1. Background and Context

Unlike many projects and programmes which incorporate context analysis as an ongoing process during project implementation, however, UNDP’s Community Security and Stabilization Programme (C2SP) has taken a different dimension by carrying out context analysis as the first step in the design of a sustainable and impact creating programme. Firstly, perception surveys were conducted in 127 communities in states bordering South Sudan (namely South Kordofan, West Kordofan, North Kordofan, White Nile, Blue Nile and Sinar States respectively) to determine the perception of communities in regard to UNDP assistance as well as to have an in-depth knowledge into existing challenges in the communities and the collective views of these communities in finding sustainable and result oriented solutions to these challenges. The outcome of the community level perception surveys were discussed at state level involving state line ministries, locality commissions, the Governor’s office, state level civil society organisations, and other state authorises to get their views and inputs into the findings of the said perception surveys. Beyond this, UNDP and its government counterpart (Sudan DDR Commission) further took the outcomes of the State level consultations at national level and held further national consultations involving federal ministries, UN agencies, International NGOs, National NGOs, and other national level civil society organisations. The purpose of the national level consultations was to get the views and inputs of the above-mentioned national stakeholder and entities into the outcomes of the community and state level context analysis.

Based on the above-mentioned three-level context analysis, 93 communities were classified and ranked as being at risk of being destabilised and being drawn into violent conflicts due to numerous threats facing these communities, unless something was done to stabilize these communities. Key vulnerability
threats identified include but not limited to: high presence of displaced populations (IDPs, refugees, returnees, economic migrants, etc.), high youth unemployment, prevalence of small arms and light weapons, contested land ownership and use, women at risk, prevalence of local conflicts, pressure on basic services, pressure on natural resources, blocked nomadic routes, etc. All of these threats put together makes these 93 communities to be at risk of being destabilised and or being drawn into violent conflict.

Following the three-level context analysis and the identification of the key threats facing these border communities, C2SP was conceptualised, designed and put into operation to appropriately respond to the needs of the vulnerable communities while providing durable social stability for the residents and displaced populations living along the host communities. C2SP intends to contribute to the stability and resilience of communities and unemployed youth who are on the verge of being destabilised and be drawn into violent conflicts in six states bordering South Sudan (including South Kordofan, West Kordofan, North Kordofan, White Nile, Blue Nile and Sinar) and the suburbs of Khartoum. It aims to achieve this by: (i) Strengthening the resilience of community through provision of diversified alternative livelihoods primarily focusing on unemployed youth with conflict carrying capacity; (ii) Provision of economic infrastructure and facility in targeted communities to stimulate local economic development (iii) Enhancing social cohesion and peaceful co-existence between displaced populations and host communities through strengthening conflict management capacities of local community institutions such as community management committees (CMCs) while linking these local institutions to state level peacebuilding mechanisms, (iv) Enhance capacities of Government and local service providers to deliver services.

C2SP is implemented in a complex ethnic and socio-economic environment with equally complicated stakeholder relations. The evaluation consultant should take this reality as its point of departure. While answering the questions posed in this Terms of Reference, the evaluation consultant should also take into consideration the problems and challenges of the current programme set-up as a result of the outbreak of violent conflict in BNS and SKS since June 2011 as well as the conflict in South Sudan which inevitably precipitated thousands of South Sudanese refugees into the 93 communities targeted by C2SP.

2. **Purpose of the Evaluation**

The objective of this evaluation is to gain insights into the design and implementation of C2SP as well as identify the programme’s shortcomings and recommend timely corrective measures. The review recommendations will be shared with key stakeholders, including government counterparts and funding partners for their endorsement. Such recommendations will be integrated into ongoing C2SP activities to help shape the programme. Therefore, the evaluation is expected to provide an independent assessment of past and ongoing C2SP activity and should provide an opportunity to generate findings and recommendations which are expected to assist in identifying appropriate strategies and operational approaches to strengthen the ongoing programme activity.

3. **Scope and objectives of the Evaluation**
The evaluation will cover C2SP activities carried out during the last 4 years (2015 - 2019) in South Kordofan, West Kordofan, North Kordofan, White Nile, Senar and Blue Nile. Given the varied and complex operational context of C2SP implementation, it should be seen as a component of a much larger development and peacebuilding strategy with a focus on community stabilisation. For this reason, it is prudent that an evaluation be undertaken to understand the extent to which the C2SP process has been successful especially considering its importance in stabilising communities. Furthermore, a lot of resources have been committed to support C2SP implementation in these areas; therefore it is pertinent that UNDP commissions an evaluation to assess the sustainability of the programme and its contribution to long-term development in the target states and communities.

As noted earlier, the evaluation will be undertaken in six States in the Republic of Sudan (Blue Nile, Kordofan, West Kordofan, North Kordofan, White Nile, Senar and Blue Nile) with the following specific objective:

The main objectives of the evaluation is to assess the C2SP activity and the results achieved so far towards meeting the overall objective of the programme; as well as to generate lessons learned; and best practices and to develop recommendations for future replication of the programme in other parts of Sudan. In particular special attention will be given to:

1. Contribution of the programme at the state and community level to the socioeconomic development and improved peaceful co-existence between host and displaced populations;
2. Identify and ascertain sustainable economic and social linkages of the programme at the State and local level;
3. Existence of requisite community and national ownership, capacity and leadership in the implementation of the C2SP activity;
4. Direct support and social benefits to communities and individual beneficiaries (hosts and displaced populations);
5. Modes of decision making on key C2SP policies, strategies and technical issues;
6. Community involvement in C2SP process through diverse mechanisms; and
7. National and State level mechanisms and processes that support sustainable C2SP activity.

4. Evaluation Questions

The evaluation will be conducted based on the assessment C2SP’s strategic, conception and theory of change. The evaluation criteria, to be considered by the evaluation, include relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, connectedness, sustainability and inclusiveness within the framework of the following guiding questions as outlined below.

Relevance

1. Has UNDP been able to help design C2SP processes within the context of local and national recovery and other development strategies in Sudan?
2. Do the partners, target groups and beneficiaries consider that the interventions contributed to community stabilisation, peaceful co-existence, social cohesion and local economic development?
3. Have C2SP interventions responded to the needs and priorities identified during the three level context analysis that was carried out which informed the design of the programme?
Efficiency

1. Have the resources (funds, human resources, time, etc.) of C2SP interventions been efficiently used to achieve the relevant outputs?
2. Have C2SP interventions been implemented within intended deadlines and cost estimates?
3. What were the strengths and weaknesses of C2SP approach and strategy?
4. Have associated risks of the programme at the national and local levels been anticipated and addressed?
5. Were management capacities of C2SP adequate to deliver activities in a timely and efficient manner? Management capacity should be assessed on all levels: steering committees, UNDP country office and field offices.
6. What measures were taken to assure the quality of development results and management practices, both in relation to process and products?
7. What monitoring and evaluation procedures were applied by UNDP and partners to ensure greater accountability? Has the M&E set up and capacity been appropriate to deliver information needed for the program?
8. Provide a general description of the program set up to include; the organisation, management, the field offices, the various staffing at UNDP, SDDRC and others, the management steering and decision making model (steering committee, project management etc), the financing from different sources, overview of participating local government offices, NGOs and implementing partners

Effectiveness

1. Have C2SP’s expected results been achieved and what were the supporting or impeding factors?
2. Were the programme approaches for the different components (inclusive livelihoods, socioeconomic infrastructures/assets, the social, peacebuilding and women empowerment components) relevant to achieving the intended outcome and outputs in supporting community stabilisation, peacebuilding and social cohesion in targeted areas?
3. Have the programme contributed to the capacity building of NGO implementing partners and also Government partners? Review how local government ministries (such as State Ministries of Agriculture, State Departments of Rural Water, etc. have been invited to participate and involve in C2SP implementation and whether they have the skills and capacity to actually contribute to the program results (SDDRC)?
4. Have the programme been implemented with appropriate and effective inter-agency and partnership strategies? What has been the nature and added value of these partnerships?
5. Were UNDP’s comparative advantages perceived/interpreted well to contribute to community stabilisation reflected in the division of responsibilities in implementing the programme?
6. To what extent has the SDDRC contributed in advancing C2SP?
7. To what extent has the capacity development of NGOs and government counterparts strengthened the services delivery?
8. To what extent has private sector partnership contributed in advancing the programme?

Connectedness

1. To what extend the C2SP interventions, at the local level, were coordinated with other interventions?
2. Have the programme built on / match the individual and local capacities/ needs?
3. To what extend did the programme formed as part of an integrated package

Sustainability

1. To what extent was sustainability considerations taken into account in the design and implementation of C2SP interventions, results definition and monitoring of reintegration?
2. Were exit strategies appropriately defined and implemented, and what steps have been taken to ensure sustainability of results to support community stabilisation and women empowerment?
3. How did the development of partnerships at the national and state level contribute to sustainability of the results?
4. Assessed whether the community support given has been able to establish self-sustained development (as regards, CMCs, youth clubs, Peace committees, livelihood activities etc. etc.).
5. How many communities have been “graduated” in that sense of the communities supported? If communities supported have NOT been able to sustain – what are the reasons for that? To me this is a key question

Impact

1. What has been the general effect (both positive and negative) of the programme on its direct and indirect beneficiaries?
2. The C2SP program contain distinct and different programmatic parts (e.g. CMCs, peace committees, livelihood activities, agricultural investments and inputs, market connections, youth clubs, small income generating activities, REFLECT etc). Have all parts been effective in delivering against the objective? If not, why? How can the outcome of help in the design of the next phase of C2SP? What aspects should be included in the next phase, and what could we perhaps leave out?
3. Mention the different forms of impact that can be distinguished: direct and indirect, intended and unintended for project beneficiaries.
4. On training offered, what has happened with the knowledge gained in the training initiatives and skills development for project beneficiaries? How has REFLECT training promoted women empowerment? Will it be recommended for the next phase? What are the lessons learnt and best practices of REFLECT?
5. Did project participants usefully apply their knowledge and use it to further develop/improve their role in society?
6. Was there clear evidencing of C2SP results and recognition of the role of UNDP and the donors

Inclusiveness:

1. Establish the level of community participation of beneficiaries particularly women and youth and other vulnerable groups
2. Assess the extent to which C2SP interventions empowered women and improve their control of resources and access to basic services.
3. Assess and confirm the ability of the program implementers to maintain impartiality and respect the UN programming principles iincluding the do no harm principles.
Assess the CMC involvement in project planning, implementation and results sustainability?
7. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The evaluation methodology should employ a participatory results-oriented approach that involves project implementers, targeted beneficiaries and other community members and relevant stakeholders and provide evidence of achievement of expected outputs through the use of quantitative and qualitative methods. On the basis of the evaluation objectives and questions, it is expected that the consultant will propose an evaluation methodology and agree on a detailed plan for the assignment as part of the evaluation inception report. This inception report should be finalized and approved in consultation with the project team as well as other relevant UNDP staff. More specifically, the findings of the evaluations and the recommendations will be grounded in evidence and analytical work derived from the following methods at minimum:

- Desk review of C2SP relevant documents and reports
- Meetings/ discussions with Stakeholders including Government partners, NGO Implementing Partners, donors etc.
- Field visit (at least two-three States) to meet and consult with beneficiaries and state level stakeholders and to collect quantitative & qualitative data from beneficiaries and community members, partners, implementing partners, government, beneficiary institutions.
- Interviews with key informant and Focus Group Discussions with sample of project beneficiaries
- Assistance will be provided by UNDP in the identification of key stakeholders, and in organizing the schedule of interviews, focus groups, and site visits
- Ensure gender equality and women's empowerment are included in the methodology for addressing gender-specific issues

8. Tasks and Deliverables

The evaluation shall be led by an independent international consultant. The consultant shall have the overall responsibility for conducting the evaluation including the development and submission of the draft and final evaluation reports. The civil society organization will be hired by UNDP simultaneously and the consultant is expected to work closely with the CSO and contribute necessary expertise in the core subject areas of the evaluation, provide sound understanding of the Sudan context and dynamics.

The key tasks of the consultant include:

- Develops an inception report detailing the design, methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis criteria for selection of field locations, required resources), and work plan of the evaluation.
- Advise on the data collection and analysis tools including review of all relevant documentation;
- Coordinates with the CSO that will assist in data collection within the framework of the TORs;
- Oversees and quality assures the preparation of the evaluation and takes a lead in the analysis of the evaluative evidence;
- Takes the lead in the analysis of the evaluative evidence and administrates the analysis of the results of the data collection exercise;
• Leads the stakeholder feedback sessions, briefs UNDP on the evaluation through informal sessions and finalizes the report based on feedback from the quality assurance process;

• Delivers draft and final evaluation reports.

It should be noted that above list of deliverables, together with the implementation time-frame might be subject to review and revision by UNDP in discussion with the consultant in the event of unexpected changes to the context/ working environment in Sudan during the consultancy period, given the operating context of COVID-19, etc.

Profile:

• Master’s Degree in a relevant discipline
• At least Seven years of relevant international development experience with at least 5 years of experience in designing/implementing community development projects in conflict /post conflict countries.
• Experience in reviewing projects/programmes of UN agencies (preferably UNDP).
• Regional expertise in either Africa or Arab countries will be an advantage
• Strong analytical and research skills with experience with participatory approaches
• Facilitation skills and ability to manage diversity of views in different cultural contexts.
• Demonstrated capacity for strategic thinking, communication skills and ability to produce a high quality report in a short period.
• Fluent in English language.
• Must be available on the anticipated start date.

Outputs/Deliverables:

The evaluation consultant will produce the following outputs, at minimum:

• Inception Report: at the end of the first week of the assignment, the evaluation consultant will submit an Inception Report, which should include detailed evaluation methodology, and evaluation matrix explaining the methods for assessing each evaluation criteria and the associated evaluation questions including proposed sources of data. The inception report should also include the proposed evaluation work-plan detailing schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, with clear responsibilities in coordination with the CSO supporting in data collection.

• Evaluation brief: The consultant will be asked to present his/her preliminary findings, for UNDP staff and major stakeholders, for discussion and validation

• Draft evaluations report: The consultant will provide draft report, covering the issues outlined in the terms of reference including evaluation findings and conclusions, lessons, and recommendations, for review by the programme unit and the key stakeholders.
- **Final evaluation report**: The final report incorporates the inputs resulting from the review of the draft report as relevant.

**Timeframe for the evaluation process**
The estimated time for conducting this evaluation is 48 working days, starting from the date of commencement mentioned in the contract that will be signed by the consultant, as per the below tentative timetable.

Day 1-5: Initial desk review (Home based)

Day 6-8: National/International consultant meeting and initial consultations

Day 9: Submission of the Inception Report

Day 10-13: Interviews, consultations, and meeting (Khartoum)

Day 14-37: Field visits for selected states covering institutions and beneficiary communities

Day 38-40: Follow-up meetings, analysis of the information collected and preparation of a draft report

Day 41: Presentation of draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders

Day 42-48: Incorporate/respond to UNDP/stakeholders comments on the draft report (if deemed appropriate) and submission of final report. Prepare a PowerPoint presentation of the report, including contents, design and lay-out and conduct presentation/debriefing to UNDP and relevant partners

9. **Implementation Arrangements:**

The Programme Manager will oversee all stages of the evaluation conduct to ensure that the process is being conducted as per the agreed plan and guidelines. The PM will coordinate with UNDP Country office team and UNDP senior management on the evaluation process. The CZSP programme staff will provide administrative and logistical support and will facilitate coordination and liaison with key stakeholders in Khartoum and the field.

Additionally, UNDP will constitute evaluation “Reference Group” comprised of key stakeholders and UNDP relevant staff. The Reference Group will guide the evaluation process and will provide methodological and substantive inputs into the evaluation process as well as peer review of the evaluation deliverables.

10. **Evaluation Ethics:**

This Evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (UNEG 2008) to ensure the credibility and integrity of the evaluation process and products. The consultants must use measures to ensure compliance with the evaluator code of conduct including

- Refer to UNDP Evaluation Report Template.
measures to safeguard the rights, safety and confidentiality of the individual and communities interviewed, particularly permissions needed to interview or gather information about children and young people and provisions to store and maintain security of collected information and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. The consultants shall respect differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, while applying evaluation methods and tools.

11. Duty Station

The duty station will be Khartoum with visits to the project sites if the situation allows, however we are flexible in case the situation does not allow the consultant to travel due to COVID-19 restrictions imposed by the government and the consultant can operate remotely.

12. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payment

The consultancy fee will be determined on a lump sum basis. The lump sum amount must be all-inclusive, and the contract price must be fixed regardless of changes in the cost components. Payment will be made twice, after submission of inception report and after submission of Final Report with confirmation letter from C2SP programme stating satisfaction with work carried by the Consultant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Deliverable Timeline</th>
<th>Deliverable Due Date</th>
<th>Payment (%)</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception report</td>
<td>9 working days</td>
<td>6 Dec 2020</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation brief</td>
<td>32 working days</td>
<td>19 Jan 2021</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft evaluation report</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 Jan 2021</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final evaluation report</td>
<td>7 working days</td>
<td>28 Jan 2021</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. 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%.

14. 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.

15. Reference Materials

Documentation to be reviewed/referred to includes but is not necessarily limited to the following:
• United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Sudan (Current edition).
• The C2SP Project Document, project AWPs and quarterly and annual reports of the project.
• Community perception survey reports
• Any other documents and materials related to C2SP (from the government, donors, etc.).
• UNDP Evaluation Report Template.
• UNDP Evaluation Policy (2011)
• Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (UNEG 2008).
• UN Evaluation Norms.
• UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Results.

16. Approval

This TOR is approved by:

Name and Designation: Srinivas Kumar, C2SP Programme Manager

Signature: [Signature]

Date: 19 Nov 2020

TOR Annexes:
1. Intervention results framework and theory of change (C2SP approved/signed Prodoc).
2. Please list the project’ partners, stakeholders and donors’ names.
3. Documents to be reviewed and consulted.
5. Outline of the evaluation report format required for the evaluation report (example: content and length, etc).
7. Code of conduct forms.

1 UN Programming principles refer to the: Result Based Management (RBM), Gender Equality, Environmental Sustainability, Human Rights Bases Approached and Do No Harm Principles.