

Terms of Reference

for the mid-term evaluation of the project:

Reducing hunger and malnutrition and promoting resilient food production in Cueibet County/Gok State, South Sudan (PROMISE)

1. Introduction

Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe (DKH) renders humanitarian aid worldwide. In its activities, DKH is committed to the Humanitarian Principles of the Code of Conduct of the Red Cross and Red Crescent movement and of non-governmental aid organizations. In all its actions, DKH is guided by the four humanitarian principles: humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence. These principles provide the foundations for DKH's humanitarian action, and are regarded as essential in order to establish and maintain access to affected people, whether in a natural disaster or a complex emergency, such as armed conflict. DKH is also committed to the Core Humanitarian Standards (CHS) in order to adhere to enhanced accountability protocols.

DKH's assistance is designed to suit the local conditions and is integrated in the economic, social and political context of a specific country or region. It is adjusted to respond to the needs and the situation of the affected population, respect the dignity of the people, and protect valid laws and traditions. Assistance is provided according to needs, corresponds to local standards and is based on a thorough response analysis. It is DKH's approach to work through a global network of partner organizations. Wherever possible and required, DKH is accompanying the partners from project design through implementation until final project documentation.

Vétérinaires Sans Frontières (VSF) is an international Non-Governmental Organization, providing humanitarian aid and development assistance to pastoralists and vulnerable communities in areas where livestock is of importance. VSF support is in animal health; livestock related agriculture, marketing, food safety, drought responses and mitigation, capacity development of communities and governmental institutions, peace and conflict resolution with the ultimate aim of food security and strengthened livelihoods of pastoralist communities.

2. Subject of the evaluation: PROMISE

In South Sudan VSF has been implementing the project *Reducing hunger and malnutrition and promoting resilient food production in Cueibet County/Gok State (PROMISE)* funded by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). The implementation of this project started in September 2016 and is scheduled to end in August 2023 (two project phases). The project is being

implemented in Cueibet County, Gok (Lakes) state of the Republic of South Sudan in a predominantly agro-pastoral community.

PROMISE supports activities aimed at improving food security and reducing malnutrition within vulnerable populations. It addresses structural issues leading to hunger and malnutrition in a bid to resolve these in the medium or long term, with an emphasis on developing sustainable solutions. PROMISE aims to contribute to this global objective by building capacities of target households in innovative and sustainable agricultural practices as well as strengthened resilience against conflict and climatic risks.

The overall goal (impact level) is to contribute to increased food security, reduced malnutrition and resilient livelihoods for vulnerable households in Lakes/Gok State, South Sudan.

The three specific objectives (outcome level) of the project are:

1. Acute malnutrition in Cueibet is reduced.
2. Households have adopted innovative, adaptable and sustainable agricultural and/or livestock production practices which allow them to significantly reduce their average food gap per year.
3. The livelihoods of the target group are strengthened and more resilient against conflict and climate risks.

A baseline was carried out and completed in December 2016 and project monitoring missions carried out in July 2017 and November 2017. Six semi-annual reports covering the period 01 September 2016 to 30 June 2019 have been submitted to DKH. The end of the first phase of PROMISE was in June 2019, for which matter VSF is seeking to conduct a mid-term evaluation.

3. Scope, purpose and objectives of the evaluation

3.1 Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the progress made towards achieving expected outputs and outcomes and identify and document lessons-learned and to make recommendations to improve the project for the implementation of phase 2. The evaluation shall further coagulate the identified issues into actionable elements, aimed at improving the current project status.

3.2 Objectives of the evaluation

- a) To appraise and establish the relevance of the project. The evaluation will appraise the appropriateness of project objectives to the problems that it was supposed to address, and to the physical and policy environment within which it operates. This will include an assessment of the quality of project preparation and design – i.e. the logic and completeness of the project planning process, the internal logic and coherence of the project design.
- b) To determine the level of efficiency of the project implementation. Project efficiency will be evaluated by gauging whether the progress made towards achieving the

expected results is happening at a reasonable cost – how efficiently means and activities are being converted into outputs.

- c) To determine the effectiveness of the project implementation. The mid-term evaluation will determine the contribution made by project outputs towards achieving the project objectives, and how assumptions have affected project achievements.
- d) The evaluation shall also determine the effectiveness of the employed approaches in addressing the primary challenges affecting the community. The linkage and resultant synergy between these respective components shall be appraised.
- e) To determine the project quality. The evaluation shall appraise PROMISE against desirable project quality factors that include: participation and ownership by beneficiaries; policy conformity; appropriate technology; socio-cultural implications; gender equality & outcomes; environmental protection; local institutional development; and management capacities; and financial and economic viability. Any deviation from initial plans shall be evaluated and accounted for. Achievements made in respect of the exit strategy will be gauged.
- f) To provide actionable, context appropriate and innovative recommendations for project improvement and future programming.
- g) To evaluate the project on quality and accountability using the Core Humanitarian Standards (CHS).
- h) Engage in more explorative study to identify overall outcomes and impact against the backdrop of a “Resilience Framework” (from the perspectives of capacities of communities) and to identify potential shortcomings in this respect as a crucial basis to improve approaches in the second phase.
- i) Engage communities (focus on school feeding committees and other groups established), in action-research and a visioning exercise that borrows from PVCA (Participatory Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment) and SCLR (Supporting Community-Led Response). Identify potential to enhance resilience of communities to maintain educational outcomes and food security with “own means” *with* the support and facilitation of the project for the next five years and *without* upon exit (based on a “Resilience”/LRRD framework).

3.3 Evaluation type

This is a mid-term evaluation to assess the progress made by the project towards achieving planned activities and results as set out in the project design. It aims at capturing the progress attained towards addressing the project objectives.

3.4 Scope of the evaluation

The mid-term review period will focus on the past 34 months of project implementation from September 2016 to June 2019 in the targeted project areas in Cueibet County. The evaluation will cover in detail programming quality as well as protection and equality topics.

3.5 Target audience

- a) *BMZ, Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe and Bread for the World:* The mid-term evaluation shall provide the donor BMZ and Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe with information on how the project is performing towards finally contributing to the final objectives of the program and what follow-up actions may be necessary to ensure the desired outcomes and project re-designing to suite the context dynamics.
- b) *VSF Germany and partners:* The mid-term evaluation shall provide VSF and its partner's opportunity to critically assess technical arising issues and mechanisms and meticulously focus on the recommendations to improve the pathways and potential of PROMISE to achieve expected outcomes and objectives within the project timeframe.
- c) *Beneficiaries and stakeholders:* The mid-term evaluation process will accord beneficiaries and stakeholders opportunity to participate in the review process, build the capacity for effective participation in reviews, and enhance ownership and accountability of the implementing partners. The exercise will enable improvement of the relevance of the project to the needs of the beneficiary and priorities of the stakeholders.

4. Key questions

The evaluation tasks relate directly to the evaluation objectives and should be comprehensively addressed with reference to one another.

The key questions of this evaluation based on the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria are:

Relevance

1. What is the prevailing project context and its significance to project implementation?
2. Who are the key actors (stakeholders) in the project? What are their roles and responsibilities and how have they influenced project implementation?
3. What is the relevance of the project objectives to the beneficiaries, community, governance and policy priorities at project and how has this changed during the life span of the project?

Effectiveness

4. To what extent is the project meeting its objectives?
5. To what extent has each of the approaches employed by the project contributed towards achievement of project objectives?
6. What is the quality of the outputs?
7. What are the identified and potential barriers to successful delivery of the project?
8. How have the assumptions made at project design evolved and how have they impacted on the project implementation and progress towards achievement of the objectives?
9. What are the strengths and successes in project implementation (management, staff, coordination and reporting)?

10. What are the weaknesses and challenges in project implementation (management, staff capacity, coordination and reporting)?
11. How has the project responded to each of the quality parameters listed under 3.2 (e) above?

Efficiency

12. What is the level of cost-effectiveness in the accomplishment of the outputs completed so far or in the process of completion?
13. Were objectives achieved on time?

Impact

14. To what extent is it likely that the results of the project in terms of the project objectives (outcome level) contributed or will contribute to the achievement of the overall goal of the project (impact level)?
15. Are there other unintended positive and/or negative changes which have occurred by implementing the project?
16. How effective has the project been in delivering a gender impact and what unutilised potentials can be identified?

Sustainability

17. Has the project contributed to enhanced community resilience, and which steps could contribute to this even further?
18. What is the degree of soundness and feasibility of the project's exit strategy and to what extent has it been implemented?
19. What is the level of overall viability of the expected outcomes and signs of sustainability of the same?

5. Evaluation design and methods

It is a requirement that the evaluation standards of the German Evaluation Society (DeGEval) and the principles and standards of the OECD/DAC for a participatory, credible, gender-sensitive and fair evaluation will be observed.

The methodology proposed by the consultant(s) should include a mix of quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. The chosen methods shall be inclusive and respect the social and cultural context of the target groups. The desired methodology is participatory and all the key stakeholders in the program including target beneficiaries, County Agriculture and County Livestock Department staff, will be considered to be part of the mid-term evaluation process. The evaluation will be based on the findings and factual statements identified from review of relevant documents including the project document, Annual Project Reports (APR), Project Implementation Reports (PIR), in addition to the technical reports produced by the project.

The anticipated benefit of a participatory and stakeholder-centred approach is the empowering that the process will impart to those service providers and the beneficiaries/stakeholders who will participate in the exercise. Focus group discussions, key informant interviews, site visits, etc. are proposed amongst the methods to be used

for the review. The consultant will provide leadership and bear responsibility for the process, the findings, the comments and the content of the final document. VSF will be responsible for organizing the locations for conducting interviews, household questionnaire and/or focus group discussions in the respective payams of operation whilst the consultant will review and finalize the tools in conjunction with VSF programming team. Participation of stakeholders in the evaluation should be maintained at all the times, reflecting opinions, expectations and vision about the contribution of the project towards the achievement of its objectives.

The consultant should generate a sampling strategy upon giving appropriate justification which will then be reviewed by VSF and DKH program team before being adopted.

6. Expected products

Inception report

The inception report shall provide a detailed description of the methodology to answer the evaluation questions as well as the proposed source of information and data collection procedure. The inception report shall outline the contents of all the deliverables. The inception report shall be written in English and should not exceed 15 pages and must be accepted by DKH and VSF.

Draft evaluation report

The consultancy team will develop a draft evaluation report for review by the PROMISE program personnel and partners. The final report shall be validated by stakeholders in Berlin and via Skype as may be feasible. The draft report will adopt the format of the final report as presented below under the final report. Generally, the report will include the executive summary, intervention description, evaluation purpose, evaluation methodology, findings and conclusions (answers to the evaluation questions), recommendations and annexes (list of people interviewed, key documents consulted, data collection instruments, ToR, etc.).

Final evaluation report

The evaluation team shall endeavour to develop the final report and present the output in an electronic format to DKH and VSF for final approval and adoption. The final report (Word, Excel files to be put in PDF as well) will be submitted according to the evaluation timeline. The final report shall be written in English and should not exceed 40 pages plus annexes. A sample structure for the evaluation report can be downloaded [here](#).

The final report will be accompanied by the following deliverables:

- A 2-page evaluation fact sheet and soft copy of dataset. This is to include relevant findings from the evaluation, key points and recommendations.
- An Indicator Summary Sheet, giving status of all indicators measured in the questionnaire compared against baseline values.
- Learning dossier – lessons learnt by the entire evaluation team shall be documented and shared with the project team and Programs Office Juba so that

they may be taken into consideration for future studies. The documentation of these lessons will be vital for reflection, growth and continued improvement.

Short anonymous summary of the evaluation

Between 7,000 and 10,000 characters (with spaces) for the homepage of Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe and/or Bread for the World.

7. Process of the evaluation/time frame

When	Who	What
20 November 2019	Consultant	Expression of interest plus questions
25 November 2019	DKH/Bread for the World, VSF	Circulation of responses to questions raised by interested parties
11 December 2019	Consultant	Submission of offers
18 December 2019	DKH/Bread for the World, VSF	Selection of evaluation team
20 January 2020	DKH/Bread for the World, VSF	Concluding the contract(s)
End of January 2020	Consultant, DKH/Bread for the World, VSF	Kick-off meeting (tentatively via Skype)
February 2020	Consultant	Inception report
March 2020	Consultant (with local support)	Data collection and analysis
Middle of April 2020	Consultant	Draft version of the evaluation report
Beginning of May 2020	Consultant, DKH, VSF	Validation of report (Berlin & via Skype)
End of May 2020	Consultant	Final version of the evaluation report

8. Key qualifications of the evaluators

The evaluation team should be composed of one consultant with international work experience and at least one local consultant.

The evaluation team shall compose of members with a comprehensive mix of competencies in agro-pastoral production and market systems and evaluation methods (quantitative and qualitative methods). These will be complemented with at least five years' experience in related programming and program research. Extensive experience in the specific fields in the Horn of Africa and South Sudan in particular will be required. Excellent communication skills as well as demonstrated writing and presentation skills are requisite.

9. Management arrangements

The consultant should be informed of some issues, situation and conditions as they are or may arise during the exercise.

- a) **Contractual matters:** The evaluation will be financed by two different funds. The Protestant Agency for Diakonie and Development (Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe/ Bread for the World) will conclude a contract with the international consultant. The local consultant(s) will get a separate contract by the partner organization. The financial offer should contain two separate budgets: one for the international consultant and another for the local consultant(s). However, the technical offer should contain an evaluation team and an overall approach.
- b) **Travel:** All international flights land in Juba, it is not possible to fly to Rumbek and onwards to Cueibet on the same day. Rumbek flights are only during week days. The consultant should take into consideration this challenge that should not lead to cancellation of the exercise. VSF will cover the cost of all internal flights and transport.
- c) **Accommodation:** Consultants will be housed in hotels in Juba and Rumbek whilst in Cueibet they will be housed at the organizations compound lodgings. However, electricity for powering laptops is not guaranteed at all times. Internet access will be available at VSF offices, but may not be available in the hotels.
- d) **Data entry** may not be possible in the field. VSF will not supply data entry clerks or equipment for data entry. Consultants are responsible for all data entry and management. All hard copies of tools will need to be transported by consultants to the place where data entry will be done. All data sets must be provided to VSF in soft copy at the time of submission. They are the property of VSF and the communities from which the data will be collected and may be used for future analysis. Data will in most instances be collected from non-English speakers. However, tools will not be translated into the local language. A way around this matter will be developed in discussion with VSF program staff and the consultant.
- e) **Operation arrangement**
 - Accommodation and transport will be provided by VSF;
 - Translators, drivers, facilitators, office space, printing of questionnaires, etc. will be provided by VSF;
 - The contact person in South Sudan will be the VSF Country Programs Manager;
 - The focal person in the field will be the Project Manager;
 - Security advisory issues will be provided by VSF;
 - VSF will take care of internal travels but in case of international flights, the consultant will organize and DKH will pay reasonable prices incurred only.
- f) **Reference materials:** Relevant documents will be available for the secondary information desk study. The consultant will be encouraged to identify any other sources for appropriate additional information that may be required to supplement

what is provided by the project. The project team will share the following documents with the consultants for reference:

- Project Application
- Cooperation Agreement for PROMISE
- Cooperation Agreement for complementary projects
- Baseline report
- Project log frame
- Project activity reports
- Project Interim Reports
- Sudan Population and Housing Census report 2008
- National Baseline Household Survey 2009
- FAO/WFP food security assessment/survey reports
- IPC reports
- Humanitarian Response Plan 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020
- Comprehensive Agricultural Master Plan 2018
- Other reports and documents that may be necessary

10. Content of the evaluator's offer

a) Expression of interest

Interested consultants, who intend to hand in a proposal, can submit their expression of interest and ask questions until **20 November 2019** using the e-mail-addresses below. Questions asked in the context of the expression of interest will be answered by **25 November 2019** and the answers will be sent to all of the consultants having submitted their expression of interest. After the 20 November 2019 consultants can still participate and hand in an offer and ask for the answers given, but no further questions will be admitted.

b) Submission of offers

Offers must be submitted by **11 December 2019**. A complete offer submission consists of:

- **CVs** of all consultants involved;
- a **technical proposal**, which states by what methods the objective of the evaluation is to be achieved, how the team will distribute the tasks between themselves and sets out the timeframe;
- a **financial proposal** stating the fees for the consultants, the estimated travel and ancillary costs and subsistence. All costs including VAT must be set out in the financial proposals. The financial offer should contain two separate budgets: one for the international consultant and another for the local consultant(s).

We reserve the right to conduct telephone or personal interviews with 2-3 bidders in order to reach a decision. Further, we reserve the right to take a decision among the offers received.

The selection process of the assignment will be taken place by 18 December 2019.

Please send the complete offer by e-mail to:

Evangelisches Werk für Diakonie und
Entwicklung e.V.
Abteilung Ergebnismanagement und
Verfahrenssicherung
Attn. Dietmar Mälzer
Caroline-Michaelis Str. 1
10115 Berlin, Germany
e-mail: dietmar.maelzer@brot-fuer-die-welt.de

Evangelisches Werk für Diakonie und
Entwicklung e.V.
Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe
Attn. Mario Göb
Caroline-Michaelis Str. 1
10115 Berlin, Germany
e-mail: mario.goeb@diakonie-katastrophenhilfe.de

Vétérinaires sans Frontières (VSF)
Attn. Mr. Silvester Okoth
Address: off Unity Road, Hai Malaka, Juba.
Land mark: across UAP Equatoria Tower,
alongside Cambridge Training Centre, & opp
Finance SS.
e-mail: silvester.okoth@vsfg.org