



Funded by  
the European Union



## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### END-TERM EVALUATION: FOSTERING PEACE AND NATURAL RESOURCES GOVERNANCE (FOPNAG) PROJECT

<b>Region</b>	<b>EAST AFRICA</b>
<b>Beneficiary Country</b>	<b>SOUTH SUDAN</b>
<b>Sector (as defined in CSP/NIP)</b>	<b>Food Security and Livelihoods</b>
<b>Project reference</b>	<b>Contract NDICI AFRICA/2023/446-389 (Reference: ACT-60408 “Peace, rule of law, and reconciliation”)</b>
<b>Contracting Authority</b>	<b>European Union Delegation to the Republic of South Sudan</b>
<b>Implementing Partners</b>	<b>Vétérinaires Sans Frontières Germany (VSF Germany) – Lead Applicant, and Enjojo Foundation – Co-applicant.</b>
<b>Project Duration</b>	<b>30 months (January 2024- September 2026) and a 3-month No cost extension (July-September 2026)</b>
<b>End-Term Evaluation Period:</b>	<b>At the end of project implementation (covering the full period: January 2024 – September 2026)</b>
<b>Project Location</b>	<b>Kidepo Game Reserve (KGR) in Ikotos and Budi counties, Eastern Equatoria State, South Sudan; and Lantoto National Park (LNP) in Yei and Maridi Counties, Central and Western Equatoria States, South Sudan.</b>

## Table of contents

1. Evaluation mandate .....	4
2. Background .....	4
3. Evaluation Objectives and Main Users .....	5
4. Evaluation scope, Intervention Logic and Evaluation Questions:.....	7
4.1. <i>Scope</i> .....	7
4.2. <i>Intervention Logic of the Project/Programme</i> .....	7
4.3. <i>Issues to be studied / Evaluation Questions</i> .....	7
5. Methodology, Tools and main Deliverables.....	10
5.1. <i>The evaluation approach and the main deliverables</i> .....	12
5.2. <i>Quality of the Final Evaluation Report</i> .....	14
5.3. <i>Management and steering of the Evaluation</i> .....	14
6. Reporting Requirements.....	15
7. The Evaluation Team .....	16
8. Technical Offer.....	17
9. The Indicative Work Plan & Time Table .....	17
10. Administrative aspects .....	18
11. Annexes .....	20
11.1. Annex I: Information that will be provided to the evaluation team .....	20
11.2. Annex II: structure of the Executive Summary & Final Report.....	21
11.3. Annex III: Quality assessment grid .....	23

## List of Accronyns

CV	Curriculum Vitae
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
EF	Enjojo Foundation
EU	European Union
FGD	Focus Group Discussions
FOPNAG	Fostering Peace and Natural Resources Governance in NaturAfrica Supported Landscapes in South Sudan
HH	Household
KGR	Kidepo Game Researve
KII	Key Informant Interviews
LNP	Lantoto National Park
MEAL	Monitoring, Eevaluation, Accountability and Learning
NDICI	Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
PIR	Project Implementation Reports
PLWD	People Living with Disabilities
PMT	Project Management Team
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
ROM	Results Oriented Monitoring
SSPDF	South Sudan People's Defence Forces
SSW	South Sudan Wildlife Service
TA	Technical Assistants
TOR	Terms of Reference
VAT	Value Added Tax
VICOBA	Village Community Banks
VSF-G	Vétérinaires sans Frontières Germany
VSLA	Village Savings and Loans Association

## 1. EVALUATION MANDATE

The focus of this end-term evaluation is the assessment of achievements, quality and results of interventions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy with an increasing emphasis on result-oriented approaches<sup>1</sup>. The FOPNAG end-term evaluation also seeks to carry out an appraisal of the Project Impact, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability and progress towards meeting its overall objective. The information gathered will be important in understanding to what extent the project achieved or didn't achieve expected results. It will serve as an accountability assessment and report to the European Union, FOPNAG partners and project stakeholders. The evaluation will seek to provide an understanding of the cause and effects links between activities and results as well as serve as a decision making, learning and management purpose. The end-term evaluation is a specific requirement under the FOPNAG Financial Agreement.

## 2. BACKGROUND

Vétérinaires Sans Frontières Germany (VSFG) 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 Germany 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. VSF-G is implementing a Thirty-month grant (and a 3-month No-cost extension) funded by European Union funding framework for cooperation with African countries under the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument – Global Europe (NDICI). for a project entitled Fostering Peace and Natural Resources Governance (FOPNAG).

The FOPNAG project aims to contribute to an inclusive and peaceful society in South Sudan that respects the rule of law and human rights, through enhanced social cohesion, reconciliation, and sustainable management of natural resources. The action specifically promotes peace and enhances resilience in NaturAfrica-supported landscapes, namely Kidepo Game Reserve and Lantoto National Park.

The project adopts a holistic approach, linking non-violent conflict resolution and peacebuilding with livelihood recovery and economic opportunities to foster sustainable peace and social cohesion. It seeks to reduce food insecurity by diversifying livelihoods and providing economic opportunities as "peace dividends." Concurrently, it strengthens social cohesion through the inclusion of marginalized groups, advocacy, and capacity building for improved inter- and intra-community relations, with active participation of community members in peacebuilding activities through peace committees and dialogues.

The project operates in contexts marked by complex challenges:

- **Kidepo Game Reserve:** Historically volatile with conflicts driven by cattle raiding, banditry, and revenge killings, leading to displacement and hindering development. Competition for land, water, and pasture, coupled with high youth

---

<sup>1</sup> COM (2011) 637 final "Increasing the impact of EU Development Policy: an Agenda for Change"

unemployment remains a critical challenge that exacerbates negative coping mechanisms and criminality. The lack of economic opportunities, especially for young people, intensifies competition over scarce resources such as land, water, and pasture. This situation fuels negative coping mechanisms and increases susceptibility to criminality and armed violence.

- **Lantoto National Park:** Faces insecurity due to the presence of non-signatory armed groups such as (NAS) and regular clashes with SSPDF. Due to the political nature of this conflict, the project focuses solely on livelihood support in LNP to increase community resilience, rather than direct peacebuilding.

The project works closely with another EU-funded conservation project (NDCI AFRICA/2023/446-393 – "Restoring effective management control in the Kidepo Game Reserve and associated catchment forests of South Sudan and improving the welfare of neighbouring communities") to maximize synergy and landscape transformation.

The 3 key result areas of the project are:

The Project aims at achieving its overall goals by attaining the following outcomes:

- **Outcome 1:** Local initiatives/mechanisms for conflict resolution, reconciliation, and trauma healing strengthened.
- **Outcome 2:** Community resilience is strengthened through increased economic opportunities and sustainable livelihoods.
- **Outcome 3:** Communities, including women, youth, and disadvantaged groups, are empowered and increasingly able to meaningfully participate in local and broader political, peace, and security processes.

The project ends in September 2026, for which matter VSFG is seeking to conduct an end-term evaluation of the project progress made to date against the baseline. The review will be participatory with valid inputs from all the relevant stakeholders such as beneficiaries, local authorities at state and National Wildlife and livestock officials, VSFG Staff and other community stakeholders.

### 3. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND MAIN USERS

The main objectives of the end-term evaluation is to provide the relevant external co-operation services of the European Union, VSF Germany, government and beneficiary communities with:

- an overall independent assessment of the past performance of the FOPNAG intervention paying particular attention - with particular attention to the extent to which project results have been achieved against its stated objectives- key lessons learned and actionable recommendations to improve ongoing and future interventions.

Specific evaluation objectives will be as follows:

- a. To appraise and establish the **relevance** and **appropriateness** of the project

The evaluation will appraise the appropriateness of project objectives and activities to the problems that it was supposed to address, to the physical and policy environment within which it operates, and to the needs, capacities, and preferences of the target group. 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 expected results were achieved timely – how efficiently Means and Activities are being converted into Outputs. This includes comparison with possible alternatives.

c. To determine the **effectiveness** of the project implementation

The end-term evaluation will determine the contribution made by project Outputs towards achieving the Project Objectives, and how Assumptions and Risks have materialized and possibly affected project achievements.

The evaluation shall determine the effectiveness of the employed approaches in addressing the primary challenges affecting the community. Further, the linkage and resultant synergy between these respective components shall be appraised.

d. To determine the project **quality**

The evaluation shall appraise FOPNAG against desirable project quality factors that include: Participation and ownership by beneficiaries; Policy conformity; Appropriate technology; Socio-cultural implications; Gender equality; 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.

e. To determine the project **accountability** towards beneficiaries

The evaluation shall include an examination of the projects achievements with regards to key commitments of the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS), especially with regards to accountability to and participation of affected communities (women and men, girls and boys, elderly and particularly vulnerable groups).

The end-term evaluation will provide the European Union, as the donor, with a comprehensive and evidence-based assessment of the project's performance, focusing on the extent to which agreed objectives and intended outcomes have been achieved

**a. VSF Germany, Enjojo Foundation and other partners.**

The end-term evaluation shall provide VSFG and its partner's opportunity to critically assess administrative and technical issues and mechanisms and use of the resulting recommendations to adopt in future programming.

**b. Beneficiaries and stakeholders**

The end-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. As such, the end-term review is part of and should help to strengthen accountability to affected communities (women and men, girls and boys, elderly and particularly vulnerable groups) and participation benchmarks as stipulated by the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS).

#### **4. EVALUATION SCOPE, INTERVENTION LOGIC AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS:**

##### **4.1. SCOPE**

The end-term review period will focus on the entire project implementation period (January 2024 – September 2026) and all geographical areas: Kidepo Game Reserve (Ikotos and Budi counties) and Lantoto National Park (Yei, and Maridi Counties) of Eastern Equatoria. The evaluation will cover in detail programming quality as well as accountability to affected communities, protection and Gender equality topics. The evaluation will also take into account the previous VSFG EU funded projects such as RRP, PARIS, FESAP, as well as the ZEAT-BEAD FOPNAG project.

##### **4.2. INTERVENTION LOGIC OF THE PROJECT/PROGRAMME**

Through this Action, the European Union funding will help mitigate the risk of violence and contribute to an inclusive and peaceful society in South Sudan through a multi-layered approach, flexible multi-sector interventions and joint advocacy initiatives cognizant of existing complexities in conflict typology. This Action will happen alongside another EU funded conservation project. The proposed Theory of Change and the intervention logic is that the proposed intervention will contribute to an inclusive and peaceful society in South Sudan that respects the rule of law and human rights through enhanced social cohesion, reconciliation and sustainable management of natural resources: If conflict resolution mechanisms are strengthened and the capacities of peace scouts, peace committees, chiefs and local leaders are developed to enable them to raise the issues, then peace groups will contribute to local peacebuilding processes. If there are increased dialogues between men, women, youth and justice and security service related stakeholders, then local or national-level initiatives/ action will occur for improved security, formal and informal justice actors will have the capacity to participate in ongoing rule of law interventions, engage and participate in decision making platforms, and provide increased access to justice for the population using established frameworks and mechanisms. If the peacebuilding mechanisms generate interactions between conflicting parties, then it will build an environment of understanding and trust, and If there is evidence of peaceful resolution of conflict, then confidence in, and acceptance of, peacebuilding mechanisms will be developed. If resilience activities are implemented through provision of technical and business skills, then communities will increase access to community assets, youth and women will engage in positive livelihoods, and capacity in natural resource management will be enhanced. Increased capacity of communities will contribute to behavioural changes such as increased self-reliance, functional natural resource management structures, increased youth and women engagement in peace promotion and increased peace dividends.

##### **4.3. ISSUES TO BE STUDIED / EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

The evaluation will assess the project/programme using the standard 5 OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

#### ***4.3.1 Determine the relevance and appropriateness of the project***

- a. What is the prevailing project context and its significance to project implementation?
- b. Who are the key actors (stakeholders) in the project, what are their roles and responsibilities and how have they influenced project implementation?
- c. What is the relevance of the project objectives to the beneficiary, community, governance and policy priorities at project and how has this changed during the life span of the project?
- d. What are the strengths and weaknesses in project design and how have these impacted on project implementation and monitoring?
- e. To what extent did the project's objectives and design align with the needs and priorities of target communities (agropastoralists, women, youth, PLWDs, local leaders) and remain appropriate throughout implementation?
- f. How well did the intervention logic respond to the evolving socio-political, economic, and environmental context in South Sudan?
- g. To what extent did the project align with national development plans, EU strategies, and relevant frameworks? Was the differentiated approach (peacebuilding in KGR vs. livelihood support in LNP) appropriate?

#### ***4.3.2 Determine the efficiency of the project***

- a. What is the level of cost-effectiveness in the accomplishment of the outputs completed?
- b. What is the quality of the outputs?
- c. What are the strengths and successes in project implementation (management, staff, coordination and reporting)?
- d. What are the weakness and challenges in project implementation (management, staff capacity, coordination and reporting)?
- e. Would there be alternative solutions or approaches which are likely more cost-efficient?
- f. Were project resources (financial, human, material) utilized economically, timely, and cost-effectively to deliver results?
- g. How efficient was the project management structure (Steering Committee, PMT, partner roles) and coordination mechanisms?
- h. How effective were monitoring, reporting, and adaptive management systems?

#### ***4.3.3 Determine the effectiveness of the project***

- a. To what extent did the project meet its objectives?
- b. To what extent has each of the approaches employed by the project contributed towards achievement of project objectives?
- c. Did the project reduce or accidentally increase resource competition?
- d. What were the identified and potential barriers to successful delivery of the project?
- e. How have the assumptions made at project design evolved and how have they impacted on the project implementation and achievement of the objectives?
- f. What is the degree of project quality with reference to the evaluation's desired project quality factors?
- g. To what extent were the planned outputs and outcomes achieved against baseline and target values in the Logical Framework? (Reference specific indicators, e.g., number of people trained in conflict management, VSLA/VICOBA established, women in peace processes, etc.)

- h. What were the main internal and external factors influencing achievement (or non-achievement) of results?
- i. How effectively were cross-cutting themes (gender, protection, disability, etc.) mainstreamed and how did they contribute to results?
- j. How well did the project adapt to contextual changes and emerging challenges?

#### **4.3.4 Determine progress towards impact and sustainability of results**

- a. What is the degree of soundness and feasibility of the projects exit strategy and to what extent has it been implemented?
- b. What is the level of overall viability of the expected outcomes and signs of sustainability of the same?
- c. What is the overall impact on Gender and equal opportunities for women and men? (Take Gender Analysis of the project into consideration.)
- d. What has happened as a result of the project? (Intended and unintended impacts on individuals, communities, institutions, improvement of social and economic indicators, health, poverty reduction, resilience, capacities, assets, cross-sectoral impact, impact on Gender and equal opportunities for women and men, age-groups, or other relevant cross-cutting issues)
- e. To what extent will the positive impacts or changes of the project (are likely to) continue?
- f. Taking DRR and Resilience concepts as a background, which aspects of community resilience and disaster risk reduction did the project strengthen and how, in order to avoid affected communities falling back with renewed hazards.
- g. Which measures were implemented in order to support sustainability?
- h. To what extent did the benefits of this or similar other projects/activities persist after donor funding ceased?
- i. What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?
- j. To what extent has the project contributed to the overall objective of strengthening resilience of agropastoral communities in the Kidepo catchment against recurring climate and other shocks? (Reference impact indicators: reduction in conflict incidences, increased personal safety/security, institutional conflict handling strategies, etc.)
- k. What were the observed intended and unintended positive or negative effects on social cohesion, resource access, power dynamics, and broader peace and resilience? What is the likelihood that project benefits (peace mechanisms, livelihoods, capacities, etc.) will continue after closure?
- l. To what extent were local capacities (community structures, leaders, institutions) strengthened for sustained results?
- m. What measures were taken to ensure financial, institutional, policy, environmental, and social sustainability? What gaps remain?

#### **4.3.5 Reach:**

- To what extent have the project beneficiaries been reached and what mechanisms were in place to improve coverage?

#### **4.3.6 Quality:**

The End-term evaluation should assess the overall quality of the implementation. It is important to include beneficiaries' opinions on the quality of the services received.

- What mechanisms have been in place to track implementation of the project? (i.e. internal monitoring, evaluation, accountability, learning (MEAL)) and quality assurance mechanisms)?
- Did the quality of the outputs delivered by the project meet the needs and expectations of the beneficiaries? What do beneficiaries feel could be improved for enhancing local capacity?
- To what extent have project outputs contributed to build long-term community capacity?
- To what extent the project was participatory throughout the project cycle?

#### **4.3.7 Learning:**

- Is there any substantial evidence on how project learning were generated and applied to improve the implementation, effectiveness and efficiency of the project?
- Who benefited from shared learning experiences (e.g. joint meetings, joint field visits, workshops provision on best approaches and methodology), mainly the NGOs or also the local sector, community members and beneficiaries?
- How did the different actors learn from these experiences?
- The End-term evaluation should at least include one lesson learned and recommendation per evaluation category, i.e. effectiveness, efficiency, relevance etc.
- What are the key lessons learnt so far per project objective? To what extent has the delivery of response activities contributed to effective, efficient, relevant and timely delivery of aid and enhanced impact for the beneficiaries?

#### **4.3.8 Complementarity and harmonization:**

- Are there any concrete examples of successful models of collaboration of the project with other EU/NGO partners on geographic level, not just in terms of avoiding duplication but increasing complementarity and integrated programs affecting the reach and impact on beneficiaries?
- To what extent were the activities of the project complementary to the work of other stakeholders, i.e. prevented duplication and contributed to the larger response activities in South Sudan?

#### **4.3.9 Visibility:**

- How visible is European Union emblem and partner's logo at project sites?
- What measures have been taken to create visibility of the project's added value towards government line ministries and other INGOs?

In addition, the evaluation will assess two EU specific evaluation criteria:

- the EU added value of the project/programme, both regarding its design and implementation;
- the coherence of the project/programme itself, with the EU strategy in South Sudan and with Member States, and other donors such as USAID.

## **5. METHODOLOGY, TOOLS AND MAIN DELIVERABLES**

The assessment methodology proposed by the consultant(s) should include a mix of quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. The desired methodology is participatory and all the key stakeholders in the program including target beneficiaries, County Wildlife and County Livestock Department staff, will be considered to be part of the end-term evaluation process. Also non-beneficiaries should be met and interviewed.

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.

Verbal expressions of stakeholders and beneficiaries which give exceptional insights should be recorded literally with reference.

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 (female, male, girls, boys, elderly, PLWD), key informant interviews, site visits/transect walks supported by elders and rangers, joint community mapping (female, male), surveys, 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. VSFG will be responsible for organizing the locations for conducting the Key Informant interviews, PRA related methods, household questionnaire and 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 general rule related to acceptable margins of error (5%) in social research will apply to the study. Sampling criteria should be agreed upon with VSFG National office, a 30 x 30 cluster sampling is recommended, however, the Consultant may have the discretion to employ any other sampling methodology upon giving appropriate justification which will then be reviewed by VSF programme team before being adopted.

Triangulation of data is important and comparisons with the baseline have to be presented.

Important: Data collected needs to be disaggregated into Gender, age, location, and any other relevant category to the issue at hand (e.g. duration of residency, HH status, etc.).

For HH surveys, the use of electronic data collection is highly recommended with preference of Kobotoolbox/ODK.

The process

- **Desk Review:** All project documents (Description of Action, Logframe, progress/interim/final reports, baseline report, M&E plans, EU ROM report, etc.).
- **Key Informant Interviews (KIIs):** With VSF Germany and Enjojo Foundation staff (management, project teams, MEAL), EU Delegation representatives, local government officials, traditional leaders, police, SSWS, and other relevant stakeholders (e.g., Catholic Church, other NGOs).
- **Focus Group Discussions (FGDs):** With diverse groups of direct and indirect beneficiaries, including women, youth, PLWDs, peace committee members, CAHWs, VSLA/VICOBA members, producer group members, and community members in both Kidepo and Lantoto project areas.
- **Field Visits and Direct Observation:** On the ground visit to project sites in Kidepo Game Reserve (Ikotos and Budi) and Lantoto National Park (Yei and Maridi) to verify activities and observe changes. Due consideration must be given to security protocols.
- **Data Analysis:** Quantitative data analysis (e.g., against project indicators in the approved Logframe) and qualitative data analysis (thematic analysis of interviews/FGDs).
- **Validation Workshop:** A workshop with key stakeholders (VSF Germany, Enjojo Foundation, EU Delegation, relevant local authorities, and community representatives) to present preliminary findings and gather feedback.
- Sharing of initial findings and learning with regional team and partners in country

Additional guidance on the methodology to be used can be obtained from the DEVCO Evaluation methodology for projects/programmes as set out on the website

<http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/node/71165>

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/reports/2008/1258\\_isspap\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/reports/2008/1258_isspap_en.pdf)

## 5.1. EVALUATION APPROACH AND MAIN DELIVERABLES

The evaluation process will be carried out in five phases: an Inception Phase, a Desk Phase, a Field Phase, a Synthesis Phase and finally a Dissemination phase. Deliverables in the form of reports and/or slide presentations should be submitted at the end of the corresponding stages.

*Synthetic table of phases/deliverable –*

<b>Phases of the evaluation:</b>	<b>Methodological Stages:</b>	<b>Deliverables</b>
1. <u>Inception Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structuring the evaluation (Detailed work plan, refined methodology, evaluation matrix/questions, data collection tools, sampling strategy, and report outline (max 15 pages).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>Inception report/Note</i> The inception report shall provide a detailed description of the methodology as per the evaluation questions as well as the proposed source of information and data collection</li> </ul>
2. <u>Desk Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data Collection</li> <li>• Analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>Desk Report / Note</i></li> </ul>
3. <u>Field Phase</u> (Mission in the country)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data collection</li> <li>• Analysis</li> <li>• Verification of hypothesis/preliminary findings</li> <li>• Debriefing before leaving the country to share key findings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>Intermediary report / Note</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Slide Presentation of key observation from field</i></li> </ul>
4. <u>Synthesis phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis and Judgements</li> <li>• Drafting and Finalisation of the report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>Final report</i></li> <li>➤ <i>Learning Dossier</i></li> </ul>
5. Dissemination phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publication of the report</li> <li>• Dissemination of the findings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>Seminar / Publication / Conference</i></li> </ul>

### 5.1.1. Inception phase

The process will start with a briefing session in Juba. Half-day presence of Evaluation team, Project Management team, EU TAs and Country Management team is required.

In the inception phase, the relevant documents will be reviewed (see annex 1). The evaluation team will then analyse the Intervention logic. On the basis of the information collected the evaluation team should:

- Describe the development co-operation context.
- Comment on /analyse the intervention logic / logical framework.
- Comment on the evaluation questions proposed or, when relevant, propose an alternative or complementary set of evaluation questions justifying their relevance.
- Check the consistency and validity of the evaluation questions, propose judgement criteria and identify provisional indicators and their means of verification
- Present an indicative methodology for the overall assessment of the project/programme.
- Describe the approach for answering each evaluation questions.
- Propose the work plan.
- Confirm the final schedule for the evaluation exercise

During the inception stage a report/note shall be prepared and shared with EUTA'a for approval (see section 6).

### **5.1.2. Desk phase**

In the Desk Phase, the evaluation team shall carry out the following tasks:

- Analyse systematically the relevant available documents;
- Interview the FOPNAG project management, EUD's as well as VSFG and its partners.
- Provide preliminary responses to each evaluation question stating the information already gathered and their limitations, identify the issues still to be covered and the assumptions to be tested, and describe a full method to address the question.
- Identify and present the list of tools to be applied in the Field Phase;
- List all preparatory steps already taken/to be taken for the Field Phase.

At the end of the desk phase a desk report/presentation will be prepared. A presentation by the evaluation team to the Reference Group will take place in Juba with the Evaluation team and FOPNAG management in attendance.

### **5.1.3. Field phase**

The Field Phase starts after approval of the Desk Phase report by the evaluation commissioner. Before going to the field, the evaluation team must submit its detailed work plan, including the list of people to be interviewed, and other data collection tools to be used, dates of visit, itinerary, and name of team members in charge. If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation, these should be immediately discussed with the evaluation manager.

In the first days of the field phase, the evaluation team shall hold a briefing meeting with the FOPNAG field project team as well as state and county stakeholders.

During the field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; working closely with the relevant government authorities and agencies; using the most reliable and appropriate sources of information.

At the end of the field phase, the evaluation team shall summarise its work, discuss the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present preliminary findings in a meeting with the VSFG Head of field office.

#### **5.1.4. Synthesis phase**

This phase is mainly devoted to the preparation of the draft final report. The evaluation team will present in a single document their findings, conclusions and recommendations in accordance with the agreed structure (Annex II).

The evaluation team will make sure that:

- Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements accurate and verifiable, and recommendations realistic.
- When drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.

The evaluation team, comprised of the team leader and deputy team leader will present) the draft final report to the reference Group to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations. On the basis of comments expressed by the reference group members, the evaluation team has to amend and revise the draft report. While potential quality issues, factual errors or methodological problems should be corrected, comments linked to diverging judgements may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluation team should explain the reasons in writing.

#### **5.1.5. Dissemination phase**

An end of evaluation workshop will be conducted in the Juba, and virtually to allow beneficiary participation after which the evaluation report will be disseminated. Evaluation team members, EUD , VSFG, Enjojo and relevant line ministries will be in attendance.

### **5.2. QUALITY OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

Besides the provisions of the article 8.6 of the Global Terms of Reference, the quality of the final report will be assessed by the evaluation manager using a quality assessment grid. Please note, the QAG has to be filled **online** in the Evaluation Module after reaching an agreement on the final report (see annexes III and guidance).

### **5.3. MANAGEMENT AND STEERING OF THE EVALUATION**

The evaluation is managed by VSFG Country Management team, under the overall guidance of the Head of Programmes with the assistance of the MEAL Manager.

The Country Management's main functions are:

- To facilitate contacts between the evaluation team, donor(EU) and external stakeholders.
- To ensure that the evaluation team has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the project/programme.
- To define and validate the Evaluation Questions.
- To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team. Comments by individual group members are compiled into a single document by the evaluation manager and subsequently transmitted to the evaluation team.

- To assist in feedback of the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation. Provide logistical support for in-country/field level (e.g., transport, security briefings, local guides).
- Facilitate access to project staff, beneficiaries, and stakeholders.
- Review and provide timely feedback on the Inception Report and Draft Evaluation Report.
- The contact person will be the Consortium Coordinator;

## 6. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The reports must match quality standards. The text of the report should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables; a map of the project's area(s) of intervention is required (to be attached as an Annex).

The evaluation team will submit the following reports:

	Number of Pages (excluding annexes)	Main Content	Timing for submission (please refer to section 9 for a timetable)
<b>Inception report</b>	10 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention logic (if necessary)</li> <li>• Evaluation questions, Judgement criteria and Indicators</li> <li>• Encountered and anticipated difficulties</li> <li>• Detailed evaluation approach and workplan</li> </ul>	End of Inception phase
<b>Desk report</b>	40 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preliminary answer to each evaluation questions stating the information already gathered and their limitations</li> <li>• Issues still to be covered and the assumptions to be tested</li> <li>• Full description of the methodology used to answer the questions</li> <li>• Field phase detailed plan</li> </ul>	End of the desk phase
<b>Draft Final report</b>	60 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Cf. detailed structure in Annex 2</u></b></li> <li>• Answer to the evaluation questions</li> <li>• Synthesis of all findings, conclusions and recommendations into an overall assessment</li> </ul>	End of Synthesis phase
<b>Final report</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same specifications as above, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted</li> </ul>	

All reports will be in English using Font Times New Roman 12 single spacing. Each report will be submitted first in electronic version as a draft.

For each report/output, the Evaluation manager will submit comments within 2 calendar days. The revised reports/outputs incorporating comments received from the concerned parties shall be submitted within 5 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for non-integration of certain comments.

The Final Report (final version) will be provided in word and pdf electronic versions with accompanying datasets. The executive summary will be translated into English.

#### Additional Products:

- Legacy Products: 2-page evaluation fact sheet.
- Indicator Summary Sheet (status of all Logframe indicators vs. baseline and targets).
- Learning dossier documenting key lessons for the project team and future interventions.
- Soft copy of cleaned dataset.

## **7. THE EVALUATION TEAM**

The evaluation team shall compose members with a comprehensive mix of competencies in Food Security, Livestock production, Value chain, Peace Building, Governace, European Union Evaluation guidelines OECD-DAC criteria and social research methodologies. These will be complemented with at least five years' experience in related programming and programme research. Extensive experience in the specific fields in the Horn of Africa and South Sudan in particular will be required. Excellent communication skills and well as demonstrated writing and presentation skills are requisite. The team shall comprise of at least one male and one female member conducting relevant data collection methods throughout the entire field mission.

### **7.1. CONSULTANT(S) QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE**

The End line survey team or firm should comprise the following minimum criteria listed below

- Consultant or firm with human resources having appropriate mix of relevant qualifications in Animal Science, Pastoralism, Veterinary Medicine, Development studies, Agriculture, Peace Building, Natural Resource Management, Disaster Risk Management or any other relevant degree from recognized institutions.
- At least 8 years' experiences of conducting baseline studies, mid-term and Final evaluations and use of participatory methods for assessment in a field-based setting and/or undertaking similar assignments under humanitarian and development frameworks in pastoral and agropastoral setting of South Sudan.
- Sufficient knowledge and experience covering the key result areas of the project.
- Have excellent track record of conducting Baseline Studies, Impact Evaluation, Ex-ante Evaluations on Agricultural Research and Development in South Sudan.
- Previous work experiences on EU funded projects; knowledge of context of project area is an added value to those with at least 2-3 midterm or final evaluation reports, and relevant to Pastoralism, livelihoods diversification, income generation and peace building related interventions
- Technical Skills: Proven ability to apply OECD-DAC criteria and design mixed-method methodologies.
- Demonstrated understanding of Peacebuilding, livelihoods, natural resource management, VSLA, animal health at community level in Budi/Ikotos area or Eastern Equatoria State of South Sudan
- Sound Knowledge of Budi/Ikotos Counties, its development issues, especially from and conflict-development nexus in a cross-border perspective
- Outstanding research, strong analytical and writing skills to clearly present findings
- Ability to deliver on the tasks within tight deadlines and against set targets.
- Firm or consultant has registered and proven evidence of working in Republic of South Sudan since its registration to date.

## 8. TECHNICAL OFFER

The consultant should provide a technical and financial proposal outlining the methodology to be undertaken during the end-term evaluation.

Indicative table of criteria that will be used is as follows:

Criteria	Maximum
Total score for Organisation and methodology (Technical evaluation)	70
Relevance & Quality of Applicant (25%)	25
Team Composition (Quality & Professional Mix)	
Relevance & Depth of the Firm's Experience	
Quality of Application (35%)	35
2.1. Completeness of Application	
2.2. Responsiveness to TOR	
Delivery of Outputs (10%)	10
Schedule	
Deliverables	
Total score for financial evaluation	30
Daily rates, per diems, local enumerators, and any other relevant expenses	
<b>OVERALL TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>

## 9. THE INDICATIVE WORK PLAN & TIME TABLE

Provisional start of the assignment: 1<sup>st</sup> August

Maximum duration of the assignment: 31 calendar days. In addition to the man-days indicated in the table below, a reserve of 10 additional days is to be quoted to cover final reporting.

### *Work Plan :*

Event	Responsible Persons	Timelines
<b>Preparation phase</b>		
<b>Desk phase – secondary data review, tools development</b>		
Review – secondary data, information	Consultant	4
Data Collection Tools Development	Consultant	3
Share Data Collection tools with VSF programs	Consultant	
<b>Field phase – data collection</b>		
Enumerators selection and Training	Consultant	2
Pretesting, refining and printing of evaluation tools	Consultant & project staff	1
Data collection and interviews	Consultant and Evaluation team	14
<b>Synthesis phase</b>		
Data Analysis and validation	Consultant	3

Draft Report of Evaluation	Consultant	3
Final Report with Feed back	Consultant	1
<b>Total Number of days excluding preparation and planning days</b>		<b>31 Days</b>

## 10. ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS

### 10.1. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The Framework contractor and the evaluation team members must not have had a direct role in the planning or implementation of the FOPNAG project. In case of doubt in the course of the assignment, the Framework contractor must inform VSF Germany as soon as possible of any risk of conflict of interest.

### 10.2. VAT

The Framework contractors are invited to obtain information from VSF Germany concerning reimbursement procedures or possible exemption from VAT.

### 10.3. INTERMEDIATE PAYMENT(S)

The evaluation budget will take care of the expenses such as the consultant's charges, international travel, in country travel, accommodation full board, and fuel for vehicles to be used during the survey period, enumerators' fees and lunches, stationery and communication costs.

*Travel:* All international flights land in Juba, it is not possible to fly to project locations on the same day. Field location flights are only during weekdays. The consultant should take into consideration of this challenge that should not lead to cancellation of the exercise. VSFG will cover the cost of all internal flights and transport.

*Accommodation:* Consultants will stay in hotels in Juba and field locations. However, field sites may not consistently provide electricity for powering laptops. Internet access may be limited in the field locations.

*Data entry* may not be possible in the field unless using electronic data collection tools. VSF-G will not supply data entry clerks or equipment for data entry. Consultants are responsible for all data entry and management. Consultants must transport all hard copies of tools to the designated data entry location. They must also submit all data sets to VSF-G in soft copy at the time of submission. VSF and the communities from which the data is collected own the data and may use it for future analysis. In most instances, evaluators will collect data from individuals who do not speak English. However, the team will not translate the tools into the local language. VSF program staff and the consultant will develop a solution to address this matter through discussion

VSFG will take care of the following

- a) Provide logistical support for in-country (e.g., local flight, security briefings, local guides).
- b) Provide all necessary project documents and background information.
- c) Facilitate access to project staff, beneficiaries, and stakeholders.
- d) Review and provide timely feedback on the inception report and draft final evaluation report.
- e) The contact person will be the program manager;

The following costs will not be covered by the organization and should be factored into the consultancy and related fee which the consultant will submit with the application.

- Responsible for the overall design, planning, execution, and reporting of the evaluation in line with the ToR.
- Ensure ethical conduct, data quality, and adherence to timelines.
- Manage all aspects of data collection, analysis, and report writing.
- Cater for their accommodation, meals, international flights, field movement and any other relevant expenses as feasible
- Responsible for his team’s medical cover and war risks insurance.

#### 10.4. OWNERSHIP OF THE FINDING

The ownership of both the draft and final documentation rests solely with VSF-Germany, the lead agency of the program and EU, the funding donor. VSF- Germany must keep the document and any related publication confidential and must not disclose them to any other party until it submits the final version to the donor.

VSF- Germany and Enjojo Foundation are the primary recipients of the evaluation, and its findings may influence both operational and technical strategies. That said, VSF-Germany may choose to share the evaluation results with the following stakeholders:

- Partner(s)
- Donor(s)
- Governmental partners
- Relevant coordination bodies

For independent evaluations, it is essential that the consultant maintains no affiliation with project management and avoids any conflict of interest that could compromise the objectivity of the evaluation.

#### 10.5. APPLICATION PROCESS

We invite interested consultants or firms to submit:

##### 1. Technical Proposal:

- Understanding of the ToR.
- Proposed detailed methodology, work plan, and timeline.
- Team composition and roles (if a team).
- Relevant experience of the consultant(s)/firm.
- CV(s) of the proposed evaluator(s).

##### 2. Financial Proposal:

- Detailed breakdown of costs (daily rates, travel, per diems, other expenses).

Interested consultants may send their questions to [juba@vsfg.org](mailto:juba@vsfg.org) until **08 May 2026**. The program team will answer questions related to the expression of interest by **15 May 2026** and will send the responses to all consultants who submitted their expression of interest after the 15 May 2026, consultants can still participate and hand in an offer and ask for the answers given, but no further questions will be admitted.

- **Application Deadline: May 30, 2026**
- Submission Method: All applications shall only be received via this Google Form: <https://forms.gle/x8MbpZUe9BSTfaak6>

## **11. ANNEXES**

### **11.1. ANNEX I: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM**

The Project Team will share the following documents with the Consultants for reference.

- Project Description of the Action (Proposal)
- Grant Agreement for FOPNAG
- Grant Agreement for complementary projects
- Baseline report
- Project log frame
- Project activity reports
- Project Interim Reports
- EU Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Report.
- Other reports and documents that may be necessary

Note: The evaluation team has to identify and obtain any other document worth analysing, through its interviews with people who are or have been involved in the design, management and supervision of the project / programme. Resource persons to collect information and data are to be sought in the EU services, implementing body and / or public service in the partner country.

## 11.2. ANNEX II: STRUCTURE OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY & FINAL REPORT

The final report should not be longer than the number of pages indicated. Additional information on overall context, programme or aspects of methodology and analysis should be confined to annexes.

*The cover page of the report shall carry the following text:*

‘‘ This evaluation is supported and guided by the European Commission and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the European Commission’’.

*The main sections of the evaluation report are as follows:*

### **Executive Summary**

A tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary is an essential component. It should be short, no more than five pages. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations.

#### **1. Introduction**

A description of the project/programme and the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant.

#### **2. Answered questions/ Findings**

A chapter presenting the evaluation questions and conclusive answers, together with evidence and reasoning.

#### **3. Overall assessment (optional)**

A chapter synthesising all answers to evaluation questions into an overall assessment of the project/programme. The detailed structure of the overall assessment should be refined during the evaluation process. The relevant chapter has to articulate all the findings, conclusions and lessons in a way that reflects their importance and facilitates the reading. The structure should not follow the evaluation questions, the logical framework or the seven evaluation criteria.

#### **4. Conclusions and Recommendations**

##### **4.1 Conclusions**

This chapter introduces the conclusions of the evaluation. The conclusions should be organised in clusters in the chapter in order to provide an overview of the assessed subject.

A paragraph or sub-chapter should pick up the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive. This practice allows better communicating the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission.

If possible, the evaluation report identifies one or more transferable lessons, which are highlighted in the executive summary and can be presented in appropriate seminars or.

#### **4.2 Recommendations**

They are intended to improve or reform the project/ programme in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new intervention for the next cycle.

Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure.

### **5. Annexes of the report**

The report should include the following annexes:

- The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
- The names of the evaluators and their companies (CVs should be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
- Detailed evaluation method including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations. Detail of tools and analyses.
- Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrices (original and improved/updated)
- Map of project area
- List of persons/organisations consulted
- Literature and documentation consulted
- Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures)
- Detailed answer to the Evaluation questions, judgement criteria and indicators (evaluation matrix)

### 11.3. ANNEX III: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

**This grid is annexed to the ToRs for information to the evaluation team**

The quality of the final report will be assessed by the evaluation manager using the following quality assessment grid where the rates have the following meaning:

**Legend:**  *very weak* = criteria mostly not fulfilled or absent  *weak* = criteria partially fulfilled  *good* = criteria mostly fulfilled  *very good* = criteria entirely fulfilled  *excellent* = criteria entirely fulfilled in a clear and original way

In relation to the criteria and sub-criteria below, the evaluation report is:	<i>Very weak</i>	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
<b>1. Meeting needs :</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the report describe precisely what is to be evaluated, including the intervention logic?</li> <li>• Does the report cover the requested period, and clearly includes the target groups and socio-geographical areas linked to the project / programme?</li> <li>• Has the evolution of the project / programme been taken into account in the evaluation process?</li> <li>• Does the evaluation deal with and respond to all ToR requests? If not, are justifications given?</li> </ul>					
<b>2. Appropriate design :</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the report explain how the evaluation design takes into account the project / programme rationale, cause-effect relationships, impacts, policy context, stakeholders' interests, etc.?</li> <li>• Is the evaluation method clearly and adequately described in enough detail?</li> <li>• Are there well-defined indicators selected in order to provide evidence about the project / programme and its context?</li> <li>• Does the report point out the limitations, risks and potential biases associated with the evaluation method?</li> </ul>					
<b>3. Reliable data :</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the data collection approach explained and is it coherent with the overall evaluation design?</li> <li>• Have data collection limitations and biases been explained and discussed?</li> <li>• Are the sources of information clearly identified in the report?</li> <li>• Are the data collection tools (samples, focus groups, etc.) applied in accordance with standards?</li> <li>• Have the collected data been cross-checked?</li> </ul>					
<b>4. Sound analysis :</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the analysis based on the collected data?</li> <li>• Does the analysis focus well on the most relevant cause/effect assumptions underlying the intervention logic?</li> <li>• Is the context taken into account adequately in the analysis?</li> <li>• Are inputs from the most important stakeholders used in a balanced way?</li> <li>• Are the limitations of the analysis identified, discussed and presented in the report, as well as the contradictions with available knowledge, if there are any?</li> </ul>					
<b>5. Credible findings :</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the findings derived from the qualitative and quantitative data and analyses?</li> <li>• Is there a discussion whether the findings can be generalised?</li> <li>• Are interpretations and extrapolations justified and supported by sound arguments?</li> </ul>					
<b>6. Valid conclusions :</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the conclusions coherent and logically linked to the findings?</li> <li>• Does the report draw overall conclusions on each of the five DAC criteria?</li> <li>• Are conclusions free of personal or partisan considerations?</li> </ul>					
<b>7. Useful recommendations :</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the recommendations consistent with the conclusions?</li> <li>• Are recommendations operational, realistic and sufficiently explicit to provide guidelines for taking action?</li> <li>• Are the recommendations drafted for the different target stakeholders of the evaluation?</li> <li>• When necessary, have the recommendations been clustered and prioritised?</li> </ul>					
<b>8. Clear report :</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the report include a relevant and concise executive summary?</li> <li>• Is the report well-structured and adapted to its various audiences?</li> <li>• Are specialised concepts clearly defined and not used more than necessary? Is there a list of acronyms?</li> <li>• Is the length of the various chapters and annexes well balanced?</li> </ul>					
	<i>Very weak</i>	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
<b>Considering the 8 previous criteria what is the overall quality of the report?</b>					