



---

## Terms of Reference: External Evaluation of ACROSS project “Integrated Multi sectorial Lifesaving Humanitarian Assistance Response in Kapoeta and Lainya”

### 1. BACKGROUND TO PROJECT

---

ACROSS is implementing a lifesaving humanitarian assistance project in Kapoeta North County (Paringa, Najie and Chumakori), Kapoeta East County (Kauto and Lotimor), Kassengor and Lainya County. The project timeframe is from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2020 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021. The project goal is to save lives by providing timely and integrated mutli-sectoral assistance aimed at reducing acute humanitarian needs for the most vulnerable people in Kapoeta North, Kapoeta East, Kassengor and Lainya. The project targeted 3,400 vulnerable households with in-kind food distributions, Nutrition and WASH services. In addition, boreholes were drilled and repaired to ensure longevity of the boreholes and continued access to clean drinking water to the beneficiaries.

The main objectives of the project are:

- To reduce food insecurity through food distribution and provide livelihood support to enhance emergency food production.
- To provide timely/sustainable, equitable access to safe water, sanitation and hygiene and mitigate WASH related gender based violence.
- To increase equitable access to utilization of quality lifesaving nutrition services for earlier detection and treatment of acute malnutrition for girls and boys under five years of age and pregnant and lactating women.

Key activities included:

- Hire and familiarization of project staff, and recruit and train assistants and volunteers.
- Stake holders meeting; liaise with government authorities, church leadership, UN clusters and humanitarian agencies in the area to identify target population, to avoid duplication and reach communities not yet located/served by other agencies. Staff will introduce the project stakeholders including the affected population.
- Identification and verification of beneficiaries
- Procurement
- Monitoring and Evaluation
- Reporting and Audit
- Distribution of food, seeds and tools
- Pre-season (including kitchen garden establishment) and post-harvest (using local methods of storage) trainings.
- Drilling of boreholes
- Training of local pump mechanics

- Distribution of toolboxes for boreholes
- Training and refresher trainings of water user committees
- Provision of hygiene kits (Metallic buckets, washing soap)
- Provision of reusable sanitary pads, underpants, detergents (Dignity kits for 1000 households)
- Distribution of drinking water storage containers to 1,600 households.
- Conduct hygiene promotion campaigns.
- Production and printing of visibility materials.
- Distribution of Digital Audio Players (DAPs) messages with GBV, peace building, good agronomic and hygiene practices.
- Construction of three communal latrines in Lainya
- Construct and model the use of two sensitive pit latrines in Kapoeta East.
- Training of 8 nutrition volunteers on active and identification of malnutrition, referral and home visits.
- Nutrition training in emergency to 15 local government staff (capacity building)
- Nutrition screening and referral and health education to 1,900 households.

## 2. PURPOSE

---

An external evaluation is planned to understand how the project has been implemented. The main objectives of the evaluation are:

- Assess the relevance, appropriateness, effectiveness, accountability and impact of the programme;
- Identify lessons learned, best practices and recommendations to inform future project design.

Analysis of the intervention should also consider if the project has been implemented in line with Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS) and if it is meeting Sphere Minimum Standards (relevant to this project).

## 3. KEY QUESTIONS

---

### *Relevance/appropriateness*

- Was programme design based on an impartial assessment of needs? Are needs assessments based on SADD (Sex and Age Disaggregated Data)? Do they include people's needs, vulnerabilities and capacities?
- Did the assistance provided by ACROSS meet the needs of the affected population? Were the most vulnerable persons identified, selected, and supported by the programme?
- Which parts of the assistance were the most appropriate and why? Which were least appropriate and why? Were activities aligned with the affected population's needs and priorities? Did the program cover the most acute needs?
- Have the appropriate measures been taken to take into account the specific needs of e.g. girls and women in the project? Are feedback and complaints committees comprised of men and women?
- Were recommendations and learning from past reviews and evaluations applied to the response?

### *Effectiveness*

- Was the response timely?
- What internal and external factors affected the speed of the response?
- Were there appropriate systems in place to monitor activities, outputs and outcomes of the programme? How were indicators measured throughout the project timeframe? Did

monitoring outcomes inform programme adjustments/revisions? Did the ongoing data collected include SADD?

- Did the project activities lead towards the achievement of the expected results/indicators as set in the Results Framework? E.g., were the hygiene kits provided appropriate to the needs of the target group?

#### *Accountability*

- Has the implementing partner been able to access the target group and implement the project without any interference of parties of conflict?
- To what extent has the affected population been involved in the design or implementation of the program?
- Were appropriate systems of accountability (participation, information sharing and feedback/complaints), put in place and used by project participants? Were project beneficiaries aware of the feedback/complaints mechanism? Were the complaints taken seriously and handled with confidentiality?
- Were project participants and communities aware of selection criteria?
- Were project participants and communities aware of the assistance they should receive?

#### *Coordination*

- How effective was ACROSS in coordinating with relevant external stakeholders such as relevant national and sub UN clusters and other agencies operating in the same area.
- How effective was ACROSS in coordinating with local authorities including negotiating access? In addition, key community members? How does ACROSS engage with the community networks?
- What aspects of coordination could be improved in the future and how?

#### *Impact*

- Has ACROSS's response strengthened local capacities?
- What are the intended and unintended, positive and negative effects of the project? Has the project identified and acted on potential negative effects during its implementation?
- What, if any, aspects of the programme will have a longer-term impact?

## 4. METHODOLOGY

---

- Review of project relevant documents including project log frame, reports, etc.
- Interviews and meeting with key informants:
  - Expectations and strategies of the implementing organisation
  - View of local authorities
  - View of beneficiaries targeted by this project
- Visits to the project location(s)- security permitting
- Household survey intended to investigate the knowledge Attitude and Practices of the beneficiaries
- Other approaches deemed suitable in the specific context for the gathering and analysis of data

## 5. CONSULTANT

---

The consultant should have an understanding of the intervention methodologies and experience of analysing humanitarian projects.

The competencies required from the evaluator are:

- Post-graduate training in M&E

- Experience and track record on leading evaluations in the field of humanitarian response
- Ability to use participatory approaches to evaluation
- Good knowledge of the local context
- Good analytical skills
- Excellent writing skills

The consultant(s) is expected to submit a proposal to ACROSS at ACROSS, Juba Office, no later than 11<sup>th</sup> February 2021.

The proposal for the evaluation needs to include:

- Proposed evaluation methodology (if different from above)
- Relevant track record and reference from previous work.
- A statement about the consultants' values and priorities in evaluation, and a Code of Conduct that the consultant adheres to.
- 3 references with contact details (both email and mobile number)
- Cost proposal including proposed work plan to undertake the assignment and deliver according to the ToR. The cost proposal shall include a breakdown as follows:
  - Professional fees estimated on number of days for desk review, field visits, facilitation forums and report writing.
  - Per diem (excluding accommodation)
  - Estimates for reimbursable expenses
    - Road/air travel (both international flights and domestic flights)
    - Accommodation and related expenses
    - Other specified costs (e.g. entry permit, visa)
  - Other costs (e.g. local translators)
    - Total Amount (including VAT).
- Description of deliverables and a timeline
- CV(s) of evaluator(s)

## 6. TIME PLAN

---

*Enter dates and/or estimated dates below.*

Preparation time: One week, 22<sup>nd</sup> of February 2021

Data collection: Three weeks, 1<sup>st</sup> March 2021

Reporting writing: Two weeks, 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2021

Draft report complete: 12<sup>th</sup> April 2021

Please submit your proposal by 15<sup>th</sup> of February 2021

The selected consultant will be informed by email by 19<sup>th</sup> February 2021 at the latest

## 7. Juba

---

There should be an oral reporting of preliminary findings and draft recommendations to ACROSS in connection to the consultant's visit.

Draft reports for ACROSS to review and comment (see report specifications below).

The report should be written in English and not exceed X pages, including an executive summary and recommendations. The report is shared with the implementing organisation, ACROSS and ACROSS partner PMU. .

Recommendations should have needs -based perspective and consider sustainability in terms of strategy, performance and outcomes.

Potential between evaluator and ACROSS workshop/seminar

**Proposed content of the evaluation report:**

1. Introduction
2. Executive summary
3. Description of the scope of the project
4. Evaluation methodology
5. Major findings
6. Conclusion including lessons learned and recommendations

**Submission and Review process**

The proposal will be evaluated both qualitatively and by cost as follows:

- Experience in evaluation and facilitation of participatory approaches (30%)
- Knowledge and experience of the country, humanitarian interventions and of the humanitarian sector (30%)
- Proposed approach, methodology and overall plan for the assignment (20%)
- Costs (including fees, travel and other expenses) (20%)

The proposal shall be submitted by email to [procurement@across-ssd.org](mailto:procurement@across-ssd.org) and copied to [executivedirector@across-ssd.org](mailto:executivedirector@across-ssd.org) and, [headofprograms@across-ssd.org](mailto:headofprograms@across-ssd.org)