.

3.1 Scope

The evaluation will cover the period from the 15th of November 2021 to the 14th of November 2022 to create an accurate and comprehensive picture of the project implementation, generating findings on evaluation criteria and documenting best practices and lessons learned and recommendations for future similar programming. It shall be conducted in (Eastern Equatoria State), Magwi County in the following Payams; Magwi, Obbo, Pajok, Pageri and Nimule.

4.0 PROJECT

4.1 Expected Outcome and Impact

The project intends to address critical needs identified in both counties with a major focus on addressing basic needs through multipurpose cash transfers in Magwi and Twic East Counties; support shelter building to integrate returnees and hosts through conditional cash transfer in Magwi County; and address protection concerns for women, including Gender Based Violence risks in Magwi County.

The Overall Impact is to contribute to building resilient communities through vulnerability reduction in Eastern Equatoria and Jonglei States, with the project aiming at enhancing the resilience of households, individuals and communities affected by the impact of conflict, floods and consequences of COVID-19 in Magwi and Twic East counties.

4.2 Objectives

The project has two objectives:

1. ***Vulnerable communities in Magwi and Twic East Counties in Eastern Equatoria and Jonglei States, respectively, have improved access to basic needs.***

This objective is implemented both in Magwi and Twic East Counties. The objective will be realized in two main ways;

First through Multipurpose cash transfers to 5,300 most vulnerable members of the communities such as the elderly and disabled, widows; and orphans in Magwi and Twic East Counties. The multipurpose cash will help the most vulnerable households to cover the most pressing and lifesaving needs, which may include food, lifesaving NFIs, health, and education among others.

Secondly, it will be through conditional cash transfer for shelter to 430 households in Magwi County only. The conditional cash for shelter will target returnees, the elderly, people with chronic illness, people living with disabilities, female-headed households, and child-headed households. The conditional nature of the project entails the beneficiaries' contribution through erecting their shelters up to the wall plate level upon which they will get a token for materials equivalent to cover for the roof, doors and windows. Their contribution is to foster ownership and sustainability. It additionally aims at minimizing the risk of diverting the money to other needs other than shelter.

2. ***Protection strengthened in five Payams of Magwi County in Eastern Equatoria state***

This objective is implemented in Magwi County only. It aims at achieving two results.

First, it intends to improve protection through strengthened women's community networks that include Community Based Protection Networks (CBPNs); women's justice networks (WJNs); and women leaders. This will be achieved through training, human rights awareness sessions; advocacy meetings and having a functional Women and Girls Friendly Space (WGFS) in one of the border-Payam to provide psychosocial support to women and girls. At least 200 individuals will be reached.

Secondly, the objective will be realised by protecting 1400 women at risk from GBV in Magwi County in Eastern Equatoria. This will be through the provision of fuel-efficient stoves, livelihood skills, GBV prevention messaging, the celebration of 16 Days of Activism and timely and safe access to necessary case management services, including medical, legal, psychosocial and family- Magwi County. Refer to table 1 for details of the results chain

Table 1: Results chain

	DESCRIPTION	INDICATORS ¹	MEANS OF VERIFICATION
Overall Objective²	Vulnerable communities in Eastern Equatoria States have improved community resilience.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Progress/interim reports and final report - Monitoring and evaluation reports - Documentation of success stories, best practices and lessons learnt
Project Objective³	Objective 1: Vulnerable communities in Magwi Counties in Eastern Equatoria States, respectively have improved access to basic needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 80 % of beneficiaries (f/m) report meeting basic needs through the intervention - 80% of targeted household register improved food consumption 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Progress/interim reports and final report - Monitoring and evaluation reports - Documentation of success stories, best practices and lessons learnt -PDM reports
	Objective 2: Protection strengthened in five Payam's of Magwi County in Eastern Equatoria state.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 80 % of people in five reporting improved protection - 80% of the targeted beneficiaries reporting that humanitarian assistance was delivered in a safe accessible accountable and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Survey report - Monitoring and evaluation reports

¹ Please refer to the DKH Indicator Guidance for cash and voucher projects, and to DKH DRR PCM Toolkit - Tool 6: DKH DRR Monitoring & Baseline Guidelines. Otherwise no more than 3 objective indicators.

² Describe the intended outcome of your project in terms of direct benefits for the target groups. This should be logically achievable when all of the results have been achieved.

³ The results are the final products and services (outputs) provided by through the intervention

		participatory manner	
Result 1.1	5,300 Vulnerable Households received Multipurpose cash grants in Magwi Counties of Eastern Equatoria States, respectively.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 80% of targeted households reporting adequate access to household non-food items - 100% of HHs confirm receipt of multipurpose cash at end of the cash transfer - 100% of the selected HHs report having received 100 % of the cash entitlement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Beneficiaries Cash distribution list - Progress/Interim reports and final report - Training report - Monitoring and evaluation reports - Documentation of success stories, best practices and lessons learnt - PDM reports
Activities	<p>Magwi County</p> <p>1.1.1. Conduct sensitization of stakeholders on cash transfer in Magwi County</p> <p>1.1.2. Form and train the Cash Distribution Committee (CDC) at each Payam of the project intervention, one committee composes 9 members (at least 5 females) in Magwi</p> <p>1.1.3. Form and Train Complain Response Committee (CRM) at each Payam of the project intervention, one committee Composes of 4 members (2 F, 2M) in Magwi</p> <p>1.1.4. Carry out identification, selection, verification, and registration of beneficiaries for Multipurpose cash in Magwi County</p> <p>1.1.5. Design and print beneficiaries' tokens in Magwi County</p> <p>1.1.6. Provide multipurpose cash grants for 2000 HHs in Magwi County</p> <p>1.1.7. Conduct Post Cash Distribution Monitoring (PDM) in Magwi County</p>		
Result 1.2	430 Vulnerable households received conditional cash for shelter in Magwi County	<p>80% of the target population living in safe and dignified shelters.</p> <p>100% of targeted HHs confirm receipt of conditional cash for shelter</p> <p>98% of HHs who received conditional cash transfers have improved/built/ their shelter at the end of the cash transfer.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Beneficiaries Cash distribution list - Progress/Interim reports and final report - Monitoring and evaluation reports - Documentation of success stories, best practices and lessons learnt - PDM reports

Activities	<p>Magwi County</p> <p>1.2.1. Carry out identification, selection, verification, and registration of shelter beneficiaries in Magwi County.</p> <p>1.2.2. Design and print 430 beneficiaries' tokens-Magwi County</p> <p>1.2.3. Provide conditional cash for shelter for the 430 HHS in Magwi County 430 beneficiaries</p> <p>1.2.4. Conduct Post Cash Distribution Monitoring (PDM) in Magwi County</p>		
Result 2.1	<p>The targeted communities in Magwi County in Eastern Equatoria have improved protection through strengthened women's community networks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5 Community Based Protection Networks (CBPNs) strengthened and functional - 5 women justice networks (WJNs) formed and functional - 150 women trained in leadership and actively engaged in decision-making in the community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Progress/Interim reports and final report -Monitoring and evaluation reports -Documentation of success stories, best practices and lessons learnt -CBPNs and WJNs action plan and regular reports
	<p>2.1.1. Form Community-Based Protection Networks (CBPNs) in five Payams. The networks will compose of Form and Community Based Protection Networks (CBPNs) in five Payams.</p> <p>2.1.2. Facilitate protection risks and human rights awareness sessions through radio and other forms-Magwi County</p> <p>2.1.3. Establish Women Justice Networks (WJNs) to identify, lead and advocate for women's equality and accountability issues- Magwi County</p> <p>2.1.4. Conduct Advocacy meetings for establishing Women Justice Networks (WJNs)-Magwi County</p> <p>2.1.5. Train 150 women on leadership and women's rights to increase their participation in decision-making processes at the community level- Magwi County</p> <p>2.1.6. Open and make functional one Women and Girls Friendly Space (WGFS) in one of the border-Payams to provide psychosocial support to women and girls-Magwi County</p>		

Result 2.2	1400 women at risk protected from GBV in Magwi County in Eastern Equatoria	# Of women supported -Number of GBV cases referred	
Activities	2.2.1. Provide Fuel-Efficient Stoves (FES) as a GBV risk mitigation measure- Magwi County 2.2.2. Provide livelihood skills training through Village Savings and Loans Association (VSLA) approaches to 50 women and support with start-up capitals to begin and sustain their small businesses (this is a GBV mitigation measure- Magwi County 2.2.3. Conduct GBV prevention messaging at WGFS in the community and via radio- Magwi County 2.2.4. Facilitate celebration of 16 Days of Activism- Magwi County 2.2.5. Assist GBV victims with timely and safe access to necessary case management services, including medical, legal, psychosocial and family- Magwi County		

5.0 Study Purpose

5.1 Specific Objectives

The evaluation specifically serves to;

1. Assess the appropriateness of the intervention design and approaches in addressing the identified problems, considering the context, adaptability in the context of conflict/displacement and reaching the interventions to the marginalized people **(Relevance)**.
2. Measure the extent to which the intervention has achieved or is likely to achieve its intended, immediate results, i.e. the outputs **(efficiency)** and outcomes **(effectiveness)** against the project log frame which includes identification of major reasons for achievement or non-achievement of results
3. Identify key lessons learnt, best practices and challenges and draw evidence-based recommendations for future similar programming
4. Assess the potential for, or contribution and progress made in, achieving lasting solutions and behaviour changes with a major focus on **(sustainability)** and the extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.
5. Assess the quality of governance and management of the project and organization
6. Measure the extent to which the intervention has achieved or contributed to the achievement of the project's goal/**impact** and the wider scope of the development goal
7. Assess the synergies between the project and other LWF interventions, the **coherence** of the intervention with policies and programs of other partners operating within the same context and also assess if the intervention design and delivery was in line with the humanitarian principles

5.2 Evaluation criteria and questions

Table 2: Proposed Evaluation questions

S/No	Evaluation elements	Proposed evaluation questions
1	Relevance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the intervention constitute an adequate response to the current needs and rights of the beneficiaries? Are there any stories of change? 2. Has the intervention improved the present institutional and financial capacities of the partners and any other key stakeholders with a role in implementation? 3. Is the choice of implementation method including the partnerships proving to be appropriate? 4. Do all the stakeholders demonstrate effective commitment to the objectives of the intervention (i.e., Ownership)? 5. To what extent are the project activities relevant or suited to the priorities of beneficiaries and the existing government policies and strategies? 6. To what extent are the objectives of the project valid? 7. Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the development goal and the attainment of its objective? 8. Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the intended impacts and effects? 9. To what extent was the project able to adapt and provide an appropriate response to context changes and emerging local needs, and the priorities of beneficiaries? 10. Was the choice of using mainly cash rather than in-kind assistance justified in terms of needs, availability and functionality of markets, and beneficiary households' preferences? If preferences of different groups differ (data disaggregation), what is the reason 11. To what extent did beneficiary selection criteria complement the targeting of other humanitarian assistance provided in the area? Were there any significant gaps for particular community groups
2.	Intervention logic, monitoring and learning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent does the current intervention take into account past experiences, good practices and lessons learned from previous interventions? 2. What is the current quality of the intervention logic? Are the planned outputs and outcomes coherent and feasible, and have the key assumptions and risks been clearly identified? 3. Is the horizontal logic of the Logical Framework Matrix (LWF) adequate? I.e., choice of indicators, data availability, baseline data, target values and relevant disaggregation?

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Does the intervention have an adequate or effective internal monitoring system? . 5. Are there any lessons learnt and good practices that would be useful to share beyond the intervention context? Are the lessons learnt being shared between the project partners?
3	Coherence	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent were context factors (political stability or instability, population movements, etc.) considered in the design and delivery of the intervention? 2. To what extent was the intervention coherent with the policies and programs of other partners operating within the same context? 3. To what extent was the intervention design and delivery in line with the humanitarian principles 4. What have been the synergies between the intervention and other LWF interventions?
4	Effectiveness	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent have the planned objectives in the log frame of the project, been achieved 2. To what extent have the project activities contributed to the overall goal? 3. To what extent are the results inclusive, (ensuring the fair distribution of effects across different groups of the population)? How well did the targeting mechanism function, what were the (potential) inclusion and exclusion errors (by design and through implementation), and what tensions were caused, if any? 4. What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives? 5. Does the intervention effectively influence the partners' relevant policies and interventions? 6. Is the intervention having any unintended positive or negative effects? Were the negative effects considered for possible risk mitigation?
5	Efficiency	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes? 2. Was the intervention cost-efficient? 3. How timely was the response in relation to the needs of different community groups, seasonality/flood, security challenges, accessibility of the target areas, and comparatively with other humanitarian response actions in the areas? How could timeliness have been improved? 4. Was the intervention implemented most efficiently compared to alternatives? 5. Did the targeting of the intervention mean that resources were allocated efficiently?

6	Effectiveness of management arrangements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the project received adequate political, technical and administrative support? 2. Was there a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities by all parties involved? 3. How effective is communication between the project team, partners and financial partners? 4. Was the budget and available financial resources realistic for the achievement of the intended objectives and outputs? 5. Generally, is there a potential for optimisation concerning planning, procurement and logistics? Would it have been possible to obtain certain goods in a better way and, perhaps, cheaper somewhere else? 6. Has there been enough time allowed for the achievement of the intended objectives and outputs? 7. Is there enough staff, of appropriate competency, for the achievement of the intended objective and outputs? 8. Are there appropriate financial systems in place? 9. Are there appropriate logistics systems and other support systems (eg HR) in place? 10. Was the selected service provider good value for money?
7	Sustainability	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How effectively has the project built the necessary capacity of people and institutions? 2. How effectively has the project built local ownership and capacity? 3. Has the private sector been sufficiently involved in contributing to the sustainability of the intervention? 4. Does the proposed intervention increase resilience to shocks and pressures by addressing specific dimensions of fragility and their root causes? 5. Will the changes caused by this programme continue beyond the life of the project? 6. What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project? 7. Does a sensible exit strategy exist including a schedule and guidelines for the transfer of responsibility and activities to government departments and/or development organisations? Is there a budget scenario for the time after the assistance
8	Impact	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What has happened as a result of the project? 2. What real difference has the activity made to beneficiaries? 3. Have outputs been achieved? And if so, to what extent have outcomes been achieved? 4. How did beneficiaries use the funds?

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. What were the changes seen in the lives of the beneficiary households attributable to the project? 6. Which negative coping mechanisms have been avoided or reduced due to the support provided through the project? 7. To what extent (including for how long and to which degree) were vulnerable unconditional cash transfer beneficiary households able to meet their nutritional and other basic needs during critical periods? 8. What psychological effects have the response had (e.g. do beneficiaries feel dignified, empowered, trusted and respected due to cash
9	Accountability	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What mechanisms and processes were used to disseminate relevant project information to beneficiaries and other concerned stakeholders? How effective were the mechanisms in terms of coverage and ensuring beneficiary knowledge of the project? 2. To what extent did the beneficiary households know their rights and entitlements in relation to the project? 3. Were beneficiary households aware of their right to complain in case of any irregularities and that their complaints would be welcomed and addressed? What system was in place at the community level to ensure that? What was the role of the community-level cash committees in relation to this? What was the level of utilization of this mechanism (e.g. cases recorded per month)? How satisfied are affected communities with the mechanism? 4. Was there a process in place to receive, process and resolve complaints? What were some key findings and lessons learnt on this aspect? 5. Was beneficiary accountability carried out independently and impartially from other project activities? 6. To what extent was information obtained from post-distribution monitoring (PDM) activities during the course of implementation used to make adjustments, if any? What gaps exist or improvements could be made for future projects? 7. What collaboration and coordination mechanisms were adopted during the implementation of the project and to what extent have such mechanisms added value?
10	Key Lessons learnt	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the good practices and key lessons learnt from the interventions, as well as the practices in the project areas and among beneficiaries in relation to targeting criteria, transfer modality and delivery mechanism, conditionality, restriction, seasonality, security, gender relations, the influence (positive and negative) of existing community

		<p>structures, coping mechanisms and the impact of the project on local markets? These need to be highlighted with concrete recommendations for future interventions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. What should be repeated and developed for the next phase of the project? What should not be repeated the next time? 3. How did the financial service provider perform and is there any key lessons for the employment of such a FSP (e.g. improvements to contractual arrangement etc.?) 4. Organisationally what lessons can be learnt from the cash interventions for LWF and DKH? 5. What are the learnings from a Do-no-Harm perspective? Were there any incidences of conflict on any level with regards to the distribution of cash to selected beneficiaries (HH level, intra- and inter-communal level)? Were there any protection issues recorded and what would be lessons learnt from that?
--	--	--

6.0 Methodology

The evaluation methodology will be proposed by the evaluator after a thorough study of TOR's requirements. The evaluator is expected to use a mixed method approach and/or Most Significant Change Technique (MSCT), collecting both qualitative and quantitative information from targeted households and communities members

Data will be disaggregated into gender, age, diversity⁴, location, and other relevant markers to allow precise analysis of the Project's impact on target beneficiaries in different locations, and on different age groups and stakeholders.

Potential methods to be used:

- Desk review of project documents (proposal, log frame, detailed monitoring plan, progress reports including project monitoring data and studies, budget and financial documents) and other Relevant internal and external documents, literature, and secondary data.
- Household survey
- Key Informant Interviews with Country office staff, regional teams, advisers, project officers, community members, partner organizations' staff, religious leaders, Cultural leaders, Women Leaders and County Authorities among other stakeholders.
- Focus Group Discussions with targeted beneficiaries (female and male of different age groups as well as Persons with disability).
- Visits to selected project sites and direct observation of the conditions of shelters, and households among others.
- Collection of Most-Significant-Change stories
- Photo- and video documentation with before/after comparison and GPS tagging if legally possible.

⁴ This will include IDPs, host community, refugees, returnees disability

7.0 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Below are the expected roles and responsibilities of each partner but may expand further in the contract with more specificity:

LWF shall;

1. Contract the consultants
2. Facilitate transport from Juba to field locations and back to Juba including local transport while in the field
3. Provide food and accommodation for the consultants while in the field locations during the data collection exercise
4. Help the consultant to identify and have to access the relevant actors for interviews and field visits and will provide the consultant with available documentation.
5. Support to the consultant to access any relevant documents from any of its sub-granted partners as may be required by the consultant.

DKH shall;

1. Provide an oversight role in the procurement process
2. Provide overall technical guidance and support

Consultant(s) shall;

1. Submit clear technical and financial proposals as indicated in this Terms of Reference(TOR)
 - **Technical proposals should include:**
 - a) Elaboration of sampling strategy
 - b) Elaboration of data collection methods
 - c) Tentative evaluation grid
 - d) Elaboration on analytical methods and presentation of results
 - e) Recommendations
 - **Financial proposals have to show explicitly:**
 - a) The total amount in US Dollars (USD)
 - b) incl. any/all fees and withholding tax if applicable
 - c) incl. detailed costing for each staff on a day/half-day basis
 - d) incl. detailed costing for any other expenses (if not taken care of by another party as stipulated above)
2. The consultant will be responsible to:
 - Prepare a detailed checklist and questionnaires for the evaluation work and coordinate the evaluation,
 - Conduct field visits, discussions, and interviews.
 - Collect field data.
 - Conduct field assessments survey
 - Train enumerators on data collection,
 - Cover per diem cost for data collectors or enumerators, supervisors, and any related expertise cost.
 - Conduct evaluation field assessments,

- Upon return from the fieldwork, the consultant shall summarize the findings and debrief LWF SSD and DKH.
- Submission of the draft evaluation report for subsequent comments/feedback.
- Prepare and submit a draft and final reports of the end-line evaluation both in hard and soft copies
 - Prepare a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the key findings and recommendations and present it to LWF, DKH and other key stakeholders
- Facilitate a learning event in Juba/Magwi to disseminate lessons learned through a presentation and a workshop
- Complete the work within 30 days

8.0 DELIVERABLES

The consultant will summarize and analyze the Evaluation & field assessment findings and debrief LWF SSD immediately after the fieldwork. After the discussion, he/she prepares the report and will submit:

1. The draft evaluation report of one hard & soft copy to LWF SSD.
2. Upon review and comment on the draft report and debriefing workshop to LWF SSD and DKH, the consultant will incorporate the comments and prepare & submit hard and soft copies of the end-line evaluation report.

9.0 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

The evaluation report shall be written in English and has to include the following contents:

- 1) **Information Page:** Basic organizational data, duration of the project to be evaluated, the title of the evaluation, principal of the evaluation (who commissioned the evaluation), contractor of the evaluation and date of the report.
- 2) **Executive summary:** tightly drafted, to-the-point, free-standing document (maximum 2 pages), including the key issues of the evaluation, main analytical points, conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations.
- 3) **Introduction:** the purpose of the evaluation, scope of the evaluation and key questions. Short description of the project to be evaluated and relevant frame conditions.
- 4) **Evaluation methodology/ design including sampling and limitations**
- 5) **Key results/findings:** about the questions pointed out in the ToR and also the project-specific intervention components.
- 6) **Stories of change and quotes from respondents**
- 7) **Conclusions:** a summary based on evidence and analysis.
- 8) **Recommendations:** on the findings leading to suggestions to be used for the way forward
- 9) **Lessons learnt:** all relevant information beneficial to the partnership between LWF SSD and DKH
- 10) **Annexes** (ToR, Finalized data collection tools, Relevant maps and photographs of the evaluation areas where necessary, List of interviewees with accompanying informed consent forms, Bibliography of consulted secondary sources, copy of any relevant documentation used for the assessment and CV of the evaluation team).

- A PowerPoint presentation summarizing the key findings and recommendations presented to LWF, DKH and other key stakeholders
- Learning event for project stakeholders and partners in Juba or Magwi. The structure and activities of the learning and evaluation meeting will be agreed upon with LWF and DKH.

The main evaluation report should be concise and not exceed 25 pages; excluding annexes, (supporting data and details can be included in annexes).

All draft and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data provided in an electronic version compatible with Ms WORD. Ownership of the data from the evaluation rests jointly with LWF and consultants. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with LWF. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

10.0 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The consultant shall organize the end-line evaluation in a participatory way, including consultation with both the returnees and host communities. For all the evaluation participants, the three key ethical principles – informed consent, confidentiality and anonymity – must be adhered to. The consultant shall also provide sufficient and easy-to-understand information about the evaluation in good time, conduct interviews in places deemed safe, private and comfortable by study participants and anonymize their identity in any write-ups from this evaluation.

In addition, the design and implementation of the end-line must ensure that the principles of gender equality, inclusion and non-discrimination are applied and that there is meaningful participation of the most vulnerable groups and other key stakeholders at all times.

11.0 MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The Program Coordinator will be the Overall in charge with delegated authority to DPC and PMER manager all based in Juba.

The Designated personnel will ensure the evaluation takes place according to the ToR. They will facilitate the exercise and ensure consultation of relevant LWF team members and stakeholders throughout the evaluation process.

The team in Juba will provide the necessary support to the Consultant and discuss any technical, methodological or organizational matter that may arise. The Consultant will be responsible for delivering the above evaluation outputs using a combination of methods mentioned here above.

12.0 PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATION AND EXPERIENCE

The following constitute minimum qualifications and requirements:

- a) Postgraduate studies in International Development Studies, Social Sciences, Food Security, demographic studies, public health, human security, peace and conflict studies and other related disciplines or any other relevant field.
- b) Demonstrated experience in undertaking Endline Surveys in the humanitarian and development sector, preferably South Sudan, using both qualitative and quantitative methodologies.
- c) Ability to provide evidence of similar works done before including final reports.
- d) Familiarity with the study area
- e) Excellent analytical, research, writing and communication skills
- f) Extensive experience in research, and ability to write high-quality reports in English
- g) Proven experience and Sound knowledge of computer-based statistical analysis and visualization packages (SPSS, STATA, R, Power BI, Tableau, etc) as well as mobile data collection tools (KoBo, SurveyCTO, etc)
- h) Remarkable experience in using qualitative data analysis packages (Nvivo, Atlas-ti, MAXQDA, etc)
- i) Ability to work within the expected timelines and locations.
- j) Ability to work with communities in relevant local languages would be an advantage

13.0 TIMELINES

The following timelines will guide the implementation of this assignment.

Table 3: Proposed timelines

Sn	Task	Dates
1.	Advertisement for the consultancy	20 th October- 3 rd November 2022
2.	Analysis and communication to successful bidders	3 rd November- 9 th November 2022
3.	Contract signing	10 th November 2022
4.	Inception meeting	11 th November 2022
5.	Submission of the inception report	16 th November 2022
6.	Data collection, analysis and presentation of the first draft report	21 th November- 2 nd December 2022
7.	A PowerPoint presentation with the preliminary findings and recommendations	5 th December 2022
8.	Learning Event/Workshop with project stakeholders	7 th December 2022
9.	Presentation of the final copy	9 th December 2022

14.0 SUBMISSION

Please send your CV, Technical and financial proposals detailing evaluation methodology, work plan and budget, and all relevant documents as a single file to:

consultancy.southsudan@lutheranworld.org

The deadline for expression of interest is on 3rd November 2022.

