

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR CONSULTANCY WORK FOR MIDTERM PROJECT EVALUATION.

1. Service Summary

Project name:	Enhancing Sustainable Peace and Intercommunal reconciliation in Boma (GPAA) and Jonglei State.
Project code:	12247.
Project Locations:	Greater Pibor Administrative Area (Pibor and Pochalla Counties) and Central Equatoria State (Juba).
Application Deadline:	9th November 2023.
Type of Contractor:	Open to National and International and International Consultancy firms.
Languages Required:	English.
Starting Date:	15th November 2023.
Expected Duration of Assignment:	20 Days.

2. Purpose of the end of project evaluation

The main purpose of this final project evaluation is to facilitate a process that will document the R2P project's outputs and impact from 2022 – 2023. The process will eventually mobilize all the project stakeholders to act based on the evaluation findings. The R2P peacebuilding project funded by Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MFA) is being implemented in Jonglei State, Greater Pibor Administrative Area as well as supporting the National Ministry of Peace Building in Juba, Central Equatoria State. The overall objective of the project was to contribute to achieving sustainable peace and stability in Greater Jonglei by supporting holistic conflict transformation processes and initiatives as well as facilitating the strengthening of local peacebuilding structures and conflict resolution mechanisms. The consultant is expected to conduct the final evaluation using both quantitative and qualitative methods to ascertain the impact of the project. The consultant in addition is expected assess the challenges or constraints associated with implementation, and document the results achieved, including good practices and lessons learned for future reference and programming of FCA's peacebuilding initiatives in South Sudan.

The need for end of project evaluation is critical in FCA's projects programming aimed at assessing project contribution towards its overall and specific objectives, outcomes, and impact. This is based on FCA's commitment to quality programming and being accountable to the rights holders, duty bearers and project beneficiaries. This end of project evaluation is looking forward at documenting the project design, impact, performance, lessons learned, recommendations and sustainability of the project and it will further look at collating and analysing challenges faced and best practices during the response

period, that will inform future program strategy in the next project phase. This is critical in that the humanitarian response keeps changing based on humanitarian context dynamics in the country.

3. Background and Description of the Project

Finn church Aid (FCA) was founded in 1947 and it is a faith-based organization. FCA is the largest Finland's development cooperation Non-Governmental Organization and the second largest in providing disaster relief aid through Right to Peace, Right to Education, and Right to Livelihood. FCA is a professional, non-political, neutral, non-profit humanitarian organization with head its office in Helsinki, Finland. FCA established its local presence in South Sudan in 2010 with its presence in Central Equatoria State, Jonglei, Lakes states, Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA) implementing integrated humanitarian, peace building, education, and livelihood in the Country.

FCA has been implementing a multi-year peacebuilding project (2022 – 2022) with funding from the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MFA) in Greater Pibor Administrative Area targeting the two counties of Pibor (Pibor, Verteth, Lekuangole and Gumuruk Payams), Pochalla County (Pochalla South and North) and Central Equatoria States (Juba) with support in Juba mainly targeting the National Ministry of Peacebuilding.

The overall objective of the project is to contribute to sustainable peace and stability in Boma and Jonglei state while its specific objectives is to support holistic conflict transformation processes and initiatives through facilitating the establishment and, strengthening of local conflict resolution mechanisms. The project three main Results are;

(I). Result 1: Inclusive and non-violent spaces for dialogue are created.

- R1-A1: Form/equip and support Peace clubs in 10 Primary schools with soft skills. 15 members/Club
- R1-A2: Organize stakeholders consultations between and among duty/rights-holders
- R1-A3: Facilitate peace dialogue forums for Women, Traditional and Religious leaders
- R1-A4: Youth Peacebuilding Processes/Livelihoods-for-Peace and Stability Training Activities targeting youth and women groups (30 Trainees).
- R1-A5: Organize sports for peace Tournaments for Confidence and Trust Building
- R1-A6: Inter and Intra Communal/State dialogues targeting the Dinka, Murle, Nuer, Anyuak and Jie communities of Jonglei State

(II). Result 2: State/ Community -level PSS established/strengthened.

- R2-A1: Provide need-based capacity strengthening for 90 Inclusive Peace Committee Members in Pibor and Pochalla
- R2-A2: Provide Capacity Support to state level Peace Commission and Peace desk.
- R2-A3: Radio Advocacy: Support 10 Radio Talk Shows and Community Radio Program on Social Cohesion, Peace and reconciliation
- R2-A4: Equip the Pibor Peace Hall with assorted Equipment

(III). Result 3: Development of Peace Policy (National Level Peace Structure Support and Strengthening)

- R3-A1: Print 100 copies of the Peace Education Manual/Training Pack
- R3-A2: Phase II- Framework for a National Peace-Education Curriculum for teachers/Students
- R3-A3: Provide need-based Capacity Building Support to the National Ministry of Peacebuilding.

The project has made some significant gains in Greater Pibor Administrative Area during the implementation period such as reduction in the cases of intra-communal conflicts in form of Age sets violence and land related conflicts and disputes amongst the age sets and clans or community members. Inter-communal violence however, remained a challenge especially among the Lou Nuer, Dinka, and the Murle communities. The last inter-communal violence was July attack on the Murle by armed Lou Nuer youth in Nanaam in 2023 leading to displacement of the locals from the home steads to Pibor main town. The impact, however, was mild compared to previous attacks as the attack did not spread to other locations like Gumuruk and Lekuangole centres. Authorities were in contact and discussion with the local authorities and leaders of the armed Lou Nuer youth. As a result, the youth withdrew.

The R2P Project was designed to create inclusive and non-violence spaces for dialogue and strengthening the capacities of local peace structures to enable them to develop strategic plans to curbed down the recurrence of inter/intra-communal violence by finding inclusive and non-violence mechanisms to address the root causes of conflicts within the Murle community and with the neighbouring ethnic groups. The project further seeks to establish durable and sustainable solutions aimed at ending the recurring inter/intra-communal cycles of violence in the region. The project therefore targeted local structure such as the traditional chiefs' systems, as well as women, youth and religious leaders and relevant ministries and departments as its duty bearers.

4. **Scope and focus of the evaluation.**

The midterm project evaluation is in-built in the project implementation framework. The evaluation will cover the period from January 2022 to December 2023 with focus on Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA) and Jonglei state, and it will assess the effectiveness of the implementation strategy and the outcomes of the project. This will include the implementation modalities, the right holders and duty bearers' participation, replication, and sustainability of the project as well as the roles and responsibilities of project implementers including partnership and collaboration arrangements, institutional capacity strengthening and support. The evaluation will also include assessment of the project design, sustainability of the project, including assumptions and risks included in the design of the project. In addition, the evaluation will analyse the management of the project, implementation strategies and activities to ascertain the extent to which the project achieved its intended results. It is also expected the evaluation looks at the effectiveness and relevance of complaints feedback and response mechanisms as well as well cross cutting themes for safe and inclusive programming.

The Final Evaluation will use different research methods including qualitative analysis to ascertain the impact of the project, taking into consideration what factors have enhanced and hindered the achievement of the project targets as well as documentation of achievements and lessons learnt for future programming of FCA's peacebuilding works or interventions. The analysis will include cross cutting issues i.e., gender, protection, environmental impact, prevention, and reduction of disaster risks. The evaluation will also assess whether project implementation strategy was optimum and document the learnings and areas that require improvement in subsequent programs. To achieve these objectives; the evaluation will focus on the following key areas (proposed evaluation questions).

The overall objective of this end of project final evaluation is to assess.

- (i) **Relevance:** (assess the design and focus of the project):
 - To what extent did the project achieve its overall objective?
 - To what extent were the project interventions responsive to the needs and priorities of the project stakeholders?
 - To what extent were the project stakeholders engaged throughout the project design and implementation?
 - To what extent did the project design interventions reflect the rights of project beneficiaries of all genders including feedback from a diverse range of project stakeholders including usually marginalized groups?
 - What and how much progress was made towards achieving the outputs and outcome of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
 - Were inputs used realistically, appropriately, and adequately to achieve intended outcome?
 - Was the project appropriate and relevant to the needs of the communities?

- (ii) **Appropriateness:**
 - To what extent have the project objectives been consistent with beneficiaries needs?
 - Was the project relevant to the targeted beneficiaries needs?
 - Was there a feedback mechanism in place to collect beneficiaries' complaints as well as addressing their complaints and provide feedback?

- (iii) **Effectiveness:** (Assess the management processes and their appropriateness in supporting delivery)
 - To what extent and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall objective of the project during the implementation?
 - To what extent did the project achieve its overall objectives?
 - What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs, and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
 - Where the inputs and strategies used effectively and realistically, appropriately and were adequate to achieve the project results?
 - Were the project strategies and tools used in an effective manner during the implementation process?

- Was the project effective in responding to the need of the beneficiaries and what results were achieved?
 - What recommendations in terms of project effectiveness and future intervention strategies are there for future peacebuilding similar intervention in the region or elsewhere in the country?
- (iv) **Efficiency:** (How well were resources being used in project implementation)?
- How efficient was the process of achieving the project results during the implementation period?
 - How did the actual or expected project results (outputs and outcomes) specifically justify the project cost incurred during the implementation?
 - Were the project resources effectively used to achieve the project results during the implementation period including taking into consideration value for money?
 - What other approach could have been used to produce better results in the intervention?
 - Are there more efficient ways and means of delivering more and better results (outputs and outcomes) with the available inputs?
 - Are there concerns about duplication of services during project activities implementation?
 - Did the project activities overlap with other similar interventions implemented by FCA funded by different donors or with other agencies implementing similar activities?
 - What were the enabling factors which contributed to project implementation efficiency?
 - Did project activities overlap with similar interventions (funded nationally and/or by other donors)?
 - How efficient were the management and accountability structures of the project?
 - How did financial management processes and procedures affect project implementation?
 - What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of the project implementation process?
- (v) **Coherence** – (The compatibility of the intervention with other FCA’s projects?).
- Are there synergy and linkages between the project and other FCA’s projects and programs? To what extend?
 - Was there complementarity, harmonisation, and co-ordination with others relevant stakeholders, and to what extent did the project interventions add value to other ongoing processes while avoiding duplication of services?
 - To what extent are the intervention’s design, delivery and results coherent with international laws and commitments to rights-based approach, gender equality and rights of people with disabilities as well as international human rights?
 - To what extent does the intervention support national and state level peacebuilding structures as well as initiatives that aimed to improve and capacity built these peace structures?
- (vi) **Sustainability:** (The extend to which the project benefits will continue or are likely to continue when the project is phased out)?
- To what extend are the benefit of the project likely to be sustained in the intervention location?
 - What is the likelihood that the community members will co-exist peacefully; resolve their differences through non-violent and peaceful means after the end of the project?

- Is there likelihood that the established peace structures will continue to function and work in peacebuilding and conflict transformation even when the project has ended?
 - What recommendations can you give to FCA to ensure that there will be sustainability of project outcomes even when the project has ended?
 - Are there exit strategies in place and how effective are the exit strategies, and approaches when it comes to phasing out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints?
 - What are the key factors that will require attention to improve prospects of sustainability of project outcome and the potential for replication of the approach?
 - Are there major lessons that emerged during the project implementation?
 - What are the recommendations for similar project programming and support in the future?
- (vii) **Stakeholders' participation and public involvement:**
- What is the level of stakeholder engagement and participation in the project implementation?
 - Is there project stakeholders' consultation and engagements and making use of experiences, skills and knowledge gained because of stakeholders' consultations?
 - Is the project institutional networking well placed within the national and community organizational structures by building on the local decision-making process and structures and incorporating local knowledge, and developing the project management responsibilities to the national and local communities?
 - Is the project design and implementation committed to support national and local stakeholders?
- (viii) **Impact:** (What difference has the intervention made)?
- What are the long-term effects produced by the project? (This can be directly, indirectly, intentionally, or unintentionally during the implementation process).
 - What are the changes produced by the project in the region, both negative and positive impacts?
 - Are the project beneficiaries or the community no longer susceptible to vulnerability in case of any future eruption of a violent conflict in the community?
 - What are the specific impacts on youth and women realised because of the intervention? Any lessons learnt and recommendations for future programming?
- (ix) **Crosscutting Issues:**
- Where cross-cutting issues such as gender, protection, age, people living with disabilities and human rights mainstreamed into the project programming?
 - To what extent were crosscutting issues mainstreamed into the project and how were these cross-cutting issues addressed during the project implementation?

5. Expected Deliverables:

- 1) **Inception report:** The consultant is expected to prepare a detailed inception report containing detailed understanding of both the consultant and FCA on how the evaluation questions. The report must contain detailed understanding of both FCA and the consultant on how the evaluation and the evaluation questions will be addressed during the evaluation process to make sure that

both FCA and the consultant have a common understanding of the evaluation process. The inception report should include the evaluation matrix summary that summarizes the evaluation design, methodology, evaluation questions, sources of data and data collection and analysis tools for each data source and the measure by which each question will be evaluated. The report will include the scope of work, work plan and timeframe for the evaluation. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities, and deliverables with clearly stipulated responsibilities for each task. The inception report will then be discussed and agreed upon with all the stakeholders involved.

- 2) **Draft report:** The consultant or end of project evaluator will prepare a draft evaluation report, cognizant of the proposed format of the report including checklist used for the assessment of the evaluation report and the report will be submitted to FCA for review and comments. Ten days after the receipt of the draft report, comments will be provided by FCA to the consultant. This is to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria and standards. The consultant will incorporate comments from FCA into the report to produce the final evaluation report.
- 3) **Submission of final report:** The final evaluation reports, a maximum of 25-30 pages excluding annexes will be submitted within 10 days after receipt of comments and feedback from the validation with FCA and the report with findings, lessons learnt and recommendations covering the scope of the end of project evaluation should be able to meet FCA's requirements. The evaluation report should be written in Arial font size 11 with a 1.15 line spacing. The end of project evaluation report should include the following:
 - Executive summary of not more than 2 pages
 - Introduction, maximum of 1 page
 - Description of the evaluation methodology
 - Situational analysis with regards to the outputs and outcome.
 - Analysis of opportunities to guide future programming.
 - Key findings, including best practices and lessons learned.
 - Conclusion and recommendations
 - Appendices: including charts, Aggregated respondents by gender, field visits, primary and secondary references, etc.

The consultant will submit the final evaluation report to FCA's Peacebuilding Advisor

6. Methodology and Duration of the Evaluation

The end of project evaluation should comply with the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) evaluation standards as well as OECD/DAC evaluation principles and guidelines, and consistent with OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards (206). This end of project evaluation is a summative evaluation involving qualitative and quantitative methods to evaluate the referenced project implementation and performance and to make recommendations for future and next programming cycle.

The end of project evaluation will be carried out through a wider participation of project beneficiaries and all project relevant stakeholders as well as project implementing staff and rights holders. All data

collected should be disaggregated (by sex, age, people living with disabilities and location) where applicable. The below methods will be used to collect the quantitative and qualitative data:

- (i) Desk study and review of all relevant project documents including project proposal, annual work-plans, project progress report, PDM reports and annual project report.
- (ii) In depth interviews to gather primary data from key stakeholders using a structured methodology.
- (iii) Focus Group Discussion (FGD) with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders.
- (iv) Interviews with relevant key informants.
- (v) Observations (field visits using checklist)

The evaluation starts on **13th November 2023** for an estimated duration of **30** days. This includes desk review and visit to the project locations in Pibor, Pochalla, and Juba for interviews and Focused Group Discussions (FGDs) with project stakeholders, Observations, and report writing.

Activity	Deliverable	Time allocated
Inception Meeting Initial briefing with selected consultant.	Inception Report	2 days
Desk Review-Evaluation design, methodology detailed work plan.	Draft Report	2 days
Field visit and data collection (travel to Greater Pibor, and Pochalla County), and interviews in Juba		10 days
Data analysis, debriefing & preparation of draft Evaluation report		4 days
Submit draft report to FCA for comments, and feedback		2 days
Incorporate comments, finalize report, and submit to FCA.	Final Evaluation Report	10 days

7. Required qualification and expertise.

The consultant or end of project evaluator must have the following expertise and qualifications:

1. Master's degree in Peace and Conflict Studies or Monitoring and Evaluation or Development Studies or any relevant field.
2. First level bachelor's degree with substantial hands-on experience in project evaluation maybe relevant.
3. Extensive expertise, knowledge, and experience in evaluation of similar Peacebuilding projects proven by evidence such recommendation letters or accessible publications.
4. Fluency in English (including excellent written and verbal communication skills). Working knowledge of the local languages of the project locations is an added advantage.

8. Evaluation and Selection Criteria

The evaluation and selection of the successful consultant will be based on the following criteria as presented in the below table:

Evaluation Criteria:	%	Required Information/evidence
Education/Qualification	10	Academic certificates from a reputable institution. Lead Consultant must be a holder of master's degree in M&E/Project Management/Social Research
Skills & Expertise	20	A minimum of 3 recommendation letters from INGOs for similar assignment conducted and successfully completed. One sample signed evaluation report in a similar or related field is a requirement.
Methodology	30	A proposed methodology that aligns with the requirements under Section 6: (Proposed Methodology of Evaluation)
Availability/Timeliness	10	Immediate availability of qualified consultant receives a full score of 10 points
Consultancy fee	30	Professional billing/fees that are guided by best pricing model for an assignment of similar nature and scope as defined above and other logistical and enabling costs e.g., airfares etc.
TOTAL	100	

9. Proposed Schedule of Payments.

The consultant shall be paid the consultancy fee upon completion of the following milestones.

- 1) 20 % after adoption of the inception report.
- 2) 30 % after presentation of the draft report.
- 3) 50 % after the approval of the final report.

The consultancy fee will be subjected to income tax in accordance with the South Sudan Financial ACT 2017/18, section 53 of the Taxation Amendment ACT 2016. Current withholding tax rate is 20% on professional or technical fees. Other logistical and enabling costs such as airfares, stationeries and enumerators fees should be clearly marked as such.

NOTE: The contract price will be fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

10. How to SUBMIT TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL PROPOSAL.

Interested Applicants who meets the above requirements should submit their Technical and Financial proposals (Technical and Financial + annexes listed above) through email to Procurement.Ssuco@kua.fi with the heading "END OF PROJECT EVALUATION - 12247". Deadline for submission is 9th November 2023)

Note:

- I. Technical Proposal (maximum 10 pages) must include an interpretation of the TOR, design and conceptualization of the assignment, proposed methodology, and work plan.
- II. The financial proposal (maximum 1 Page) should be in USD Only. The proposal should clearly include technical fees, Airfare/ local transport, and other associated costs relevant to the

consultancy. **FCA shall withhold 20% of the Consultancy fees per South Sudan taxation policy.**

- III. Detailed Curriculum Vitae of the Lead Consultant(s) with at least 3 professional referees (official emails ONLY)
- IV. One approved sample of evaluation reports from previous consultancy work with reputable organizations.

Note:

FCA has zero tolerance concerning aid diversion and illegal actions and may screen potential applicants, contractors, suppliers, consultants, etc. against international lists to ensure due diligence and compliance with Anti-money laundering and combating the Financing of Terrorism requirements.

FCA has zero tolerance against Sexual Exploitation and Abuse.