### Darfur Community Peace and Stability Fund (DCPSF)
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# Project Description:

The Darfur Community Peace Stability Fund (DCPSF) was established at the end of 2007 as a Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) to support community-level peacebuilding activities and foster social cohesion by drawing diverse communities together through processes of dialogue and consultations. The goal of DCPSF phase II is to stabilize communities and restore trust and confidence between communities paving the way towards early recovery understanding that long-term peace in Darfur is inextricably linked to the promotion of sustainable returns, early recovery, reconstruction and development. In doing so, the DCPSF is expected to contribute to support inclusive and sustainable Darfur-wide peace negotiations through local level peace and stability.

The DCPSF Phase II started in 2011 and will continue through December 2017. DCPSF has received over 39 million dollars in donor contributions, which have been disbursed to support 64 projects. Project funding is provided through two funding windows/modalities; Window One for UN and INGOs and Window Two for NNGO and CSOs. In addition, DCPSF has implemented a capacity-building component designed to enhance the capacity of CSOs and national NGOs.

The objective of DCPSF Phase II is to support inclusive and sustainable Darfur-wide peace negotiations through local level peace and stability. To achieve this, a two-pronged Theory of Change (ToC) was developed:

* IF processes of dialogue and consultation are independently brokered, THEN trust and confidence amongst diverse communities is restored
* IF targeted material inputs (programmes and services) are delivered, THEN community needs are responded to and processes of dialogue and consultation underpinned

It is understood in this Theory of Change that in order to enable dialogue and consultation, existing community based resolution mechanisms must be revitalized or alternatively, new platforms established. Furthermore, material inputs must respond to root causes and triggers of conflict in order to contribute to conflict prevention and to create conditions conducive towards trust and confidence-building.

DCPSF Phase II initially included five outputs; however the results framework was revised in 2013 and the number of outputs were reduced to four outputs.

* Output 1: “Effective community-level conflict resolution and prevention platforms in Darfur are in place”. This is the foundation for DCPSF interventions/projects and has been mandatory to address by all organizations applying for the DCPSF funding. DCPSF interventions aim at reviving and supporting traditional justice to prevent dispute so as not to escalate into wider conflict through reconciliation and mediation.
* Output 2: “Cooperation between communities is enhanced through shared livelihood assets and income generating opportunities activities” aims at promoting interaction between conflicting parties and promotes common interests, creating livelihoods opportunities and enhancing households’ resilience.
* Output 3: “Cooperation between competing communities over management of natural resources and access to basic social services increased” addresses root and underlying causes of conflicts and triggers associated with access to natural resources and social services and promotes good governance of shared resources.
* Output 4: “A network of effective collaborative peacebuilding initiatives created and feeding into wider peace fora and Darfur” links local peace efforts with higher level initiatives.

The progress towards DCPSF goals and outputs is measured and tracked with a set of 21 indicators that are updated regularly through collection of quantitative and qualitative data.

In addition, DCPSF supported interventions endeavor to mainstream gender, empower vulnerable groups and minorities, and promote environmental governance and optimization of natural resources management.

DCPSF funding is allocated to successful projects that address DCPSF geographic priorities and thematic areas through an open call-for-proposals process. The priority areas are updated and defined on a regular basis through a conflict analysis (See Annex \_\_\_).

DCPSF is overseen and guided by a **Steering Committee** (SC), co-chaired by the UN Resident Coordinator. The day-to-day management of the fund is performed by a Technical Secretariat overseen by UNDP. The UNDP Fund Management Unit acts as administrative agent and management agent for the disbursement of funds to implementing partners.

# Evaluation objectives and purpose

The main purpose of the evaluation is:

* To establish and document the positive impact & any unintended consequences of DCPSF funded activities and the relevance of the DCPSF’s overall strategy for community stabilization in Darfur; to validate DCPSF results in terms of achievements toward the fund goal and outputs; to examine to what extent DCPSF interventions supported peaceful co-existence efforts at the community level, strengthened local peace governance and empowered and enhanced participation of vulnerable groups particularly in decision making and resources sharing
* To assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, economy, and sustainability of DCPSF interventions and its contribution to the creation of network of effective collaborative peacebuilding initiatives that feed into wider peace fora.
* To document lessons learned, best practices, success stories and challenges to inform future initiatives.
* To formulate informed recommendations on future programmatic vision for DCPSF, including the processes and governance mechanisms of the Fund.

# Scope of the evaluation

The scope of the evaluation is determined by the Theory of Change and the planning assumptions initially agreed upon. The evaluation will cover:

* DCPSF achievements through projects funded under Phase II between 2011 to June 2016, therefore evaluators will be required to seek feedback and interact with the direct beneficiaries and communities in Darfur.
* The modality and methods used for defining priority areas, selection of projects and disbursement of funds and the advantage and disadvantage of each fund disbursement mechanism; hence the evaluator will have to obtain feedback from DCPSF implementing partners, donors and other stakeholders.
* The organizational structure of DCPSF and the Technical Secretariat and its ability in monitoring projects, providing technical support, collating lessons learned and sharing them with DCPSF IP and other actors, and coordination of exerted efforts.
* The synergism and complementarity between DCPSF and other similar programs and funding mechanism e.g. SHF, DDS.

# Evaluation objectives and questions

The evaluation will assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, inclusiveness, and sustainability of DCPSF. The evaluation questions will follow the OECD DAC Criteria. More specifically, the evaluation will address:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Criteria | Description |
| Relevance | * Assess the appropriateness of the project design, approaches and methodology with respect to the needs of the diverse groups (ethnic, livelihood, etc.) in the community and changing contexts. * What is the relevance and contribution of DCPSF project interventions to overall peace efforts in Darfur and restoring confidence and social cohesion?(utilization of objective methods/approach is highly desired). * Assess the validity of the program theory of change and the ability of CBRMs to mediate and achieve fair and impartial resolution consistent with international norms of justice. |
| Effectiveness | * Assess the scope of achievement of the project against the defined outputs and targets: DCPSF four outputs/outcomes and purpose are tracked using 21 indicators. * To what extent were the originally designed objectives of DCPSF realistic? * What factors were crucial for the achievement or failure to achieve the project objectives so far? * Assess the functionality and ability of CBRM in promoting peaceful co-existence and serving the different ethnic and livelihood groups and all community strata. |
| Efficiency | * Assess adequacy and efficiency in planning, monitoring and reporting systems and use of both material and financial resources. * Assess the cost effectiveness of disbursing and utilizing the fund at the level of the secretariat and implementing partners and ensure that principles of value for money are taken into consideration. |
| Impact | * Assess the impact of project interventions on the beneficiaries’ direct/indirect beneficiaries. * Capture and describe the direct and indirect, intended and unintended, positive and negative effects of DCPSF interventions. * Assess if DCPSF interventions contributed to stabilizing the targeted communities, restored trust and reduced the number of violent conflicts and nature and consequences of disputes. |
| Inclusiveness | * Establish the level of community participation of beneficiaries particularly women and youth. * Assess how DCPSF intervention contributed to women active participation in conflict resolution and prevention and early recovery. * Assess the extent to which DCPSF intervention empowered women and improve their control of resources and access to basic services. * Assess and confirm the ability of the program implementers to maintain impartiality and respect the do no harm principles. |
| Sustainability | * Assess the overall project, focusing on the potential for the project to be owned by the beneficiaries and for the benefits to continue after project closure. * Assess the extent to which DCPSF supported process, capacities and systems that will likely support the continued stabilization, reconciliation and co-existence and the community level. |

# 

# Evaluation methodolgy

The evaluation methodology should employ a participatory results-oriented approach that involves project implementers, targeted beneficiaries and other community members, DCPSF-TS, DCPSF donors and other relevant stakeholders and will provide evidence of achievement of expected outputs through the use of quantitative and qualitative methods. The consultative element of the evaluation is crucial for building up a consensus about the project’s overall rationale and desired outcomes. Data from different research/media sources (ACLED data, conflict barometers, etc.) can be used to enhance the validity of the outcome of the evaluation regarding the contribution of DCPSF to reducing conflict incidence and promotes social cohesion. Field visits will be organized to facilitate the process of evaluation. The process steps of the evaluation will include:

* Desk review of DCPSF relevant document e.g. DCPSF-TS reports and implementing partners, IP meeting documents, evaluation document, conflict analysis, monitoring visits reports, monitoring tools, DCPSF-TOR, call for proposal documents and other related documents.
* Develop and detailed the evaluation framework, design and methodology and the evaluation instruments and tools.
* Develop the evaluation work plan and the instrument that will be used during the exercise.
* Draft Inception Report and present to DCPSF Stakeholders
* Field and project sites visits for collection of quantitative & qualitative data from beneficiaries and community members, current and former implementing partners, national partners, etc. through case study, key informants interviews, in-depth interview, focus group discussion, cross-sectional survey, meeting, etc.
* Draft a report with the evaluation findings.
* Present the evaluation findings to relevant stakeholders and facilitate discussion to draw out the way forward.

The proposed approach and methodology should be considered as flexible guidelines rather than final requirements. The evaluators will have an opportunity to make their inputs and propose changes in the evaluation design. The consultant will be required to confirm the reliability and the quality of collected data through triangulation and diversification of sources and methods/approaches of collection.

# Evaluation Stakeholders:

DCPSF donors, DCPSF beneficiaries, DCPSF implementing partner, government bodies and other development actors working on peace.

# Evaluation Team:

The evaluation team will consist of a team leader (international consultant), with proven experience in evaluation of peacebuilding projects and two evaluation officers (national Sudanese consultants; one male and one female) with the same experience and knowledge of Darfur local context.

The international consultant is responsible for developing the evaluation methodology and completing and ensuring the quality of the overall final evaluation report; as a team leader she/he:

* Should have an academic background and/or training and/or work experience in peacebuilding.
* At least ten years demonstrated experience of evaluation work, preferably the completion of evaluations in volatile context.
* Must also have expertise in completing complex evaluations including addressing challenges related to evaluability.
* Experience in managing research processes.
* Analytical skills, experience in policy-oriented research/ assessments/ evaluations; communications and facilitation skills.

The evaluation team members must also have solid experience in the evaluation of programme effectiveness in a volatile and conflict context; they should exhibit the following skills and experience:

* Knowledge and experience of implementing various different types of evaluation methodologies.
* A strong record in designing and leading reviews and evaluations, in Darfur or similar context.
* Should have an academic background and/or training and/or work experience in peacebuilding.
* Extensive knowledge of, and proven successful application of qualitative and quantitative research and evaluation methods.
* Experience of evaluations completed with the guidance of a multi-stakeholder reference group.
* Data management and analysis skills.
* Process management skills including communications and facilitation skills.
* Demonstrated excellent presentation and report writing skills in English; Arabic skills is desirable.
* Good understanding and knowledge of Darfur traditional customs, socio-economic and political economy contexts and complications to support quality data collection and extraction. Relevant capacities on social inclusion and gender in Darfur context, are essential requirements in the team. At least one of the members must have specific experience in gender mainstreaming.

# Expected Outputs and Deliverables

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverables/ Outputs** | **Estimated Duration to Complete** | **Target Due Dates** | **Review and Approvals Required** |
| Desk review and Summary of reviewed documents | 3 days |  | UNDP Deputy CD for Programme |
| Evaluation Framework | 2 days |  | UNDP Deputy CD for Programme |
| Evaluation work plan | 1 days |  | UNDP Deputy CD for Programme |
| Meetings with stakeholders | 2 days |  | UNDP Deputy CD for Programme |
| Inception Report and Presentation | 3 days |  | UNDP Deputy CD for Programme |
| Field Visits/Data Collection | 14 days |  | UNDP Deputy CD for Programme |
| Summary of main findings | 3 days |  | UNDP Deputy CD for Programme |
| Presentation of main findings | 1 days |  | UNDP Deputy CD for Programme |
| Draft report | 4 days |  | UNDP Deputy CD for Programme |
| Final Report\* | 2 days |  | UNDP Deputy CD for Programme |

\*The final evaluation report should be 40 – 50 pages, exclusive of annexes.

# Institutional Arrangement

The contractor will be directly supervised by the UNDP Deputy Country Director for Programme.

# Duration of the Work

The duration of the consultancy is for 32 working days over the course of two months. The remuneration will be paid as a lump sum after the final draft is reviewed and accepted by DCPSF-TS.

# Annexes:

* Annexes to be provided will include:
* DCPSF ToR and Results Framework
* Conflict Analysis
* Materials for Call for Proposals
* DCPSF Annual, Bi-Annual and Quarterly Reports
* Field Monitoring Reports
* List of key stakeholders and partners
* Different version of DCPSF Result framework.
* Sample of IP proposal documents
* List of projects supported

*Note: we would prefer to contract a monitoring firm for this evaluation – as such the qualifications section for a firm will follow UNDP procurement guidelines. If we resort to hiring individuals, the qualifications will follow the example below.*

# Epxertise of the Evaluation Firm

1. Specialized Knowledge in evaluations and research especially in a volatile context, and of peacebuilding programming that involves gender mainstreaming.
2. Experience in evaluations and research, data management and analysis of peacebuilding project.
3. Experience on working on evaluating of peacebuilding projects in the Region; similar experience in Sudan and Darfur is desirable.
4. Work for UNDP/ major multilateral/ or bilateral programmes
5. Experience in Evaluation of MPTF funds.
6. Quality assurance procedure by the applicant.
7. Reputation of the organization and staff (competence/ reliability)

**Duty Station:**

The duty station will be Khartoum with visits to the project sites in Darfur.

**Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**

The offers received from the candidates will be evaluated using combined scoring method. The combined scoring method assesses the offers with technical merits of the proposals – where the qualifications and methodology will be weighted a maximum of 70%, and later combined with the price offer which will be weighted a max of 30%.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment Criteria | Maximum Obtainable Points | Score Weight |
|
| Expertise of the firm | 250 | 25% |
| Proposed Methodology and approaches | 450 | 45% |
| Evaluation team structure & composition | 300 | 30% |
| TOTAL | 70 | 100% |

1. **Assessment of the Price Proposals (30 Points) or 30%**

The lowest priced bid from among the technically qualified Offerors will obtain the full marks of 30 points in the price proposal. Price proposals of remaining qualified bidders will be prorated against the lowest priced bid using the following formula to derive the marks in their price proposal:

Marks obtained by a Bidder = Lowest Priced Bid (amount) / Bid of the Offeror (amount) X 30 (Full Marks)

1. **Award of the Contract/Award Criteria:**

The contract will be awarded to the candidate (bidder) whose proposal obtains the highest cumulative marks (points) when the marks obtained in technical and price proposals are aggregated together.

**L. Approval**

This TOR is approved by:

**Name and Designation:** ElZein Ali, Head of Technical Secretariat OIC , DCPSF

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_