

TERMS OF REFERENCE (ToR)

Final Evaluation of Restoring Peaceful Coexistence for Better Livelihoods (RSRTF-funded) Area- based Programme in Koch County, Unity State of South Sudan

1. Introduction:

The purpose of this final evaluation is to assess the impact of the programme, how well the program achieved its intended objectives, evaluate the program success, and document lessons learnt and generate recommendations which will guide future programming and shared with key stakeholders. Koch Area-based RSRTF Programme final evaluation will be conducted by external consultant (the detail purpose of final evaluation is presented under section 2). WR will facilitate field level logistics activities for the consultant to do final evaluation. The final evaluation will be conducted from 1st August to 20th September 2021. Through RSRTF funding, consortium partners have been able to build synergies (strengthening operational and programmatic efficiency and effectiveness) and integrate local actions of reconciliation, stabilization and resilience initiatives through an area-based approach. To ensure synergy of the program components and coordination of actors an Area Reference Group (ARG) was formed including a consortium partners, other INGOs (IRC, NRC) and NGOs (Humanitarian Development Consortium (HDC), Universal Intervention and Development organization (UNIDOR), and Dialogue and Research Initiative (DRI)—implementing community management of conflict in partnership with IRC/USAID) and local authorities and community leaders. To augment the ARG efforts, working groups around the thematic areas—reconciliation, stabilization and resilience—for all Koch based actors including non-consortium partners, women and youth groups were established.

The Restoring Peaceful Coexistence for Better Livelihoods programme aims to restore peaceful conditions in Koch County, Unity State so that residents and returnees can live improved lives. The Program area, Koch, has been affected by the protracted conflict, with violence, displacement, and destruction from the war, as well as from intra- and inter-community disputes and attacks. This ‘Area-Based Programme’ (ABP) is funded by the United Nations Multi-Partner Trust Fund for Reconciliation, Stabilization, and Resilience South Sudan (RSRTF) and was designed to address access to justice, reconciliation, resolving conflicts peacefully, creating opportunities for youth, and address issues related to gender power imbalance and violence. The target groups included host communities and returnees of legacy Koch County, women, men, boys, and girls. Activities were to focus on key beneficiary groups, such as uneducated or unengaged youth; girls and women; survivors of sexual violence; other affected population. The consortium intervention strategy provided assistances leading to recovery, recognizing that enforcing stability and reconciliation are critical ingredients to prepare the ground for resilience activities

The programme was designed by a consortium of partners operating in Koch County. It was launched in August 2019 with an initial completion date in July 2021. The programme was extended till end of October 2021. Each partner brought unique contributions to the consortium. World Relief is the Consortium Lead and other partners include CARE, Mercy Corps, and DRC. Project activities were implemented by the four consortium partners in a coordinated manner to maximize impact and efficiency. Consortium partners recognized that enforcing stability and reconciliation are critical pieces to prepare the ground for recovery and resilience activities to take place. Partners liaised with UNMISS for certain key activities, such as patrols, training of police officers, and peace events. The involvement of UNMISS Rule of Law was for components of access to justice activities. Activities related to access to justice, particularly accessing formal justice system to deal with serious crimes, dependent on the facilitation and coordination of Rule of Law.

An M&E framework has been adopted to monitor programme's progress, evaluate the success, and document lessons learnt. The M&E framework include hierarchies of objectives, indicators, targets and milestones which is aligned with the RSRTF results framework.

The Restoring Peaceful Coexistence for Better Livelihoods programme in Koch contributes to the following RSRTF outcomes:

RSRTF Outcome 1: Individuals, particularly children and women are facing less violence at the community and local level. Outcome 1 is a cross-cutting outcome for this project. All project interventions have been designed to contribute to reduction of violence and safer communities in Koch County either by mediating conflict or by addressing some of the key causes of conflict, namely resource scarcities. This outcome was also to be achieved by coordination with UNMISS, whose activities contributed directly to this outcome.

RSRTF Outcome 2: Communities have effective mechanisms in place that meaningfully include women and youth to resolve conflicts peacefully. Outcome 2 is aimed at creating and strengthening community-level peace committees. These peace committees are established for the purpose of mediating and facilitating the resolution of community conflicts in a non-violent way. Moreover, community-based committees allow greater participation for women's and youth, as well as offer an entry point for women and youth in peacebuilding initiatives.

Outcome 3: Justice sector actors are more effectively delivering justice, even in areas with previously limited or no judicial infrastructure. Outcome 3 seeks to assess, strengthen and rebuild formal and informal justice mechanisms, namely the court system in Koch County. The goal is to restore the ability of community members to seek justice, especially related to serious offences. Additionally, it will help reduce the number violent crimes being processed through informal mechanisms.

Outcome 5: Community resilience is strengthened through increased economic opportunities and sustainable livelihoods. Outcome 5 complements Outcomes 2 and 3 by seeking to address some of the common causes of conflict, namely scarcity of economic resources or high barriers to accessing economic resources. Activities under this outcome focus on bolstering resources available to some of the most vulnerable women and their households as well as to youth who are at risk of being conscripted into armed groups in the absence of other viable economic opportunities.

2. Purpose, scope and objective of final evaluation:

The purpose of final project evaluation is to assess the impact of the programme, how well the programme achieved its intended objectives, evaluate the Program success, and document lessons learnt and generate recommendations which will be shared with key stakeholders, including consortium members, beneficiaries, donors and others to learn from the experience and improve future interventions, specifically to give directions for a potential second phase of RSRTF programming in Koch.

2.1. Scope of final evaluation:

The evaluation will focus on assessing the achievements of RSRTF project from the start of the programme to date in targeted Payams, of Kuachlual, Gany, Mirmir, Boaw, Jaak, Pakur, and Ngong Payams of Koch County, Unity State of South Sudan. The key stakeholders to be involved in the evaluation process will be beneficiaries, head of chiefs, women representatives, youth representatives, community leaders, local authorities, state government, implementing partners (World Relief, CARE, DRC and Mercy Corps, non-

implementing partners operating in Koch and Unity State, as well as partners implementing similar activities at cross border counties with Koch.

The role of implementing partners in final evaluation will be to assign a focal person who could be able to provide relevant project documents/information to the consultant, review data collection tools and assessment reports, and providing timely feedback to consultant etc.

2.2. Specific objectives - final project evaluation:

- a. Assess the overall impact of the ABP and the extent to which it has contributed to a reduction in violence and a more stable security environment in Koch County.
- b. Assess the integration of the triple nexus and operationalization of the area reference group in the targeted area.
- c. Assess the extent to which the ABP is relevant/appropriate approach to the needs and priorities of the target groups (women, men, boys and girls, people with disabilities), and complements work from other actors.
- d. Assess the extent that the ABP is cost-effective and timely in achieving programme results.
- e. The extent that the Consortium's work has or is likely to achieve its intended immediate and long-term results.
- f. The extent that the ABP made positive and/or negative changes on stakeholders, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.
- g. Assess the participation of affected communities and stakeholder in programme design and implementation.
- h. Assess the extent to which gender equality objectives were achieved (or are likely to be achieved) and how well gender considerations were mainstreaming throughout the programme
- i. Review the progress towards achieving sustainability of programme benefits in terms of the extent to which the activities will continue in the project areas past the phase out of the programme funding.
- j. Recommend improvements for the ABP's Phase II program design and planning or long-term programming strategies, focusing on program and management quality and accountability, collaboration of stakeholders and contribute to learning in a wider sense.

The evaluation will cover the accomplishment of all expected results as outlined in the programme document, results framework, and the detailed implementation plans.

2.3. Evaluation criteria:

The project should be evaluated against the following evaluation criteria:

- Relevance
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency
 - Financial efficiency
 - Coordination efficiency
 - Implementation efficiency
 - Management efficiency
 - Value for money
- Impact
 - Impact on direct target groups
 - Impact on indirect target groups
 - Impact on duty bearers
 - Impact on stability and peace of the target area

- Participation
 - Affected communities
 - Stakeholders including local NNGOs, local and state government and other partners
- Sustainability
- Lessons learnt

2.4. Key evaluation questions:

Relevance:

- a. To what extent were the Program outcomes consistent with individual beneficiaries' (women, men, children, youth, people with disabilities) needs?
- b. How suited are the project intervention to IDPs, returnees, host communities and the local context?
- c. To what extent have gender, safety and peaceful resolution mechanism of violence considerations been addressed in the design as well as project implementation?
- d. Was the project planned based on a gender analysis/gender-sensitive needs assessment, taking into account the different needs of Women, Men, Boys and Girls?

Effectiveness:

- a. To what extent has the programme been successful in delivering results against its operational commitments to Triple Nexus? To what extent, the program ensured the complementarity of reconciliation, stabilization and resilience endeavors?
- b. To what extent are the most targeted beneficiaries being reached by project interventions?
- c. To what extent has the affected population been properly targeted and reached by the project and its partners?
- d. To what extent do project indicators, outputs, outcomes and objectives ensure that gender-related data is collected, monitored and contributes to project performance?

Efficiency:

- a. To what extent is the consortium members maximizing use of resources (human, financial and material) to achieve project results in a coordinated manner?
- b. To what extent are the project expenditures in line with the agreed upon budget, and the costs incurred consistent with the donor requirements?
- c. What are the implementation challenges and how are they being addressed?

Impact:

- a. To what extent has the programme contributed to a reduction in violence and a more stable security environment in Koch County?
- b. To what extent has the programme cause significant change in the lives of the targeted groups (women, men, children, people with disabilities)?
- c. What factors accelerated or slowed down the implementation rate of the project? How? Why?
- d. How were GBV and Protection mainstreaming principles adhered to by the intervention?
- e. Were there any unintended adverse effects on the beneficiaries and communities as a result of the project?

Sustainability:

- a. What sustainability strategies and/or plans were put in place by the key stakeholders and/or duty bearers?
- b. To what extent are interventions linking with longer-term program initiatives?
- c. Is the level of stakeholder ownership sufficient to allow for project outcomes/benefits to be sustained in the long term?

Participation:

- a. To what extent were programme beneficiaries and stakeholders actively involved in the design and implementation of the project?
- b. To what extent do beneficiaries feel sense of ownership of the project?

Lessons learned and recommendations:

- a. Which interventions worked well, did not work well, or failed and why?
- b. What are the main lessons learned for each of the project outcomes areas?
- c. What are the main recommendations that can guide the development of future programming and donor policies focusing on stabilization as well as resilience to economic or conflict induced shocks?

3. Methodology (final evaluation):

The data collection includes desk review, key informant interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions (FGDs) and observation of project activities. The desk review will include a detailed reading and assessment of key programme documents, including budgets, expenditures, work plans, and progress report. KIIs will be conducted with key World Relief project team, including Project Coordinator, Area coordinator, project Officer, M&E Coordinator, and the key staff (i.e. managers, M&E, etc) of implementing partners (WR, DRC, CARE and Mercy Corps), UNMISS, local authorities, youth representative, chief heads, community leaders, women representative, church leader and other relevant stakeholders. KII can be conducted through an online survey (eg: Survey Monkey) with key staff mentioned above. The consultant will propose any other relevant data collection methods and tools.

WRSS M&E team will be responsible for overseeing and coordinating the entire evaluation process in liaison with field RSRTF Project Coordinator/focal points and RSRTF project manager/focal person of implementing partners, and the RSRTF Secretariat M&E Specialist. The consultant(s) must follow basic COVID-19 protection protocols (always wear face mask, sanitize hands before entering office, keep physical distance, limit the number of FGD participants to have enough space for the discussion etc). The consulting team must also follow WR policies, including data protection principles and informed consents.

3.1. Consent:

Prior to conducting FGD and KII with beneficiaries, written informed consent will be obtained from all participants by explaining clearly and ensuring that respondents understand, the purpose and content of the data collection exercise, the procedures that will be followed during the course of exercise, the risks and benefits of participating and also their rights. If children will be interviewed, informed consent must be provided by a parent or guardian. The child must also agree to participate in addition to the parents' giving consent. Where participants are not able to read, a thumbprint, along with a witness' signature will be obtained. Confidentiality will be maintained throughout the survey, and no names or other identifying information will be included in the evaluation reports.

4. Deliverable/Outputs for the final evaluation

- **Inception Report** outlining the key scope of the work, intended evaluation questions, detailed methodology and tools, and suggested work-plan shall be submitted to WRSS after 5 days of commencing the consultancy.
- **Draft evaluation report** shall be submitted to WRSS Country Office for revision by September 10, 2021.
- **Final evaluation validation workshop**– the consultant will provide a **2-hours** virtual presentation on the findings, as part of evaluation validation
- **Final evaluation** report which incorporates all comments and feedback will be submitted to WRSS Country Office by September 20, 2021. The final report should include the following contents.
 - Table of contents
 - Executive summary (max. 1 page)
 - Project background
 - Final evaluation purpose and objective
 - Methodology

- Key findings, including impact of the project, how well the project achieved its intended objectives, evaluate the Program success, lessons learned and challenges
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Annexes

NB: The report for final project evaluation should not exceed 30 pages, excluding annexes.

5. Workplan and time frame

The consultant/evaluation team is expected to hold a preliminary meeting with the WRSS RSRTF programme and M&E team at the beginning of August 2021, to discuss and agree on the evaluation methodologies, and timelines. The detail of the plan for final evaluation is given under the following table.

Activity	Responsibility	Deadline (tentative)
Advertisement of the call for evaluation	WR	21 st Jul – 11 th Aug
Hiring the consultant	WR	16 th August 2021
Consultant report to WR South Sudan and debrief	Consultant(s)	18 th August 2021
Share project documents with consultant (RSRTF project proposal documents, results framework, quarterly and baseline reports, baseline data collection tools etc)	Quality Specialist with support of RSRTF team	18 th August 2021
Inception Report including data collection tools due to WR	Consultant(s)	24 th Aug 2021
Finalize data collection tools, hire enumerators; data collection/analysis, report writing and sharing a draft report with WR	-Consultant, -WR team (Quality Specialist, Field team/RSRTF M&E Coordinator) facilitate logistical activities in the field	31 st August 2021
Presentation of First Draft Report	Consultant	10 th September 2021
Evaluation validation workshop-Virtual	Consultant	13 th Sept
Review of comments and input from the validation workshop	Consultant	14 th – 16 th Sept
Final evaluation report due to WR	Consultant	20 th Sept 2021

6. Terms of payment:

The Consultant will provide a financial proposal for the provision of these services. Agreed rates will be based on prevailing market competitive rates and value for money.

The payment will be on fixed terms with disbursements detailed below:

- 1) 30% of the total amount shall be paid upon signing of the contractual agreement.
- 2) 30% shall be paid up on submission of draft reports of final evaluation
- 3) The remaining 40% shall be paid after submission of final reports final programme evaluation.

7. Quality assurance

The following will be undertaken to ensure adherence on evaluation quality:

- a) Evaluation Technical Committee (ETC) comprising of 6 staff (WR Ag. Program Director, Quality Specialist, RSRTF ABP Project Coordinator, ABP M&E Coordinator, RSRTF Secretariat M&E Specialist, Operation Director and one person from the consortium members will be established to follow and ensure the evaluation activities are being done as per the agree ToR.
- b) Inception meeting between the consultant and WRSS team (RSRTF team, Quality Specialist) to agree on the final terms of reference between the evaluation manager and the consultant;
- c) Review, and approval of the inception report
- d) During data collection, the evaluation manager will periodically check in with the evaluator to monitor how well data collection is going and discuss both methodological and practical solutions to any challenges to data collection as they arise;
- e) Debrief and presentation of initial findings to evaluation technical committee/field staff
- f) Review, and approval of the final report and evaluation brief.

8. Lines of communication/reporting:

The consultant will liaise with the Quality Specialist, RSRTF Consortia Project Coordinator/Area Coordinator and M&E Coordinator.

- 9. Budget:** The detail breakdown budget will be submitted by the consultant as part of financial proposal to conduct the evaluation.

10. Logistics:

While undertaking this assignment, WR will meet cost of flight from Juba to Koch, arrange vehicle transport at project sites in South Sudan, meals and accommodation in the field sites, reasonable and mandatory work-related telephone calls. Members of the evaluation team travelling to South Sudan for the purpose of this evaluation are responsible for their own visa applications. Days spent in quarantine only count towards the working days for this assignment if they are used to complete tasks related to the evaluation (e.g. desk-based review or online interviews). The Evaluation Team will use their own laptops and cell phones. The Consultant(s) will be responsible for their own Insurance during the subsistence of the contract and WR will not be responsible for any injuries or damages incurred during the assignment.

11. Essential and desirable experience/qualification of the lead consultant or consultant team at large

- a) A Master's Degree in in social sciences, law, international relations, development economics or relevant field
- b) Must have at least seven (7) years relevant work experience in research and peace-building analysis
- c) Must have relevant experience in reconciliation, stabilization and resilience
- d) In-depth understanding of methodologies used to measure personal perceptions of safety and security
- e) Academic, research, or consulting experience in conflict mitigation area is highly preferred
- f) Excellent English, reporting and editorial skills
- g) Ability to work in and/or lead a team of surveyors in hardship and insecure areas
- h) Experience in evaluating project management and implementation, including assessing value for money, budgeting, operations, and procurement
- i) Understanding of the 'Triple Nexus' and the 'New Way of Working' agenda and coordination mechanisms across humanitarian, development, peacebuilding and security systems
- j) Familiarity with integrating human rights and gender perspectives into evaluations
- k) Ability to design clean and meaningful graphics that support narratives, or direct access to graphic designers able to contribute to the evaluation team's work