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| **TERMS OF REFERENCE** |
| A Joint Review of Community Security & Arms Control (CSAC) Project in South Sudan by the UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention & Recovery (BCPR) & UK Department for International Development (DFID) |
| 1. **BACKGROUND** |
| * 1. One of the legacies of 40 years of civil war in South Sudan has been a significant influx of weapons to meet individual and/or community needs for protection from other neighboring communities. In post-independence South Sudan, these same weapons have been used for offensive and predatory raiding, competition over scarce natural resources and criminality by and against civilians, leading to cyclical violence and revenge attacks. Additionally, security is too often approached through traditional means with over prioritization on ‘physical security’, led through traditional security organs without adequate analysis and targeting of the underlying and causal drivers of violent conflict.   2. In line with the South Sudan Development Plan (SSDP) 2011-2013 and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), UNDP’s Community Security & Arms Control (CSAC) project was designed to support Government efforts to stabilize insecure areas, maintain community security and promote effective peacebuilding, through better analysis, planning and targeting resources, to include in a gender-sensitive manner. A key facet of the project is supporting government institutions, principally the Bureau for Community Security & Small Arms Control (BCSSAC) and South Sudan Peace Commission (SSPC), to take an effective leadership role in developing effective policies in relation to community security and arms control and in taking a greater leadership role in coordinating the implementation of programmes towards this objective. |
| 1. **PROGRESS TO DATE** |
| * 1. The project was piloted in Jonglei State in 2009, where it undertook a series of community consultations, implemented conflict-sensitive development projects and supported the establishment of the BCSSAC under the former Ministry of Internal Affairs. A joint BCPR-DFID review of the pilot was undertaken in 2009 to assess progress, identify lessons learned and good practices and provide recommendations to the future design of the project. The project made quarterly updates to its Project Board against progress of implementing the findings and recommendations, most which have either been successfully instituted, are actively in progress or otherwise addressed.   2. In 2010-2011, the project expanded to include Eastern Equatoria and Upper Nile, with a notable shift in its strategy, in part due to the findings and recommendations of the BCPR-DFID Review. During project implementation in these states, an outcome-level evaluation of UNDP South Sudan’s Crisis Prevention & Recovery Unit (CPRU) was executed, whose findings underlined strong evidence of CSAC’s ability to positively impact on community security and enable local recovery. It has also directly informed priorities of other UN and non-UN efforts, most prominent of which has been the South Sudan Recovery Fund Round III Stabilization Programmes. CSAC has now successfully completed of all conflict sensitive development projects including, police posts, provision of communications and transportation equipment, water points and mechanized farming projects in Eastern Equatoria, Jonglei and Upper Nile, with a third round of expansion to cover Lakes, Unity and Warrap States that commenced in 2011-2012.   3. CSAC is currently expanding its ‘software’ programming, building on the progress it has made through the material inputs aforementioned. Of note, is supporting the SSPC to enhance local capacity in conflict mitigation and peacebuilding through establishing a trained, grassroots network of peace cadres that can respond to and support local peacebuilding needs and processes. It is also working to ensure that the consultation methodology and process is mainstreamed into county-level budgeting and planning processes, thereby providing government a common planning platform, instituting a conflict-sensitive lens and ensuring sustainability of the assets provided by both government expenditures and external partners. |
| 1. **JUSTIFICATION** |
| * 1. From its inception in 2008 through the end of 2012, the project will have expended an estimated US 30 million in support of 55 of South Sudan’s 79 counties. During this same period, both the country context and the CSAC project have evolved in diverse ways. These conditions present an important opportunity to assess congruence with or divergence from the broader contextual landscape and inform any future iteration of the project’s design. This review will also contribute to UNDP’s and DFID’s growing body of corporate knowledge and comparative understanding on conflict stabilization, community security and other related policy and programme areas. |
|  |
| 1. **OBJECTIVES** |
| The joint review process of the CSAC project aims to achieve the following objectives:   * 1. Assess lessons learned and good practices including, application of lessons from previous BCPR and DFID review, an assessment of the programme management, conceptual model, role of field staff in project execution, implementation modalities and processes for delivering against community security and arms control objectives in the context of South Sudan   2. Assess the effect / impact of the project interventions on the different aspects of the lives of target beneficiaries (safety and security, social, economical, environmental etc) on individuals, communities, and institutions – either medium-term, or long-term; intended or unintended; positive and negative.   3. Determine the degree to which project design allowed for: the sustainability and local ownership of assets, project deliverables and results.   4. Assess whether the effects are being achieved at an acceptable cost, compared with alternative approaches to accomplishing the same objectives.   5. Assess the utilization of the project’s consultation findings by local government, UN and NGO partners in encouraging coordinated and complementary interventions.   6. Determine the extent to which the project’s conceptual model remains relevant to addressing community security and arms control issues in the current context of South Sudan. The review should be forward leaning and make recommendations for future approaches to supporting community security and arms control in South Sudan as a key pillar of a peacebuilding and recovery effort. Particular emphasis should be on mainstreaming conflict-sensitive budgeting in planning into county planning processes, implementation of the UN Peacebuilding Plan, and synergies with any future DDR Programme. |
| |  | | --- | | 1. **EVALUATION METHODS** |   5.1. Review methods suggested to be used by the evaluation team should includes:   * + Desk Review: project documents, progress reports (quarterly and annual), field visit reports, project board meeting minutes, implementing partners’ reports, previous external/internal-evaluations and reviews.   + Semi-structured interviews: donors, CPR Unit, project implementation team at the Juba Office and field locations, implementing partners, senior officials from the Bureau and Peace Commission, and Governments in selected States/Counties, beneficiaries and relevant UNMISS offices and UN agencies; and   + Field visits to selected project locations to selected counties (to be determined). |
|  |
| 1. **DELIVERABLES** |
| * 1. Briefing meeting of preliminary findings with UNDP and DFID teams in Juba and presentation to project board.   2. A draft inception report with a review work plan (maximum of 10 pages).   3. A final report of no longer than 20 pages, including an executive summary, findings that respond to the objectives set out above, recommendations and next steps. Final report should be submitted within 10 days after receiving comments from both UNDP and DFID South Sudan Offices. All reports shall be submitted in triplicate in both hard and soft (print and electronic) formats, as follows: * Review report (Hard copy and a soft copy in MS Word and PDF Acrobat reader, Times New Roman, Size 12, Single Spacing) consisting of, but not limited to:   1. Executive summary;   2. Description of the methodology;   3. Findings and analysis of key objectives of the review;   4. Key lessons learned, including possible recommendations for ongoing CSAC implementation;   5. Conceptual Framework to guide CSAC project initiative in terms of future programming and policy;   6. Conclusions and recommendations, and;   7. Annexes: ToRs, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc. |
| 1. **TIMEFRAME** |
| | **Activity** | **Timeframe** | **Location** | **Responsible Party** | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Desk review | 3 days | Home based | Review Team | | Conduct meetings with UNDP management, project and programme staff in Juba and finalization of inception report | 3 days | In-Country Juba-based | Review Team | | Field Visit and consultations (including counterparts and donors at Juba level). | 12 days | Selected States, Juba | Review Team | | Inception Report (with presentation of preliminary findings, recommendations to stakeholders; follow up discussions for full review report. | 2 days | Juba | Review Team | | Final Report |  | Home-based.  10 days of receipt of comments | Review Team | |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **REVIEW MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS** |
| * 1. The review team will report to Amanuel Gebremedhin (CPR Unit Team Leader, UNDP South Sudan) and XX (Title, DFID South Sudan). |