

Terms of Reference: Evaluation of JPF-funded projects in South Sudan

“Promotion of peaceful coexistence with the host community through collaborative activities and community-based protection at IDP camps in Juba, Central Equatoria State”

implemented by REALs

“WASH provision for IDPs in Central Equatoria State” implemented by PWJ

4 Background

The Japan Platform (hereinafter referred to as "JPF") is an international emergency humanitarian aid organization which offers the most effective and prompt emergency aid in response to humanitarian needs, focusing on issues of refugees and natural disasters. JPF conducts such aid through a tripartite cooperation system where NGOs, business communities, and the government of Japan work in close cooperation, based on equal partnership, and making the most of the respective sectors' characteristics and resources.

Since 2006, JPF has been funding Japanese NGOs responding to the chronic humanitarian crisis in South Sudan, predating South Sudan’s independence in 2011. JPF remained engaged in the face of the political unrest of 2013 and the ensuing period of instability. The 2018 Revitalized Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan (R-ARCSS) paved the way for the formation of the Revitalized Transitional Government of National Unity in February 2020. Nonetheless, the humanitarian situation in South Sudan remains dire. In 2022, the humanitarian community in South Sudan estimates that more than two-thirds of South Sudan's population, 8.9 million people, are in need of humanitarian assistance, an increase of 600,000 since 2021. The country continues to experience the cumulative effects of years of conflict, a surge in sub-national violence, unprecedented flooding and hyperinflation, further compounded by the COVID-19 pandemic. JPF repeatedly renewed its annual funding commitment to the South Sudan refugee programme¹ in South Sudan and its neighboring countries. In FY 2021, JPF funded 8 projects in WASH, protection and education implemented by 6 agencies across 5 countries. JPF’s South Sudan refugee program set the following priority objectives that are identified by its member agencies in line with the 2021 Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP)².

1. Address urgent humanitarian needs of the crisis affected people that have been aggravated and compounded by COVID 19
2. Strengthen resilience of people against sudden and complex risks

¹ JPF provided a 3-year funding scheme only during June 2016-May 2019. In principle, the funding for the multi-country South Sudan refugee program has been on an annual basis.

² <https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/document/south-sudan-2021-humanitarian-response-plan#:~:text=The%20South%20Sudan%202021%20Humanitarian%20Response%20Plan%20requests,the%20cluster-specific%20objectives%2C%20indicators%20and%20targets%20here%3A%20https%3A%2F%2Fbit.ly%2F3vtb4tm>

Reach Alternatives (REALs) and Peace Winds Japan (PWJ) are among JPF’s member agencies active in Juba, South Sudan. Under JPF’s South Sudan program, REALs has been implementing peace building and protection projects in the inner-city camps and host communities since 2014³. The project was last evaluated in June 2020. Building on the achievements and lessons over the years, REALs is implementing a project entitled “Promotion of peaceful coexistence with the host community through collaborative activities and community-based protection at IDP camps in Juba, Central Equatoria State”. On the other hand, PWJ has been implementing WASH projects at IDP camps in Juba since 2019, while mainstreaming gender and protection, and taking into account recurrent tension over limited resources and services between the inner-city camps and host communities. The project was last evaluated in April 2021. PWJ is currently implementing “WASH provision for IDPs in Central Equatoria State” in the same camps. The target areas for REALs and PWJ’s current projects partially overlap. Both projects started in late October 2021. REALs’ project comes to an end in July 2022 while PWJ’s project ends in October 2022.

JPF annually conducts evaluations on selected projects under the South Sudan program. Some of the key issues emerged from the past evaluations on WASH and Protection as well as the meta evaluation of 2016-2020 are as follows. Those are learning needs for JPF in conducting this evaluation.

Multi-year Evaluation

- Although over 50 projects had been implemented during the multi-year programs (2016-2018, 2018-2020), the evaluation was unable to verify a cumulative impact conclusively, due to lack of quantified data. It is important to streamline an evaluation framework for a multi-year program in the future, with clearly defined strategic goals and verifiable indicators.

WASH

- Insufficient resources: Access to water was improved for the target population but fell short of meeting the Sphere standards given the population in target areas much exceeded the water points provided by the project.
- Maintenance & repair: There had been greater needs for repair of water points than the project could have responded to. Consider ease of repair and locally manageable operations and maintenance in choice of water systems.
- Scope of WASH services: A project met critical WASH needs that no other agencies had

³ Of 4 camps under the current project, REALs has been working in 2 camps, Gumbo & Mahad, since 2014, initially with a focus on protection from GBV and later prevention of violence and conflicts. Another camp, Way Station, has been included, along with the two preceding camps, in a peace building project since 2016. The last camp, Mangaten only came under the current project since late 2021.

addressed such as solid waste management and desludging of latrines.

- Behavior change: Hand washing behavior, use and cleanliness of latrines required continuous follow up.
- Sustainability: Capacity building for the project-installed committees required ongoing follow up support. Lack of incentives for committee members threatened their continuous engagement beyond the project period. Communities could not self-finance activities funded by a project.

Protection

- Alignment with the existing protection system: It is important to coordinate with other protection agencies to strengthen the existing system and structure for community-based protection. Effectiveness and sustainability are undermined, where different agencies create their own sub structures and parallel systems without adequate engagement of relevant government offices and trusted community leaders who may not have formally assigned roles in protection but are counted on by community members.
- Clarity of roles and effective relationships among key community workers and focal points were important to the community based protection system. Inclusion of male and female case workers, the youth and the elder in leadership for conflict resolution, accompanied by tailored support to address gender and inter-generational barriers, were particularly effective in breaking the entrenched norms and reinforcing recognition and respect for each one's roles. There is a need for ongoing technical support to strengthen their capacity.
- Effectiveness in case management: Effective response to cases may require closer coordination between the protection structures in camps and host communities, and capacity building for police, medical personnel and local authorities. Even if referral pathways are developed, the scarcity of protection services available and access to transport limit its effectiveness.
- Insufficient resources: Capacity was built for case management but the caseload far exceeded the desired ratio of cases per caseworker in some camps.
- Sustainability: At times, child protection committees and/or para-social workers worked voluntarily alongside community volunteers who played a similar role but with incentives. Lack of consistency in payment of incentives demotivated the former.

In addition, JPF is keen to explore how it may advance the localization agenda called for since the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit. Although JPF has not consciously taken the localization agenda into account in developing the program strategy, its portfolio or financing modalities, it hopes to revisit the current ways of working vis-à-vis the localization agenda and explore how it delivers on the localization agenda in moving forward.

2. Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to evaluate two of the JPF-funded projects in Juba in line with the OECD DAC evaluation criteria⁴ and the Core Humanitarian Standards (CHS), and draw recommendations and lessons learnt for the respective implementing agencies as well as for JPF's program strategy. The past evaluations of REALs and PWJ's projects exclusively focused on one of the successive phases of the projects under JPF's annual funding scheme, and assessed the projects' achievements against the predetermined outcomes and outputs. Given that JPF is committing to a multi-year funding scheme for South Sudan for the period of FY 2022-2024, this evaluation will assess the long-term results of the two projects funded annually for multiple years, and seek to draw relevant lessons and recommendations for JPF and its member implementing agencies in strategizing multi-year programming.

The evaluation also retrospectively review the current implementation and financing modalities in light of the localization agenda.⁵ It explores opportunities and potential for advancing localization agenda, and hence informs JPF's dialogue with member agencies and other stakeholders on its positioning and strategy towards localization.

The primary audience of the evaluation are JPF and the implementing agencies, REALs and PWJ. The evaluation report will be also communicated to the wider audience in South Sudan and in Japan to share relevant lessons learnt for the broader sector and as a means to hold JPF accountable to its supporters and stakeholders.

3. Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will address the following areas of inquiry with regard to the two projects respectively. With regard to 4.4, 5.2-5.4, however, the evaluation may synthesize the findings from the two projects and consolidate the recommendations accordingly.

- 1 Assess the extent to which the newly identified needs of the target population under the current phase (Mangaten camp in REALs' project and Juba, Mahad, and Don Bosco IDP camps in PWJ's project), has been addressed in a timely and coordinated manner. In doing so, assess the level of satisfaction with the current project interventions among the vulnerable groups identified as such in the given project contexts, such as women, children, youth, the

⁴ [Evaluation Criteria - OECD](#)

⁵ The localization agenda refers to the core responsibilities 4A and 5A under the Agenda for Humanity ([Home | Agenda for Humanity](#)).

disabled and/or SGBV victims. Where there are tensions and competing interests between different social groups, assess if and how these groups perceive they have benefitted from the projects equitably.

(in line with OECD DAC criteria of effectiveness and relevance)

- 2 Assess long-term results of the two projects over different phases, both intended and unintended, on the everyday lives of the target population (REALs' project), and on the local capacity and systems to sustain the project achievements (PWJ's project)

(in line with OECD DAC criteria of impact and/or sustainability as well as CHS)

- 3 Analyze how intended and unintended results have occurred, and identify contributing and constraining factors to the changes. Assess the extent to which these factors have been attributable to different approaches taken by the projects in different phases, and if and how these approaches have been complemented by ongoing efforts of other actors. In doing so, validate the assumptions and hypothesis underpinning the project designs and positioning vis-à-vis other actors, and appropriateness and timeliness of the project responses to the past evaluations.

(in line with OECD DAC criteria of effectiveness and coherence).

- 4 Identify actual and potential alignment of the project with the core responsibilities 4A Reinforce local systems & 5A Invest in local capacities under the Agenda for Humanity, with regard to the following questions (in line with OECD DAC criteria of efficiency and sustainability as well as CHS).

Reinforce local systems: International actors should enable people to be the central drivers in building resilience and be accountable to them through consistent community engagement and ensuring their involvement in decision-making. The international community should respect, support and strengthen local leadership and capacity in crises and not put in parallel structures that may undermine it.

4.1 How have the projects involved local actors?

4.2 How have the projects allowed communities and local actors to become more active in decision making?

4.3 How have the projects increased the capacity of communities and local actors?

4.4 Have the capacity building of these actors enables them to sustain project achievements beyond the projects' lifetime?

Invest in local capacities: Local actors are the best placed to know the underlying risks and priorities of communities. While those factors place them in the ideal position to provide

humanitarian assistance, local actors can struggle to scale high-volume delivery and sustain adequate resources to support a lasting organizational presence. Direct and predictable financing, where possible, should be provided to national and local actors along with long-term support to develop their capacity to prevent, respond and recover from crises.

4.5 How has JPF's annual funding scheme and financing modalities facilitated or hindered REALs' and PWJ's efforts at localization, as assessed under 4.1-4.4.

5 Draw lessons learnt from the evaluation for REALs, PWJ, JPF and other JPF member agencies active in South Sudan.

5.1 Recommendations for the two implementing agencies on the respective project designs, implementation and stakeholder engagement.

5.2 Replicable lessons learnt on gender and conflict transformative programming, behavior change communications, and community engagement that are of broader relevance beyond these projects.

5.3 Recommendations for JPF on the program priorities and financing modalities.

5.4 Areas for further discussion between JPF and its member agencies on the localization agenda

4. Methodology

Given the nature of this evaluation, the consultant will primarily make use of participatory data collection as main methods, complemented by secondary and quantitative data. The evaluation will consider the different focus of REALs and PWJ's projects in assessing long-term results of the respective projects (the scope 2). By tracing the process and factors that led to the intended and unintended changes, the evaluation will validate the theory of change underpinning the projects (the scope 3) and retrospectively assess the projects' alignment with localization (the scope 4). The evaluation will use consistent methodology in assessing the two projects' alignment with localization agenda so the findings can be synthesized. In responding to the scope of the evaluation, the consultant will undertake the following types of assessment and analysis. Analytical tools and methods referred to are only indicative, and the consultant is requested to develop appropriate methods to collect required data.

REALs' project

1 Conflict analysis

The consultant will identify patterns and trends in conflicts happening in the target areas over the years, with particular attention to various social groups, power relations between them, which issue divides them, what stakes they each have on such issues, what triggers conflicts,

what interests they may have in common and the level of trust (or lack thereof) in each other. The consultant may use creative methods to allow people to express their perceptions and feelings towards each other. The consultant may also use Do No Harm or Benefit-Harm Analysis to analyze how the project has intersected with the conflict dynamics intentionally or unintentionally.

2 Gender and vulnerability analysis

Focusing on 3 camps (Gumbo, Mahad & Way Station) where the protection from SGBV and psychosocial support has been implemented, the consultant will identify those who are vulnerable to SGBV and analyze what makes them vulnerable. The consultant will also identify profiles of SGBV perpetrators and driving factors behind SGBV cases. It is well established in the literature that patterns of conflicts underlie the prevalence of SGBV, and the consultant is expected to analyze the one impacts on the other and vice versa. In doing so, the consultant may ascertain the presence of inter-relationships and synergy between the project interventions addressing SGBV and inter-community conflicts.

3 Assessment of psychosocial well-being, attitudes and behaviours towards conflicts and SGBV

The consultant may use a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods to explore what changes people experienced psychosocially, and what attitudinal and behavioral changes they have undergone towards conflicts, gender and SGBV, both at personal and societal levels. The consultant may use the Most Significant Change stories to qualitatively understand the value and the meaning of the changes that people perceive and/or conduct a survey to quantitatively illustrate the extent and scale of the changes.

4 Assessment of the conflict mitigation, mediation and resolution mechanisms and the protection system

The consultant will assess impact at the system level as well as on people's lives. Such assessment may trace the evolution of the conflict mitigation, mediation and resolution mechanisms and the protection system during the period under assessment. The consultant may use Outcome Mapping to unpack how the project influenced various elements of the mechanisms and systems to create desired changes at the system level. The consultant may also look into the extent to which such mechanisms/system can deliver lasting solutions and the level of trust people hold in the mechanisms/system. To this end, the consultant may pick sample cases to analyze effectiveness of case management.

PWJ's project

1. Gender and vulnerability analysis

The consultant will analyze how gender, age, disability and IDP-host community relationships may affect the accessibility to and the perceived impact of WASH facilities. It may take a form of FGDs with identified user groups, as well as physical observations of how the WASH facilities are being used by these groups. The consultant may use Do No Harm or Benefit-Harm analysis to bring to surface the intended and unintended impact of the project on vulnerable groups. The consultant will analyze the accessibility to and impact of the WASH facilities in relation to the level of participation and influence of vulnerable groups over the project design and implementation process.

2. Management of the commons

The consultant will clarify how communities understand ownership, roles and responsibilities for management of WASH facilities, and let communities self-assess how well they are working and why. The consultant will also triangulate the findings from the perspective of those with specific responsibilities to manage and maintain WASH facilities, and further investigate enabling and constraining factors to sustaining the WASH facilities ensuring accessibility for all the intended users equitably and without conflicts.

3. Assessment of local capacity and systems for WASH service delivery

The consultant may use a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods to identify and assess local actors above the community level responsible for WASH service delivery, including behavioural change, communications, waste management, maintenance & cleaning of WASH facilities and development and enforcement of rules for users. Taking into account the government and cluster policies and guidelines on WASH service delivery, the consultant will assess the extent to which those individual local actors are playing their roles in WASH service delivery and how effectively they are working as a whole at local and national levels. In order to identify enablers and barriers to WASH service delivery, the consultant may also employ comparative analysis of WASH service delivery systems across different areas of comparable conditions that are and are not targeted by the project. The consultant will analyze if and how the successive phases of the project have contributed to enablers and addressed barriers, and identify lessons and recommendations on the WASH system strengthening.

REALs and PWJ's projects

1 Alignment with the localization agenda

The consultant will outline how the respective projects developed their interventions and approaches over time from the project documents and the past evaluations. In doing so, the consultant will specifically look into how the project engaged and empowered local actors in line with the localization agenda. The consultant may make use of stakeholder mapping and capacity assessment of the concerned local actors, as well as FGDs to explore how different types of local actors may perceive their relationships with the implementing agencies and the quality of their engagement with the projects.

5. Deliverables

- An inception report, describing the methodology and plan for the evaluation and annexing the evaluation tools.
- A debriefing meeting with REALs and PWJ’s field teams
- A presentation of the preliminary findings and recommendations to JPF, REALs & PWJ
- A final report, responding to the Terms of Reference

6. Roles and responsibilities

The contractor will report directly to JPF but will work closely with the two implementing agencies. The implementation structure for third party evaluation is as follows.

JPF: Oversight over the evaluation

Contractor: Implementation and coordination of the assignment. Delivery of the outputs by the deadlines.

REALs & PWJ: Provide project information and data. Support the fieldwork as required.

7. Timeline

An evaluation is expected to take 3 months from late July to October 2022. An indicative schedule is as follows, with the deadlines to be met highlighted in bold. A schedule for the fieldwork is subject to change, due to the travel restrictions by the concerned authorities and other unforeseen circumstances that may arise. The field work concerning the project participants and stakeholders to REALs’ project needs to be complete by the end of August, however.

| Tasks | Dates |
|---|------------------------|
| Deadline for application | 27 June |
| Shortlist of the applicants | 4 July |
| Interviews | Week of 11 July |
| Signing of contract | 22 July |
| An inception meeting (JPF, REALs & PWJ) | Week of 25 July |

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Evaluation methodology & tool development | 2 weeks |
| Submission of the inception report | By 7 August |
| Feedback on the inception report by JPF & WVJ | By 12 August |
| Finalization of the inception report | By 19 August |
| Travel to Juba | 22 August |
| Field work | 3 weeks |
| Debriefing to REALs field team | 31 August |
| Debriefing to PWJ field team | 9 September |
| Travel from Juba to the country of residence | 10 September |
| Presentation of the preliminary findings to JPF & WVJ | 26 September |
| First draft report | By 7 October |
| Feedback on the draft report by JPF & WVJ | By 14 October |
| Submission of the Final report | By 21 October |

The evaluation team is expected to undertake the fieldwork in Juba independently. REALs and PWJ field staff are only available for initial and concluding briefings. The evaluation team is expected to comply with security guidelines, COVID 19 prevention measures and any other policies required by the respective implementing agencies in conducting the field work.

8. Call for tenders

JPF calls for submission of proposals to undertake the above evaluation by interested individuals or entities. Participation in tendering is open on equal terms to all natural and legal entities that can provide the required documents by this tender.

A bid proposal shall consist of the following administrative documents, technical and financial proposals and shall be numbered as below.

1. Administrative documents

- 1.1 Organizational Profile Document providing detailed information on the capacity of the organization and services provided (such as registration details, the year of establishment, the number and locations of offices, the number of full/part time staff, etc.)
- 1.2 Valid company registration documents including licenses obtained from the relevant governmental institution.
- 1.3 Submission of the most recent original and valid tax documents
- 1.4 A detailed list of previous and ongoing works in the relevant field, particularly in South Sudan, along with organizations, contact persons and contact details for a

reference check

- 1.5 Two evaluation reports from the previous work that are of relevance to this evaluation
 - 1.6 A one to two-page organization policy document on staff safety and preventive measures against COVID-19 in undertaking an evaluation
 - 1.7 Confidentiality and Data Protection Policy and Procedures that will be applied
 - 1.8 Contact details for this tender (name of the contact person, office address, phone and e-mail address).
 - 1.9 Signature declaration or list of authorized signatures, indicating that they are authorized to submit the tender
 - 1.10 A signed commitment to meeting the following 4 conditions.
 - A bidder is not bankrupt, in liquidation, under suspension by the court, nor is it in a similar situation according to the legislative provisions in their home country
 - A bidder has no history of violation of business or professional ethics during the course of business within five (5) years prior to the date of procurement.
 - A bidder's membership/license, required by the relevant legislation to conduct the business, is valid as of the date of the procurement
 - A bidder does not provide incomplete or misleading information and/or falsified documents.
2. Technical proposal
- 2.1 Evaluation design and methodology: including a sampling methodology and size, and approaches and methods used for data collection and analysis; and taking into account Covid-19 prevention measures and Do No Harm principle
 - 2.2 An Implementation Plan indicating how the deliverables are met by the deadlines
 - 2.3 A list of personnel, detailing the roles and responsibilities for each member, and how gender equality is considered in its composition, accompanied by CVs for the key personnel.
 - 2.4 A risk management plan on the possible impact of COVID-19 on the proposed plan, and a contingency plan including alternative methodology and approaches.
3. Financial proposal
- 3.1 Disclosure of all the costing information including the daily rates of the consultancy and the relevant tax, and accounting for unit costs and numbers of units.
 - 3.2 The amounts shall be given in American Dollars (USD) or Japanese Yen (JPY)

- 3.3 A total sum shall not exceed USD 26,000 or JPY 3,480,000.
- 3.4 For the tender submitted by a consortium, the price that the consortium partners offer for the parts of the business that require their expertise will be written separately. The sum of the prices that the consortium partners offer shall constitute the consortium's total bid price.
- 3.5 Payment conditions, if any.

9. Submission of Proposals

Interested Consultants/Companies/Organizations shall submit a proposal via e-mail to procurement@japanplatform.org, by **17:00 (pm) on 27h of June 2022**. The tender reference number **JPF-SS-22-004** must be specified on the e-mail and on the file names.

The documents shall be in PDF format. If a bidder is a real person, a cover letter shall indicate the name and surname of the bidder. If it is a legal entity, then the trade name must be fully written and shall be signed by the authorized persons. In case a tender is submitted by a joint venture or a consortium, a bid must sign by all partners or by persons authorized to bid.

10. Tender evaluation criteria

JPF will evaluate incoming proposals based on the following criteria.

- The conformity of the required documents
- Quality of technical proposal – weights 70%
- Financial Offer –weighs 30%

11. Notification award and contract signature

The successful bidder is informed in writing and the contract is signed within 10 (ten) calendar days. A meeting will be conducted prior to the signing of the contract. Firms that are not selected as the result of the evaluation are informed in writing within 15 (fifteen) working days. If the successful bidder does not sign the contract, the second best bidder is informed in writing by the tender committee and a contract is signed within 10 (ten) calendar days.

JPF is obliged to keep the procurement proposals collected as a result of this tender for future audits.

12. List of Annexes

Annex 1 JPF_Info_Sheet

Annex 2 REALs Project Summary Document

JPF-SS-22-004

Annex 3 PWJ Project Summary Document