



Funded by
the European Union



Terms of Reference (ToR) for Midterm Evaluation: Fostering Peace and Natural Resources Governance (FOPNAG) Project

1. **Project Title:** Fostering Peace and Natural Resources Governance (FOPNAG) Project
2. **Contracting Authority:** European Union Delegation to the Republic of South Sudan
3. **Implementing Partners:** Vétérinaires Sans Frontières Germany (VSF Germany) – Lead Applicant, and Enjojo Foundation – Co-applicant.
4. **Project Reference:** Contract NDICI AFRICA/2023/446-389 (Reference: ACT-60408 "Peace, rule of law, and reconciliation")
5. **Project Duration:** 30 months (January 2024- June 2026)
6. **Midterm Evaluation Period:** Approximately 15 months into the project implementation. (January 2024 - 2025, June 2025).
7. **Project Location:** 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.
8. **Background and Context:**

The FOPNAG project, funded by the European Union, 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 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 (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 (NDICI 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.

9. Purpose and Objectives of the Midterm Evaluation

The overall purpose of this midterm evaluation is to assess the progress made towards achieving the expected outputs, outcomes, and initial indications of impact of the FOPNAG project. Aligned with the provision of the OECD-DAC criteria, it will identify and document lessons learned, highlight best practices, and provide actionable recommendations to improve project implementation for the remaining duration. The evaluation will also inform future programming and strategies.

Specifically, the evaluation will aim to:

- **Appraise and establish the relevance of the project:** By assessing the extent to which the project's objectives and design remain appropriate and aligned with the needs of the target communities, national priorities, EU strategic frameworks, and the evolving socio-political context in South Sudan
- **Determine the level of efficiency of project implementation:** Analyse how effectively project resources—financial, human, and material— are utilized to produce the intended outputs and outcomes. This includes evaluating the cost-effectiveness of activities and the timeliness with which implementation milestones are achieved.
- **Determine the effectiveness of project implementation:** Evaluate the extent to which the project has achieved its stated outputs and is progressing towards its specific objectives (outcomes) as outlined in the Logical Framework.
- **Assess the project's coherence with other relevant initiatives,** evaluate its early indications of impact, and determine the extent to which it is laying the basis for sustainability.
- **Determine the project quality:** Assess the overall quality of project design, implementation, and monitoring processes including how well these elements adhere to best practices, stakeholder engagement, and adaptability to changing conditions.
- **Identify and document lessons learned:** Capture key successes, challenges, and unexpected findings that can inform ongoing project adjustments and future interventions.
- **Formulate actionable recommendations:** Provide concrete, practical, and forward-looking recommendations for improving the project's performance, strategic direction, and sustainability for the remaining implementation period.

10. Target audience

- **The European Union delegation to South Sudan:** The mid-term evaluation shall provide the donor, EU with information on how the project is performing towards finally contributing to the final objectives of the program and what follow-up actions may be necessary to ensure the desired outcomes and project re-designing to suite the context dynamics.
- **VSF Germany and Enjojo Foundation:** The mid-term evaluation shall provide VSF and its partner's opportunity to critically assess technical arising issues and mechanisms and meticulously focus on the recommendations to improve the pathways and potential of FOPNAG to achieve expected outcomes and objectives within the project timeframe.
- **Beneficiaries and stakeholders:** The mid-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.

11. Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation will cover all project activities implemented from the project start date in 2024 up to the point of the midterm evaluation (approximately 15 months into the project). It will encompass all geographical areas of intervention: Kidepo Game Reserve (Ikotos and Budi counties) and Lantoto National Park (Yei and Maridi Counties).

The evaluation will assess all three-project outcomes along with their associated outputs and activities as outlined in the Logical Framework:

- **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 evaluation will also consider crosscutting themes such as gender equality, protection, disability mainstreaming, environmental sustainability, and conflict sensitivity in relation to project implementation and outcomes.

12. Evaluation Questions (based on OECD-DAC Criteria)

The evaluation will address, but not be limited to, the following key questions, structured around the OECD DAC criteria:

12.1. Relevance:

- To what extent do the project's objectives align with the needs and priorities of the target communities (agropastoralists, women, youth, PLWDs, local leaders) in Kidepo Game Reserve and Lantoto National Park?
- Do the project's objectives and intervention logic (as per the Logical Framework) remain relevant given the evolving socio-political, economic, and environmental context in South Sudan?
- How well does the project align with national development plans, EU strategies, and humanitarian/development frameworks in South Sudan?
- Is the project's differentiated approach to peacebuilding in KGR versus livelihood support in LNP still appropriate and effective given the current contextual realities?

12.2. Coherence:

- How effectively does the project integrate with other relevant initiatives (e.g., the complementary EU-funded conservation project NDCI AFRICA/2023/446-393) and other humanitarian/development actors in the target areas? Are there identifiable synergies or overlaps?
- To what extent does the project's design and implementation avoid unintended negative consequences or exacerbate existing conflicts? (Conflict sensitivity)

12.3. Effectiveness:

- To what extent has the project achieved its outputs and outcomes against baseline values as planned based on the Output/outcome indicators in the Logical framework? Examples include:
 - Number of people trained in reconciliation and conflict management (Output 1.1.1)
 - Number of early warning systems strengthened or established (Output 1.1.3)

- Number of peace committees or structures strengthened or established (Output 1.2.1)
- Number of beneficiaries trained in improved business skills (Output 2.1.1)
- Number of VSLAs/VICOBAs established (Output 2.2.1)
- Number of women trained to take lead roles in peace processes (Output 3.1.1)
- What progress has been made towards achieving the project's specific objectives (outcomes) as per the Outcome indicators in the Logframe? Examples include:
 - Percentage of emerging conflicts identified by early warning systems (Outcome 1.1)
 - Percentage of households with a high resilience capacity score (Outcome 2.1)
 - Number/percentage of women and youth participating in local peace and security processes (Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2)
- What are the main factors (both internal and external) that have contributed to or hindered the achievement of outputs and outcomes?
- How effectively has the project adapted its strategies and activities in response to contextual conditions and emerging challenges?
- To what extent have crosscutting themes such as gender, protection, disability been effectively mainstreamed in project activities and contributed to desired changes?

12.4. Efficiency:

- Are the project's resources (financial, human, material) being utilized in an economical and timely manner to achieve the intended outputs and outcomes?
- Is the project management structure (Steering Committee, PMT, VSFG/Enjojo roles) efficient in facilitating implementation and coordination?
- Are there more efficient ways to deliver the same or better results?
- How effective are the monitoring and reporting mechanisms in tracking progress and supporting adaptive management?

12.5. Impact (Early Indications):

- What are the early indications of the project's contribution to the overall objective of "strengthening resilience of agropastoral Communities in Kidepo catchment against recurring climate and other shocks"? (*Referencing Impact indicators in the baseline report and Logframe: % reduction in conflict incidences, % of households reporting increased personal safety/security, % of traditional leadership groups employing institutional conflict handling strategies*).
- What are any unintended positive or negative effects (e.g., on social cohesion, resource access, power dynamics) observed as a result of the project's interventions?

12.6. Sustainability:

- What is the likelihood that the benefits generated by the project will continue after the project's completion?
- To what extent have local capacities (community structures, local leaders, institutions) been strengthened to sustain project results?
- Are the introduced livelihood and peacebuilding mechanisms likely to sustain themselves over time?
- What measures have been put in place to ensure financial, institutional, policy, environmental, and social sustainability?

13. Methodology

The consultant(s) will propose a detailed methodology in their technical proposal. The methodology should be robust, participatory, and utilize a mixed-methods approach (quantitative and qualitative data collection). It should include, but not be limited to:

- **Desk Review:** Review of all relevant project documents, including the Grant Application Form (Description of Action), Logical Framework, progress reports (narrative reports), financial reports, baseline survey report, M&E plans, communication and visibility plans, and any other relevant studies or assessments.
- **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.

The consultant(s) must ensure that the methodology is conflict-sensitive, gender-responsive, and inclusive, actively capturing the perspectives of all target groups—especially marginalized and vulnerable populations

14. Deliverables

The selected consultant(s) will be responsible for delivering the following:

1. **Inception Report (within 7 days of contract signing):**
 - Detailed work plan, methodology, and timeline for the evaluation.
 - Refined evaluation questions.
 - Detailed data collection tools (KII guides, FGD guides, observation checklists).
 - Proposed sampling strategy.
 - Outline of the final evaluation report.
2. **Draft Midterm Evaluation Report (within 21 days of inception report approval):**
 - Comprehensive report addressing all evaluation questions based on OECD DAC criteria.
 - Clear findings, conclusions, lessons learned, and actionable recommendations.
 - Adherence to the agreed-upon report structure.
3. **Presentation of Preliminary Findings (during draft report phase):**
 - Presentation to VSF Germany, Enjojo Foundation, and EU Delegation for feedback.
4. **Final Midterm Evaluation Report (within 7 days of receiving feedback on draft):**
 - Incorporation of all relevant feedback from stakeholders.
 - High quality, professionally written report (PDF and editable Word format).
 - Annexes including ToR, list of documents reviewed, and list of individuals/groups interviewed, data collection tools.

15. EXPECTED PRODUCTS

15.1. Inception report:

The inception report shall provide a detailed description of the methodology to answer the evaluation questions as well as the proposed source of information and data collection procedure. The inception report shall outline the contents of all the deliverables. The consultant shall write the inception report in English, limit it to 15 pages, and obtain approval by VSFG.

15.2. Draft evaluation report:

The consultancy team will develop a draft evaluation report for review by the FOPNAG program personnel and partners. Stakeholders in Juba shall validate the final report through a workshop, if feasible. The draft report will adopt the format of the final report as presented below under the final report. Generally, the report will include the executive summary, intervention description, evaluation purpose, evaluation methodology, findings and conclusions (answers to the evaluation questions), recommendations and annexes (list of people interviewed, key documents consulted, data collection instruments, ToR, etc.).

15.3. Final evaluation report:

The evaluation team shall endeavour to develop the final report and present the output in an electronic format to VSF-G for final approval and adoption. The consultant shall write the final report in English and limit it to **40 pages, excluding annexes**. They can download a sample structure for the evaluation report [here](#).

The consultant will submit the final report along with the following deliverables:

- A 2-page evaluation fact sheet and soft copy of dataset. This is to include relevant findings from the evaluation, key points and recommendations.
- An Indicator Summary Sheet, giving status of all indicators measured in the questionnaire compared against baseline values.
- Learning dossier – the evaluation team shall document the lessons they learn and share them with the project team and the Programs Office in Juba to ensure they are considered in future studies. The documentation of these lessons will be vital for reflection, growth and continued improvement.

16. Consultant(s) Qualifications and Experience

The evaluation team (Individuals or firm) should comprise a lead evaluator and, if necessary, supporting team members with the following minimum qualifications:

- **Lead Evaluator:**
 - Minimum Master's degree in Social Sciences, Development Studies, Agriculture, Peace and Conflict Studies, Natural Resource Management/Forestry, conservation, veterinary medicine/ Veterinary Epidemiology, M&E, or a related field.
 - At least 7-10 years of proven experience in conducting evaluations of humanitarian, development, or peacebuilding projects, preferably EU-funded.
 - Demonstrated expertise in applying OECD DAC evaluation criteria (Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, and Sustainability).
 - Evidenced Relevance - Proven evaluation skills with ability to critically assess the full context and provide constructive feedback – At least 2-3 recent referenced reports of different donors (EU, UN-FAO and USAID) past years. Added value to those with at least 2-3 evaluations relevant to conservation, livelihoods and livestock related interventions
 - Experience in working with EU, UN-FAO and USAID funded programs/projects or partners.
 - Strong analytical, research, and report writing skills.

- Proven experience in designing and implementing mixed-methods evaluation methodologies.
- Familiarity with the context of South Sudan, particularly Eastern Equatoria and Central Equatoria States, and experience working with agropastoral communities.
- Excellent communication and facilitation skills in English. Knowledge of Arabic and local languages is an added advantage.
- Understanding of conflict sensitivity, gender mainstreaming, and protection principles in evaluation.
- **Team Members (if applicable):**
 - Relevant academic qualifications and experience in data collection, qualitative and quantitative analysis.
 - Experience in the specific thematic areas of the project (peacebuilding, livelihoods, natural resource management, VSLA, animal health).
 - Strong local knowledge and language skills are highly desirable.

17. Timeline and Budget

- **Total consultancy days:** 28 working days,
- **Proposed Timeline:** (To be proposed by the consultant in the technical proposal, adhering to the project's midterm timeframe in September 2025).
 - Contract Signing & Inception Report: Week 1
 - Desk Review & Tool Development: Week 1-2
 - Field Data Collection: Week 2-3
 - Data Analysis & Draft Report: Week 4
 - Feedback Incorporation & Final Report: Week 5
- **Budget:** Consultants should submit a detailed financial proposal, including daily rates, per diems, local enumerators, accommodation, meals, international flights and any other relevant expenses. Present the budget in USD.

18. Management arrangements

The team should inform the consultant of certain issues, situation and conditions as they are or may arise during the exercise including:

- **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.

- **Operation arrangement:**
 - a. **VSF Germany and Enjojo Foundation (Project Management Team)**
 - Provide logistical support for in-country/field level (e.g., transport, security briefings, local guides).
 - Provide all necessary project documents and background information.
 - 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;
 - b. **Consultant(s):**
 - Responsible for the overall design, planning, execution, and reporting of the evaluation in line with these 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 and any other relevant expenses as feasible

- **Reference materials:** Relevant documents will be available for the secondary information desk study. The project team will encourage the consultant to identify any additional sources of relevant information needed to supplement the materials provided. 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

19. 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 until **3rd August 2025**. The program team will answer questions related to the expression of interest by **11th August 2025** and will send the responses to all consultants who submitted their expression of interest. After the **3rd August 2025**, consultants can still participate and hand in an offer and ask for the answers given, but no further questions will be admitted.

- **Application Deadline: August 22, 2025**
- Submission Method: All applications shall only be received via this Google Form: <https://forms.gle/p5FiroieAxo2jgEK8> (if you have problem opening this link when you click on it, copy it and paste it to your browser)

20. Selection Criteria

The evaluation team will assess proposals based on a combination of technical merit and financial competitiveness. The technical proposal will be weighted 70%, and the financial proposal 30%. Only technically qualified proposals will proceed to financial evaluation.

Criteria	Maximum
A. Total score for technical evaluation	70
1. Relevance & Quality of Applicant (25%)	25
1.1. Team Composition (Quality & Professional Mix)	
1.2. Relevance & Depth of the Firm's Experience	
2. Quality of Application (35%)	35
2.1. Completeness of Application	
2.2. Responsiveness to TOR	
3. Delivery of Outputs (10%)	10
3.1. Schedule	
3.2. Deliverables	
B. Total score for financial evaluation	30
Daily rates, per diems, local enumerators, and any other relevant expenses	
OVERALL TOTAL SCORE	100

Evaluation criteria points' threshold:

- Technically any bidder below 50 out of 70 will be rejected

- For any bidder to be selected the sum of technical and financial evaluation point below 70 out of 100 points, is automatically rejected.

We reserve the right to conduct telephone or personal interviews with 2-3 bidders in order to reach a decision. Further, we reserve the exclusive right to take a decision among the offers received.

21. 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.