**Annex I:**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) OR SCOPE OF WORK (SOW**)

**Background of Consultancy**:

CIS has been involved actively in South Darfur in 2009, with emergency and early recovery interventions including WASH, Health& Nutrition, Food distributions and livelihood enhancement projects, in a sense of balancing services between IPDs in Nyala, Kass and Gereida camps, and those in the rural areas in Kass & Gereida,the Livelihood Enhancement for Agro-pastoral and Pastoral rural communities (LEAP) received funding from The Royal Netherlands Embassy through CARE Netherlands in Jan 2010 to implement livelihoods activities in South Darfur localities of Kass and Gereida for a period up to 31st May2011, then a no cost extension is approved to extend the project life up to 31st Aug11. The project is mainly designed to achieve the following goal and objectives:

**Overall Goal:**

By May 2011 conditions within selected pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in South Darfur better support longer term recovery from conflict.

**Specific Objective:**

By May 2010, the livelihoods of 4,000 agro-pastoralist and pastoralist households in South Darfur have improved through increased income, access to sufficient clean water and peaceful co-existence within their communities.

**Results:**

1. 8 Functional Village Development Committees (VDCs) are in place and contributing to improved livelihoods and peace.
2. Improved capacity of 3 local NGO partners and relevant government departments
3. 4000 households increase their food and income security
4. 4,000 households have improved year-round access to clean drinking water.
5. Communities participating in the project demonstrate increased awareness of and improved practice in relation to basic household hygiene.
6. Participating communities demonstrate increased capacities for mitigating and resolving local conflicts in a non-violent manner.

**Objectives of the Consultancy**:

1. Support the project assess whether the project has achieved the proposed objectives and goals.
2. Evaluate how far was the implementation strategy has been effective into achieving the proposed objectives.
3. Evaluate how the project has impacted in people’s lives as per the project objectives and the set of verifiable indicators listed in the log frame.
4. Assess how the community participation level was and how it has contributed to the project achievements.
5. Document lessons learned through the implementation process, and what are the main factors that influenced the project implementation.
6. Provide recommendations that could be adopted for future similar projects.
7. Document at least two case studies from both Kass & Gereida that could be shared out.

**Study Methodology**

The consultant is expected to use different quantitative and qualitative methods to collect data on the project achievements, which will involve community structures, informative key person(IKP) and focal group discussions (FGD) in all project sites, the consultant will present clear methodology for CIS to be discussed and agreed on before the start-up of the process.

**Field Work**

Field work will begin with an internal consultation with CIS staff to develop an understanding of the programming context and an initial analysis of the context. The consultation will also help the consultant to identify key questions to be asked in a wider stakeholder consultation.

The consultant should spend considerable amount of time interviewing the project participants (beneficiaries) and stakeholders through FGD, KIP, quantitative surveys, and participant observation.

The consultant will use enumerators from the field and train them to support the required data collection.

**Proposed Activities**

In order to carry out this study, the consultant will perform the following activities:

Prepare interview instruments, including KIP and FGD questionnaires , in consultation with the Livelihood Sector Manager, Program Coordinator, the Deputy Program Coordinator and other key staff;

Review project documents, including the proposals, log frames, reviewed base line survey, midterm reports, Beneficiary selection criteria, Quarterly and annual reports, Household visit reports and any other reports available.
Conduct qualitative and quantitative assessment/interviews/visits to generate information needed to analyse indicators and evaluate implementation strategies and overall project performance;

Review findings and present findings to Program Staff and CIS senior management team of for their inputs and recommendations, prepare draft report.

After Action Review (AAR): A 1 day dynamic, candid and professional discussion engaging various stakeholder and project staff facilitated by the Consultant. This will focus on results of CIS activities within the evaluation period, identifies ways of sustaining what has been done, improving shortfalls, strengths and deficiencies.

Draft report will be reviewed by the team and returned with comments for preparation of the final report.

**Specific Tasks, Outputs and Time Frame**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tasks | Outputs | No. Days/ Time Frame |
| 1. **Project target-** assess if the project has reached the proposed targeted beneficiaries? And the actual needs are properly identified.
 | The primary outcomes of the Evaluation will include a draft report and presentation to Program staff and senior management, to be submitted at the end of the field visit. The presentation will provide an opportunity for sharing, answering questions and providing guidance to the consultant, and generating additional ideas. The report will be reviewed by the office and comments will be returned to the consultant within three days of the presentation, at most. A final report incorporating those suggestions and comments will be submitted to the Program management within five days of receiving feedback.The Final Report will be at most 30 pages (not including annexes) and will contain the following:1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
3. Study Objectives
4. Implementation Process
5. Study Findings
6. Recommendations and Lessons Learned
7. Two case studies of successful stories.
8. Conclusions

Annex – list of interviews and other essentials |  |
| 1. **Community capacity building-** did the project managed to properly mobilized the targeted communities/ structures and being able to raise their capacity for self-reliance and sustainability? If the project managed to build the capacity of national NGOs to effectively work in humanitarian assistance.
 | The primary outcomes of the Evaluation will include a draft report and presentation to Program staff and senior management, to be submitted at the end of the field visit. The presentation will provide an opportunity for sharing, answering questions and providing guidance to the consultant, and generating additional ideas. The report will be reviewed by the office and comments will be returned to the consultant within three days of the presentation, at most. A final report incorporating those suggestions and comments will be submitted to the Program management within five days of receiving feedback.The Final Report will be at most 30 pages (not including annexes) and will contain the following:1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
3. Study Objectives
4. Implementation Process
5. Study Findings
6. Recommendations and Lessons Learned
7. Two case studies of successful stories.
8. Conclusions

Annex – list of interviews and other essentials |  |
| 1. **Improved access to potable water for pastoral &agro-pastoralist-** Assess if the project has managed to facilitate improvement of water sources for rural communities
 | The primary outcomes of the Evaluation will include a draft report and presentation to Program staff and senior management, to be submitted at the end of the field visit. The presentation will provide an opportunity for sharing, answering questions and providing guidance to the consultant, and generating additional ideas. The report will be reviewed by the office and comments will be returned to the consultant within three days of the presentation, at most. A final report incorporating those suggestions and comments will be submitted to the Program management within five days of receiving feedback.The Final Report will be at most 30 pages (not including annexes) and will contain the following:1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
3. Study Objectives
4. Implementation Process
5. Study Findings
6. Recommendations and Lessons Learned
7. Two case studies of successful stories.
8. Conclusions

Annex – list of interviews and other essentials |  |
| 1. **Improve hygiene situation-** did the project has effectively contributed to the improvement of hygiene situation of the targeted communities.
 | The primary outcomes of the Evaluation will include a draft report and presentation to Program staff and senior management, to be submitted at the end of the field visit. The presentation will provide an opportunity for sharing, answering questions and providing guidance to the consultant, and generating additional ideas. The report will be reviewed by the office and comments will be returned to the consultant within three days of the presentation, at most. A final report incorporating those suggestions and comments will be submitted to the Program management within five days of receiving feedback.The Final Report will be at most 30 pages (not including annexes) and will contain the following:1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
3. Study Objectives
4. Implementation Process
5. Study Findings
6. Recommendations and Lessons Learned
7. Two case studies of successful stories.
8. Conclusions

Annex – list of interviews and other essentials |  |
| 1. **Improve Food security and Livelihood-** Did the project managed to improve food security among the target and raise the household income?
 | The primary outcomes of the Evaluation will include a draft report and presentation to Program staff and senior management, to be submitted at the end of the field visit. The presentation will provide an opportunity for sharing, answering questions and providing guidance to the consultant, and generating additional ideas. The report will be reviewed by the office and comments will be returned to the consultant within three days of the presentation, at most. A final report incorporating those suggestions and comments will be submitted to the Program management within five days of receiving feedback.The Final Report will be at most 30 pages (not including annexes) and will contain the following:1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
3. Study Objectives
4. Implementation Process
5. Study Findings
6. Recommendations and Lessons Learned
7. Two case studies of successful stories.
8. Conclusions

Annex – list of interviews and other essentials |  |
| 1. **Peace building-** Assess if the project interventions has contributed to reduce conflict over resources and if the project contributed to raise interaction or build trust among the different targeted communities
 | The primary outcomes of the Evaluation will include a draft report and presentation to Program staff and senior management, to be submitted at the end of the field visit. The presentation will provide an opportunity for sharing, answering questions and providing guidance to the consultant, and generating additional ideas. The report will be reviewed by the office and comments will be returned to the consultant within three days of the presentation, at most. A final report incorporating those suggestions and comments will be submitted to the Program management within five days of receiving feedback.The Final Report will be at most 30 pages (not including annexes) and will contain the following:1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
3. Study Objectives
4. Implementation Process
5. Study Findings
6. Recommendations and Lessons Learned
7. Two case studies of successful stories.
8. Conclusions

Annex – list of interviews and other essentials |  |

# Annex II: Logical Framework - LEAP

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***Intervention Logic*** | ***Objectively Verifiable******Indicators*** | ***Sources of Verification*** | ***Risks and Assumptions*** |
| Overall Objective | Improved livelihood security for pastoralists and agro-pastoralists in West and South Darfur | * Improved household food security
* Improved understating of environmental issues and conservation
* Peaceful coexistence among the pastoralists and Agro-pastoralists
* New initiatives, resulting from contact between VDC and Government
 | House hold survey Key stakeholders /beneficiaries Focus Group Discussions (FGD)KI | Increases in income and reduced vulnerability to shocks leads to a sustainable reduction in household poverty levels |
| Specific Objective | By the end of August 2009, the livelihoods of 7,000 agro-pastoralist and 3,000 pastoralist households in conflict affected areas in South and West Darfur has improved through increased income, access to sufficient clean water and peaceful co-existence within their communities.  | 1. 80% of (settled) agro pastoralists have access to clean domestic water within 500 m of their homestead
2. Increased frequency of watering animals.
3. Reduced incidences of conflicts as monitored by the VDC peace committees
4. Increase in assets (livestock, household assets, quality /size of houses) at HH level
5. Construction of new houses in the target villages
6. Markets have improved and expanded: nr of people attending, number of vendors involved, quantity & variety of goods/livestock, frequency & regularity of market days.
 | ObservationFGD Mid/Final FGDVDC reportsPartners’ observationVDC reportFGDPolice reportsUN reportsObservationFGDHome visitsObservationVDC reportsFGD with leaders & communities Locality reportsObservationVDC reportsFGD  | * HAC and MoA, MOL, and Forestry department and local authority support the project
* Peace and stability in the project site is maintained to allow continuous implementation as well as unlimited access to the project sites.
* With arrival of hybrid forces, Religious fundamentalists will mobilize community members and government officials against CARE seen as American NGO with the arrival of hybrid forces
* Tribal clashes do not results into displacement of the population from target rural areas to IDP camps
* All the required materials are repositioned before the beginning of rain season
* The Government eases visa and work permit restrictions for expatriate staff to Sudan.
* Travel options in and out of Darfur remain unhindered.
* Insecurity as a results of Bandits on major roads limits movement to project sites resulting in delay in implementation of the project activities
* Different armed factions target NGO vehicles as result of inter clan rivalry
* Other key actors in Darfur in Livelihoods, Watsan, Agriculture and forestry such as UNICEF, WFP, FAO, WHO continue to support activities in South and West Darfur.
* UNOCHA remains a critical coordinator of humanitarian interventions in Darfur
 |
| Results  | 1. 8 Village Development Committees (VDCs) are functioning successfully in targeted villages and contributing to improved livelihoods and peace | 1. Number of VDCs having development plan for their villages and being implemented

 1. Number of peace agreements signed between nomads and agro-pastoralists as a result of peace dialogue. Number of conflicts resolved between pastoralists & agro-pastoralists
2. VDCs are able to document incidences and types of conflict and outcome

 1. Community participation, including women and youth, in village development through the VDCs
2. Balanced representation and active participation of different tribes in VDCs
3. International and national efforts to build peace in Darfur support local conflict resolution mechanisms and create opportunities for communities to have a voice in the overall peace process.
 | FGD Records for VDCs Established VDC officesObservation VDC reportsUN security reportsFGDVDC/Peace committee registersFGD with local leaders, governmentVDC reportsObservation of meetingsMinutes of VDC selection meetingsVDC membership recordsFGD with leaders of all tribesAU-UN Joint Mediation Support Team documents and road maps relating to the Darfur peace process. |
|  | 2. 8,000 HHs have improved their food security and 2,000 HHs have increased income security through increased opportunities for agricultural production and income generating activities. . | 1. 60% of the targeted households have functioning IGAs and improved their income.

 1. At least 40% IGA targets are women and youth
2. Increased acreage under cultivation observed
3. Increased yield per feddan[[1]](#footnote-1)
4. Variety of food consumed and number of meals per day, dissegrated by men, women and children under 5.
 | IGA group recordsPhysical business asset verificationVDC records FGD with membersIGA group recordsObservationVDC recordsObservation, random verificationFAO/MoA reportsPost-harvest assessmentFAO/MoA reportsVDC reports Observation FGDFGD, KAP survey | Pre-conditionsSecurity condition Improves to allow free movement.Favourable climatic condition exists. The people are willing to accept the project.Basic farming inputs are available.Exotic seeds are adaptable.Cooperation of field officers from the various organizations and MOA Authorities will approve the start-up of the project.Access to target areas throughout the programme period. |
|  | 3. Sustainable HH access to clean water all year-round (including droughts) for domestic use has improved for 3000 pastoral and agro-pastoral HHs. | 1. Number of water facilities developed
2. Reduced nr of conflicts over passage of pastoralists during the dry season[[2]](#footnote-2)
3. Systems in place to monitor groundwater levels.
4. Water quality of 80% of the sites is within WHO and GoS standards
5. Functioning water users associations (sub-comittee of VDCs) are actively maintaining water facilities in at least 80% of the sites.
 | Physical verificationMonthly progress reportsVDC recordsVDC recordsUN reportsFGD with nomadic leadersUNICEF/WES reportsProgress reportsVDC reportsUNICEF/WES reportsWater quality testingObservationFGDVDC records  |  |
|  | 4.1000 HH have improved environmental conservation in the project target areas through increased environmental awareness, distribution and planning of tree seedlings and piloting revived systems for rangeland management. | 1. Number of VDCs that are involved in tree planting and take responsibility for maintaining tree seedlings planted.
2. Number of HH planting trees, for wood and fruit.
3. % increase over baseline in the # of pastoralists aware of the causes environmental degradation on the rangelands
4. Number of pilot rangeland committees (subcomittees of VDCs) formed and actively engaged in range management
5. Common understanding among key stakeholders of traditional rules and norms in rangeland management.

  | VDC recordsPhysical verificationFGDForestry dept reports ObservationPhysical verificationVDC recordsKAP surveyFGDBaseline surveyObservation VDC recordsFGD with committees involvedObservationKAP surveyFGD with established panel FGD with local leaders |  |
|  | 5. Decreased incidence of diseases caused by poor hygiene practices | 1. # of latrines at schools, markets and mosques constructed and in use and maintained
2. # of HH latrines constructed in rural areas and in use
3. % of target population who adopts key hygiene practices (handwashing, latrine use, safe water use, safe storage/handling, safe food handling)
4. # mothers reporting cases of diarrhoea in children under 5 over the previous 3 months, disaggregated by wealth
5. # of health facilities reporting a decrease in water borne diseases during periods with historically high incidence rates
 | VDC recordsPhysical verificationObservationProgress reportsVDC recordsPhysical verificationObservationProgress reportsKAP surveyKAP survey ObservationFGD with health clubsFGD with health clubsKAP surveyHealth facility recordsKAP surveyFGDUNICEF/SMOH reports |  |
|  | 6. Enhanced capacity of at least 3 local NGOs to support and strengthen VDCs and implement quality project activities | 1. Rating in Capacity Assessment Tool has improved by at least 20%
2. Local NGOs participate in monitoring
3. 70% of VDCs content with the support by local NGOs
4. Improved quality of reports by local NGOs
5. Local NGOs have implemented the activities in line with their workplans
 | CAT reportPartner recordsVDC recordsFGD with VDCs NGO reportsPhysical verificationNGO reportsObservationVDC recordsPhysical verification |  |
| ***Activities for result 1*** | * 1. Community sensitisation of the project intervention and project launch
	2. Select and form the VDCs and sub committees.
	3. Develop community management, livelihood improvement, peace building and community mobilisation training manuals.
	4. Conduct capacity building workshops for the VDCs
	5. Provide technical management & peace building support to the VDCs
	6. Engage the VDCs in planning & implementation of livelihood & peace building interventions
	7. Generate lessons learned on basis of work of VDCs from which to generate advocacy messages
 |  |  |  |
| ***Result 2*** | * 1. Construction of small-scale irrigation structures at selected areas
	2. Establish Farmer Field Schools on agricultural technologies in the targeted villages
	3. Distribution of seeds and tools
	4. Support to IGA activities and training
 |  |  |  |
| *Result 3* | * 1. Baseline survey (incl. an in depth Peace & Conflict Analysis to take into account the role of water in conflict)
	2. Technical/Environmental Impact Assessment Feasibility Study
	3. Community mobilisation and involvement in identifying sites.
	4. Form VDCs and subcommittees
	5. Training communities in management, operation and maintenance of water points and structures
	6. Construct boreholes (handpumps) and dug wells and rehabilitate existing boreholes and dug wells. Install ground water recorders in boreholes.
	7. Construct or rehabilitate water conservation structures through cash for work (Hafirs/Dams) along the nomads seasonal passages.
 |  |  |  |
| ***Result 4*** | 4.1 Discuss and develop awareness raising plan involving stakeholders4.2 Organize groups for seedling production and distribution4.3 Formation of committees for rangeland management4.4 Formation of a panel to discuss and document traditional norms and rules for rangeland management system4.5 Exchange visit with rangeland management programme in Somalia |  |  |  |
| ***Result 5*** | * 1. Studies, monitoring & evaluation
	2. Create awareness on sanitation and hygiene practices.
	3. Construct institutional latrines at schools, markets, health centre and mosques.
	4. Provide slabs and construction & maintenance tools for latrines

5.5 Form and train Women Health Club good hygiene practices to enable them to train the communities.  |  |  |  |
| Result 6 | 6.1 Prepare assessment questionaire6.2 Conduct capacity assessment for local NGOs6.3 Select the local NGO partners6.4 Signing of partner agreements6.5Conduct training sessions of programming and project implementation techniques including NGO system6.6 Sharing partners with project implementation approach and methodologies* 1. Capacity building of CSOs areas of governance, finance, management, technical, and advocacy
	2. Continue delivering technical support to the local NGOs

6.9 Monitor implementation of activities |  |  |  |
| Cross cutting activities  | \* Training staff in M&E \* Training staff in program Management \* training CARE staff on HIV and Aids preventive measure\* Sensitize staff on stigma in relation to HIV and AIDS.  |  |  |  |

**Annex III: Sample size**

Kass Locality

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | IGAs | Irrigation | Seeds & Tools | Hygiene | Total |
| Aldanga | 9 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 30 |
| Wastani | 9 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 29 |
| Singita | 29 | 17 | 25 | 35 | 103 |
| Dillo | 21 | 11 | 15 | 7 | 54 |
| Dawara | 16 | 8 | 12 | 17 | 53 |
| Taringa | - | 6 | 9 | - | 15 |
| Sarambanga | - | 6 | - | - | 6 |
| Karandi Kusulo  | - | 6 | - | - | 6 |
| Gumeiza | - | 6 | - | - | 6 |
| Fadwa | - | - | 12 | - | 12 |
| Dibis | - | - | 9 | - | 9 |
| **Total** | **81** | **72** | **92** | **78** | **323** |

Greida Locality

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | IGAs | Water Supply | Hygiene | Livestock | Total |
| Ditto | 19 | 29 | 56 | 18 |  |
| Dikka | 9 | - | 11 | - |  |
| Mowaila | 9 | 29 | 11 | 10 |  |
| Donkey Abyad | 7 | - | - | 16 |  |
| Hashaba | 3 | - | - | - |  |
| IDPs | 32 | - | - | - |  |
| **Total** | **79** |  | **78** | **47** | **204** |

**Annex IV: Success story**

This is a story of a petty trader called Eltigani Mohammed Ibrahim from Singita, Kass Locality. He is 62 years old. He used to sell food commodities as a retailer. Mr. Eltigani is ahead of an extended family consists of 20 members 6 of them are orphans from his late daughter.

He couldn’t send all of the children to school and they were food insecure as well. All what he could afford for them was two meals of porridge a day.

In June 2011 Mr. Eltigani had received a grant of SDG360 from CIS for income generation activity within the scope of LEAP. He said he used to get commodities of a value not exceeding SDG700 from wholesalers on loan basis. Usually, such deals entail higher prices. After receiving the organization’s support (he means CIS) I had abandoned the scale (retailing) and became a wholesaler. I started getting double the quantities of miscellaneous commodities and distribute them to the retailers in Singita he said. I had, also, involved in onions and potatoes trade. He sells 7 sacks of onions and 6 of potatoes twice a week. He earns profits ranging between SDG300 and SDG400 a week of these 2 items only.

The impact of this substantial increase in his income is demonstrated by qualitative and quantitative improvement of the household’s meals. Now, they can afford 3 meals a day and sometimes substitute the porridge with vegetables and bread.

Mr. Eltigani managed to enroll all his kids at school age in school and has sent 3 of them to schools in Kass. He said the education services in Kass are better and teachers are reluctant to come to Singita because they feel insecure.

Further to developing his business Mr. Eltigani purchased onion seeds to cultivate in the coming summer season. He expects more profits and growth to his revenue.

In general, Mr. Eltigani stated that the situation is much better than before the CIS project.

**Annex V: List of Interviewees**

1. Isam Bahr, Program officer (CIS Nyala), Asim Ibrahim, Area manager, and Algozo Takana, Peace Building Officer (CIS Kass),
2. FGD with all board members of the Nationalistic Association for Peace and Development in Kasss (NAPD),
3. FGD with all board members of Nationalistic Association for Development (NAD) in Greida,

Mohammed Ahmed Mohammed Ibrahim Chairman

Mohammed Omer Mohammed (Eldegair) Member

Abdallah Adam Bashir Member

Mohammed Saif Eldeen Abdelrahman Member

Guma’a Hammad Adam Member

Elsonousi Elnour Adam Member

Mohammed Hammad Ibrahim Member

Mosa Abdellah Mohammed Ahmed Member

Ahmed Saleh Ahmed Member

Hassan Ibrahim Adam Member

Abdalla Ibrahim Mohammdain Member

Habeeb Osman Eltoum Member

Ali Yousif Ibrahim Eljedai Member

Abubakr Suliman Mohammed Member

1. Ibrahim CIS, Greida Office,
2. Procurement Officer, CIS, Geraida Office
3. VDC members, Sarambanga

Omer Mosa Chairman

Mohammed Abdelrahman Member

Mohammed Abdeljabar Finance Secretary

Suliman M. Bashir Member

Bahr el Deen Ishaq Member

Yaseen Member

1. VDC members, Zelaita, Pastoral community,

Matar Ali Abdallah

Omda, Adam Abdallah Mohammed

Aljazim Hassan Ismail

Aldekhairi Ali Abdallah

Daif Allah Jabo Abbakar

Alfadul Adam Hamdan

1. Dr. Mohammed Salah, FOA, Programme Coordinator
2. National Organization for Community Development (NOCD)
3. Aldanga VDC,
4. Wastani VDC,
5. Dawra VDC,
6. Singita VDC,
7. Fadwa VDC,
8. Ditto VDC, Chairman Dawood Mohammed Hammad and members,
9. Dimillij, Ahmed Ibrahim Mohammed Beyyah
10. Mowaila VDC,
11. Dikka VDC,
12. State Ministry of Agriculturte, Nyala, Mr. Elhafiz Abubakr, General Manager & NGOs Focal Point; Mr. Elnoman Mohammed Sharief, Horticulture Department Manager,
13. Peace and Community Development Institute, Dr. Naglaa and Dr, Sabir.
1. 0.4 ha [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. If there is insufficient water along normal passageways for pastoralists and their livestock, they divert into agricultural areas. As such this is an indicator for access to water for pastoralists [↑](#footnote-ref-2)