

Final Joint Project Evaluation of Enhancing Women's Access to Land for Peace and Development in South Sudan 2018-2020



March 2022

Disclaimer

This evaluation was undertaken by a team of external evaluation team. The findings and conclusions remain those of the evaluation team. The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this report do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. Views expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect those of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat), the United Nations, or its Member States. Excerpts may be reproduced without authorisation, on the condition that the source is indicated.

Acknowledgments

Authors : Ms. M. Guglielma da Passano

And Mr. Wani Mathias Jumi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Disclaimer | 2 |
| Acknowledgments | 2 |
| Abbreviations and Acronyms | 4 |
| Executive Summary | 5 |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 16 |
| 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION | 16 |
| 3. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION | 20 |
| 4. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS | 21 |
| 5. EVALUATION APPROACH, METHODOLOGY and CONSTRAINTS | 23 |
| 6. MAIN FINDINGS | 25 |
| 6.2.1 Relevance | 27 |
| 6.2.2 Effectiveness | 30 |
| 6.2.3 Efficiency | 32 |
| 6.2.4 Sustainability | 33 |
| 6.2.5 Impact | 34 |
| 6.2.6 Coherence | 35 |
| 7. SOCIAL INCLUSION | 35 |
| 8. CONCLUSIONS | 37 |
| 9. LESSONS LEARNT | 40 |
| 10. RECOMMENDATIONS | 42 |
| ANNEXES | 44 |

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AO Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

GLTN Global Land Tool Network

GYPI Gender and Youth Programme Initiative PBF

ICLA Information, Counseling and Legal Assistance (NRC)

IDPs Internally Displaced People

IGAD Inter Governmental Authority for Development

IOM International Organization for Migration

NDF National Development Framework

NRC Norwegian Refugee Council

PBF Peace Building Fund

RCO Resident Coordinator Office

ROAF UN-Habitat Regional Office for Africa

UN-Habitat United Nations Human Settlements Programme

UNCF United Nations Cooperation Framework

UNCT United Nations Country Team

UNMISS United Nations Mission in South Sudan

Executive Summary

1. Introduction

This evaluation report concerns the evaluation of Women's access to land for peace and development project in South Sudan. The project was a land tenure intervention focusing on increasing secure access to land for women. The objective and outcomes project were to be achieved through capacity building, improving land management and administration systems, and supporting gender-responsive land policies to contribute to peace consolidation in Wau County. The project was funded through the Peace Building Fund (PBF) under the Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative (GYPI), with a total budget of US\$1.5 million. It was implemented jointly by UN-Habitat and FAO from December 2018 to December 2020.

This final project evaluation was conducted by independent evaluation consultants: Ms. Maria Guglielma da Passano and Mr. Wami Mathias Jumi during the months of December 2021 and March 2022. The intended users of the evaluation are the UN-Habitat management and the project team, the PBF, other partners involved in the project, including the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), and United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) and the general public.

2. Background and context

The number of people displaced since 2013 in South Sudan exceeds 4 million individuals, including 1.9 million IDPs, of which 85% are women and children. The conflict in Wau in 2016-2017 alone resulted in the internal displacement of about 100,000 people. Besides armed conflict, natural disasters, including floods, have significantly increased since 2019, affecting several South Sudan states, causing severe displacements and massive relocation of people and cattle, and sparking tension amongst communities.

Women in the context of return and integration are particularly challenged due to their limited capacity to secure access to land. Although the 2009 South Sudan Land Act provides equal access to land for women and men, protracted instability and conflict have led to continued displacement, tenure insecurity, land grabbing, elite capture, squatting, and secondary occupation. Procedural difficulties in land registration offices and corruption and financial constraints have affected women's equal access to land. Access to land justice by internally displaced women to reclamation and restitution through the courts is expensive and worsened by the corrupt judicial system.

The situation has undermined the tenure governance system and inhibited its capacity to implement the Land Act promoting and protecting women's land rights. Therefore, it targeted to support women and to facilitate their return and integration into communities through increased access to land while supporting the peaceful resolution of existing and emerging land disputes.

In the past, governance of land and other natural resources has been ignored in times of crisis. Land is recognised as one of the root causes of conflict but was seen as too political, complex and time-consuming, and thus a secondary priority in the emergency context. Today, however, attention is shifting to interlinked dimensions such as land (and for natural resources as a whole) and the people that live or depend on it. If not addressed through inclusive and transparent mechanisms, increasing competition over land can become a root cause of conflict, creating a set of perceived injustices that threaten to undermine the peacebuilding and peace consolidation efforts (FAO, 2016).

Recognising that armed conflicts lead to increased competition for resources with a significant impact on gender, particularly when displacement is involved, PBF has in the last decade increasingly funded land projects. Improved tenure governance can help prevent and manage conflict, improve food security, and increase resilience while reducing dependence on aid.

The Project's objective was to contribute to peace, return and reintegration, especially of women and youth, by increasing their tenure security and their capacity to participate in decision-making concerning the land. This

would improve women's access to land tenure and reduce land-related conflicts leading to greater communal peace. According to the TOC, the Project intended to achieve this objective through developing women's capacities and increasing their space for participation, making the land administration system more gender-responsive, and supporting the development of a national land policy.

The Project was designed to be a pilot and contribute to identifying lessons learnt and formulate recommendations to inform future programming and strategies on using increased tenure security to contribute to peace consolidation and women return in South Sudan. Key stakeholders included the UN-Habitat Regional Office for Africa (ROAF), Ministry of Land, Housing and Urban Development of South Sudan, Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS), and Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC).

The objective and outcomes in the project's logical framework well aligned to the ToC and global and regional best practices and allowed for sufficient flexibility to encompass a range of context-specific solutions. The outcome indicators and targets on the other end, did not capture incremental progress in securing tenure rights, rather focusing only on end results (approved land policy, signed certificates of occupancy, number of registered plots, etc.). Not only the achievement of these results is often beyond the control of the project, but it may not be desirable within the project lifespan.

The Project's approved monitoring and evaluation plan included an independent final joint evaluation (covering the implementation period from December 2018 to December 2020, including the original 18 months Project lifespan and the six months extension later granted by PBF.

3. Purpose, objectives and scope of evaluation

The Final Evaluation provides an opportunity to capitalise on the Project's experience and ensure a broad sense of ownership over and future uptake of the evaluation recommendations. The Evaluation serves purposes of accountability and enhancing learning and gives insights on future programming and designs of new programmes/projects or replication of the Project in South Sudan.

The **Evaluation TORs** included detailed specific objectives and evaluation questions that inform this Final Evaluation Report findings. The standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, coherence and impact); and additional criteria of complementarity, coordination, and the cross-cutting issues of gender equality and social inclusion were used to assess the performance of the evaluation. In addition, the evaluation investigated the effects of the Covid-19 pandemic and how effectively the Project managed to mitigate them.

4. Approach and Methodology

The approach to the Evaluation is guided by the ToRs and evaluation principles and good practices as established in OECD/DAC Principles and the UNEG. The methodological evaluation framework is designed to understand what works well and under which conditions so that lessons can be learned going forward.

The Evaluation was designed to address the needs and requirements of the UN-Habitat and FAO, adhere to UNEG quality standards, mitigate risks related to the information gathering process and produce a final product with coherent and thorough analysis. The Evaluation adopts a mixed-method, evidence-based approach, combining qualitative and quantitative data.

Given the pilot nature of the Project, one of the important aspects of the Evaluation are the lessons learnt and the recommendations that will influence programming in South Sudan in this thematic area in the future. Therefore, to ensure wide ownership over the Evaluation's contents and recommendations and increase its usefulness and uptake in the future, an **Evaluation Reference Group**, including representatives of FAO and UN-Habitat Evaluation Offices, ROAF, PBF has been provided an opportunity to have an input in the final product.

The Evaluation Questions were drafted through an inclusive consultation process involving land stakeholders in South Sudan. They provide the basis of key informant interviews and inform the Final Evaluation Report findings and conclusions. The steps include inception report, literature review and key informants' interviews, report drafting, and final revision.

The Evaluation started in January 2022 and ended in March 2022, working under time pressure due to the delays in starting the process and the need expressed by the Client to produce recommendations that would inform future programming on land and conflict in the country.

4.1 Evaluation limitations

Several challenges related to timing, demand, ownership and access to information limited the evaluation effectiveness. The evaluation was commissioned more than a year after the Project closure. Follow-up projects have already been designed and are under implementation, weakening the demand for the evaluation itself and translating into limited willingness to engage with the evaluation team by Project stakeholders. The Project team has, for the most part, been dismantled. Team members were not readily available, creating a critical information gap a lack of ownership and direction of the evaluation itself.

To make up for the fact that no field visits were envisaged, the Evaluation Team had planned to significantly increase the number of partners and beneficiaries to be contacted remotely, but this was not possible due to the incomplete beneficiaries' records. UN-Habitat and FAO did not have the list of beneficiaries in the field in their possession. It took four weeks of email exchanges with different stakeholders to finally obtain two partial beneficiaries' lists from NRC. Most of the contacts provided have changed or unavailable. For example, out of the list of one hundred and two (102) beneficiaries whose complex land cases were resolved through Court or administrative process, the team was able to only talk to five (5) respondents on the phone. The remaining beneficiaries either have no phone or other contact, or the contact provided was no longer valid.

While the team has still been able to carry out the assignment and formulate findings and recommendations, the process and impact would have certainly been more successful had the evaluation come earlier or had the team been allowed to travel to the field to mitigate the effects of the delay.

5. MAIN FINDINGS

Despite these limitations, the evaluation did produce some findings based on the literature review and the key informant interviews. They were organized following the evaluation questions under each criterion and provided the foundation for conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations.

Achievements of the project at objective, outcome and output levels

The evaluation confirmed that the project had achieved or partially achieved six (6) out of the nine outcome targets (Outcome 1, target 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3; Outcome 2, target 2.2; Outcome 3, targets 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3). The evaluation team did not have sufficient information to independently verify the remaining three targets (Outcome 2, targets 2.1 and 2.3; Outcome 3, target 3.3).

At output level the evaluation was able to confirm the achievement or overachievement of those results related to increased women and public's capacity and awareness (Output 1.1., Output 1.2, Output 1.3 indicator 1.3.2 and 1.3.3); those related to increased administrative capacity to record and protect women tenure rights (Output 2.1, Output 2.2, and Output 2.3); and those related to policy formulation and strengthened political will (Output 3.1, and Output 3.2). Not enough evidence was available to the Evaluation Team to independently verify the achievements related to the issuance of certificates of occupancy (Output 1.3, indicator 1.3.1).

These results are in line with the overall observation that the project's outcome indicators and targets, failed to reflect incremental progress in securing tenure rights, instead focusing only on end results (approved land policy,

signed certificates of occupancy, number of registered plots, etc.). Not only the achievement of these results is often beyond the control of the project, but it may not be desirable within the project lifespan. This limitation was partially overcome at the output targets and indicators level, formulated in a way more conducive to capturing incremental progress.

5.1 Performance of the project using OECD-DAC Evaluation Criteria

The Project was timely and relevant to the needs and priorities of the geographical target beneficiaries and critical implementing partners. The Project was aligned with the UN Country Framework 2015-2016, the only strategy in place at the project design time. It targeted women and youth as primary beneficiaries, aligning with SDG5 on gender equality and women empowerment. It further aligned with the African Union Agenda 2063, Goal 17, which recommended that 20% of rural women have access to and control land by 2023. The Project retrospectively was therefore well aligned with the Strategic documents now in place in South Sudan, including the National Development Strategy (objective 1, facilitating return and objective 2, develop laws and enforce the rule of law; the United Nations Cooperation Framework (UNCF) objective a, strengthening peace and objective d, empowering women and youth; and the Strategic Framework for the Creation of a Protective and Enabling Environment for Return Home of the IDPs in POC and Collective sites. The mainstreaming of land in the Peace Building programmes is further in line with the PBF Strategic Plan 2017-19: Addressing critical gaps for sustaining peace.

The Project objective was found to be relevant to the broader objectives, targeting land tenure insecurity as an underlying cause of instability, food insecurity and limited resilience in protracted crises. The selection of UN-Habitat and FAO as implementing partners was deemed appropriate given their expertise in land tenure issues in crisis – in urban and rural areas and the high risks of these interventions.

The Project objective was relevant to the broader objectives, targeting land tenure insecurity as an underlying cause of instability, food insecurity and limited resilience in protracted crises. Local stakeholders confirmed that land disputes, especially those involving dispossession of women-headed household rights, increased drastically in return. The Project responded to an urgent need of the community, and strengthening the security of tenure granted the women-headed household an increased sense of security and safety, which improved their food security and resilience.

Some beneficiaries built a shelter on the land, others rented it out and created an income, others cultivated it directly with an immediate positive effect on their livelihoods. Moreover, the women's understanding of their rights and how to claim them increased, jointly with their capacity to advocate within their communities and with local and state authorities.

The Project increased local land disputes resolution capacity and local authorities' awareness about women's land rights, creating an enabling environment for those rights to be claimed and upheld in the long term.

The Project was effective to different degrees in the different levels and areas of intervention. Thanks to the Project, obtaining land in Wau for women returnees is now better understood, more accessible and transparent. Targeted local authorities are better equipped to manage land recordation and land disputes resolution. The space for policy dialogue on women and returnees' land rights has increased, and the lessons learnt in Wau have enriched the State and National level debate on tenure. The number of projects to secure tenure rights is growing steadily with an increasingly ambitious scope, and land is more and more present in the national development strategies.

It has not been possible for the evaluation team to independently assess individual land certificates' existence, quality, number, and effectiveness in protecting tenure rights. Due to the limited records, the team could only interview twenty-three (23) beneficiaries, which is not considered a high enough number to be representative. The evaluation was therefore unable to assess whether the individual women beneficiaries targeted by the Project were still in possession of the land one year after the end of the intervention and what percentage of them had successfully gone through the entire process and had the land and the physical registered certificate.

Moreover, even though most of the respondents indicated that they felt their tenure security had improved as compared to before engaging with the Project, many shared concerns regarding their future tenure rights without the complete paperwork. In a country where people often lack identification documents, it is challenging to verify and monitor how their tenure security situation evolves over time without complete records of project beneficiaries.

Targeted traditional leaders' capacity and their awareness and understanding of women's land rights was significantly strengthened thanks to the Project. The Project used community dialogues with traditional leaders, women and youth groups. These dialogues were instrumental in shaping traditional leaders' role to recognise women's rights to land. In addition, the traditional leaders were instrumental in understanding and identifying women's issues related to land within their communities.

The interviewed chiefs confirmed the positive results reported by the Project in this area. They felt they were consulted and involved at different stages in the Project and that the Project was well designed to target their changing needs. For example, they identified women beneficiaries and issued resident permits, advocating the importance of formalising their tenure rights and building their capacity to understand the process and their rights.

The Project established some mechanisms to monitor the implementation of activities. However, it failed to develop and implement adequate data-collection tools and monitoring mechanisms to provide insights into the relationship between project activities and conflict, assess and monitor changes in beneficiaries' tenure security, and to track progress in their land documentation.

In terms of efficiency, the inputs allowed for implementing most project activities and achieving most of the project objectives. However, the limited presence in the field, the lack of a Chief Technical Advisor and the high staff turnover rate undermined results under this criterion.

Overall activities' progress as reported is in line with the expenditures and budget, thus showing the cost-efficiency of the project. In addition, variations in expenditures versus the original budget aligned with normal project implementation adjustments.

The specialised technical expertise in land had to be mobilised externally during the Project because the project document did not envisage the deployment of a Senior Chief Technical Advisor, planning instead to mobilise this expertise internationally due to its local unavailability. External periodic technical backstopping on land could have been an expensive but viable option in a development context, but its efficacy in volatile contexts is debatable. When the security and health crisis limited travelling options, the limited technical capacity at the field level and in Juba became a hindrance to Project implementation.

The Project's management structure seemed to be over-complicated for the PBF quick impact projects, possibly contributing to the delays in activities start-up. UN-Habitat draws its technical capacity on land from GLTN, but engagement is not automatic; instead of requiring the signature of an In-House Agreement. Despite the Project being approved in September 2018, UN-Habitat only signed the In-House Agreement with GLTN to mobilise critical technical support in September 2019 and the Letter of Agreement with NRC, which enabled the successful delivery of field activities and piloting initiatives to secure women returnees' tenure rights shortly after. Similarly, on the FAO side, challenges were linked to Human Resources. The high turnover and limited seniority in land expertise mobilised caused delays in Project implementation and frictions with project partners.

Working on land issues in a fragile context requires building an intricate net of relationships, institution building, capacity development, and great flexibility to capitalise on windows of opportunity. Having a non-technical junior project team supported by external technical backstopping has not been ideal in the volatile South Sudanese context.

The cost of UN-Habitat and FAO technical assistance for capacity development was in line with the technical expertise required for the assignment. The tenure domain in post-conflict is a specialised and easily politicised area of work that may bring high dividends in terms of contribution to peace processes but entails high risks. These kinds

of interventions require seniority, experience and skilled expertise, which can only be attracted for the longer term in fragile contexts with adequate compensation and job security.

The sustainability of the Project was partially achieved. The results of the policy work have contributed to opening a space for dialogue that remains and is being further developed. Based on improving business processes and record management, the land administration results will likely require some follow-up technical support to ensure systematic uptake. For the land allocation and registration, the evaluation team could not independently quantify the increase in beneficiaries' tenure security and verify whether it is sustained in time due to the incomplete beneficiaries' records. UN-Habitat and FAO did not have the list of beneficiaries in the field in their possession. Only two partial beneficiaries' lists were provided by NRC, but they were inaccurate and incomplete. Moreover, after the baseline survey, there was no follow-up with a representative sample to quantify progress.

The Project invested systematically into building capacity at the local level, among beneficiaries and local authorities, thus increasing the sustainability of results and benefits.

The Project though **did not prioritize the design and implementation of data collection tools, thus making it difficult to analyse the impact.** It did not set up a system to monitor individual women beneficiaries' improvement in tenure security nor to follow them through the registration process beyond the life of the project itself. **It never developed a contingency plan or hand-over strategy to cater to land registration delays,** leaving project beneficiaries with incomplete documentation, thus potentially undermining their tenure security in the medium and long term. In the absence of a consolidated beneficiaries' database, it was similarly unable to hand over the follow-up responsibility to local authorities.

The most significant Project achievement was identifying and opening a space for debate on land rights and women's land rights when most stakeholders did not think it would be possible to prioritize these topics given the security situation. The Project saw a window of opportunity and was able to capitalize on it generating enough evidence in the field to feed back into a higher-level dialogue.

Regarding the unintended adverse effects, the Project's failure to disseminate the baseline study findings and the recommendations from the validation workshop undermined local ownership denying the right to information and participation in the land rights debate and setting a negative precedent for future projects. Moreover, the Project's exclusive focus on women brought some risks and criticisms from the local people, especially landless male counterparts. Also, the chiefs lamented the delay in issuing land titles and were being blamed for that. The women beneficiaries accused them of conniving with the partners and the state land administration to grab their land and give it to local and foreign investors. Leaving the land registration process incomplete increases the risks of tenure insecurity for women beneficiaries in the medium and long term.

The Project built synergies with the existing land management and administration institutions. The partnerships envisaged during the design focused almost exclusively on UN stakeholders since there was no recognised National Government in place, and stakeholders' consultations were impossible due to the security environment. Moreover, there were no other ongoing land interventions.

The apparent complementarity with the NRC ICLA programme was further developed through the partnership in Wau. Under the partnership, effective collaboration was established through an MoU with local authorities to fast-track legal verification of existing land rights in the context of the beneficiaries' land claims.

Even though the Project was later used to influence the design of new Projects (i.e., a follow-up initiative under PBF), there is no evidence of formal collaboration with the projects established by other partners such as IGAD or OXFAM during the project lifespan.

The Project was designed as a result of consultation with development actors and recognised national and local authorities. There were no ongoing partners interventions on land at the time of the design, but the project was aligned with existing peacebuilding interventions.

Regarding inclusion, the Project focused explicitly and effectively on advancing women returnees' tenure rights and, in line with the PBF mandate, women were at the centre of all activities. It developed mechanisms to identify and target those who most needed support in accessing land among women returnees. It assessed their capacity, developed flexible and customized tools to increase awareness and outreach, and later adapted them to the COVID-19 imposed restrictions.

The Project strived to foster an enabling environment for women to gain space in the tenure governance arena and increase their capacity to advocate for their rights. This was achieved by working with the traditional chiefs and local authorities, increasing their awareness of women's land rights, and helping women litigate their cases in courts.

It provided insight into women returnees' specific challenges in accessing land and helped map the typology and severity of land disputes they are involved with. NRC received one hundred and two (102) cases. Fifty per cent (50%) of these cases were inheritance cases, the remaining concerned double allocation and illegal occupation. Ninety-eight per cent (98%) of all these cases were between women and men. The majority of these cases were resolved in formal courts of law favouring the women claimants.

Lastly, the Project was able to identify and address some of the bottlenecks to women's land access linked to customs and misinformation. For example, it was common to expect women to go to the land office with a male relative to attend to their queries.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The Evaluation team concluded that the Project was overall successful. It addressed an existing urgent need for action. It achieved most of its intended results as a pilot at outcome and output levels. It provided the required space for learning for land programmes in the South Sudanese context. It succeeded in establishing a precedent, demonstrating the space exists for an informed dialogue on land rights for women and returnees in South Sudan and piloting field measures to improve tenure governance and access to land. There is now increased awareness of women having equal rights to own land and increased women's participation in land-related decision-making processes and structures, and women's role in peace building has been increasingly acknowledged not only in Wau county but in the whole of South Sudan.

The Project stakeholders reached by the evaluation team agreed on the fact that the project had a positive impact. The Project achievements are expected to be sustainable to some extent. For what concerns the land administration system, the business process transparency and accessibility, the public's awareness, and the inputs into the land policy discussion. At the level of the individual women beneficiaries, it is unclear what percentage of them have acquired the full suite of documents required for land ownership and the repercussions in time for those that did not. Those respondents who do not have all the documents seem to feel more tenure insecure and worried about the future.

Capacity development activities were well designed, appropriately targeted and beneficial, though they were limited in scale, being the Project, a pilot. The process to obtain land in Wau for women returnees is now better understood, more accessible and more transparent than before. More information is available on types of land disputes affecting women returnees, their intensity, and consequences, though the linkages to peace consolidation are still to be investigated. Assessing how much individual beneficiaries' tenure security has increased and how durable these improvements will be is not possible due to lack of data/information

Based on global experience, the increased security of tenure for women returnees is expected to contribute to stability and food security. Still, the Project has not put in place sufficient monitoring mechanisms to produce evidence to establish the tenure security contribution to reducing land-related conflicts and to peace consolidation.

The mixed implementation (direct and through partners) modality required longer time to set-up but eventually proved to be flexible and able to adapt to the emerging challenges to delivery (especially restriction of field activities

related to COVID-19). The envisaged collaboration and coordination mechanisms were appropriate, but they were not implemented throughout the entire life of the Project, undermining their effectiveness.

The critical gaps related to human resources, limited field presence, and unclear division of responsibilities among project partners. The lack of a Senior Project Coordinator based in Juba throughout the Project and the high turnover of staff deteriorated the otherwise well-structured coordination mechanism between project stakeholders. The limited field presence in Wau led to delegating to NRC of most field level activities without capitalising fully on the technical expertise, global experience, and convening capacity available to UN-Habitat and FAO. There was also some inconsistency in the division of responsibilities between FAO and UN-Habitat in the Project Document. For instance, Output 2.3 was to be implemented by FAO using an UN-Habitat digital land mapping tool. The activity was never delivered.

COVID-19 exacerbated challenges by minimising the Partners' presence on the field, increasing staff turnover, and becoming a barrier to a collaboration that was often based on trust and personal relationships built over time rather than formalized institutional arrangements. However, the strategies to mitigate COVID-19 effects under the partnership with NRC in Wau seem adequate and allowed the outreach and awareness-raising activities to continue.

7. LESSONS LEARNED

- The lessons learnt are derived from the evaluation experience and based on the findings and conclusions. **The Project was designed to lead to a better understanding of women's land rights, gender dynamics, peace and development. It was received much better than expected in a highly fragile and conservative context of Wau county. Now, space exists to discuss women's land rights in general and in the context of return.** Policymakers and community leaders have an understanding of how to address women's land rights and can actively contribute to peace consolidation and resilience building. Strong champions among policymakers can contribute significantly to advancing women's land rights.
- **Women and their communities are often unaware of their land rights or how to secure them. Also, women's ability to access land and obtain security of tenure is still hampered by complex, costly, and bureaucratic land governance and administration procedures.** There is a need to educate the public, targeting specifically those actors such as policymakers, traditional leaders, or administrators who can become champions for women's land rights. Targeting women alone is not enough.
- **The Land Administration system is not equipped to advance women's land rights. Still, an incremental approach can help Government counterparts and local authorities address immediate gaps while strengthening the system itself.** The land administration system is outdated and dysfunctional, with an enormous capacity gap between the community and state levels and limited operational capacity, leading to a weak tenure governance system unable to protect people's rights to land. Under the Project, small operational measures were adopted that already increased transparency and accountability. An incremental approach can help Government counterparts and local authorities find the solutions that best address their immediate challenges and act as building blocks for a more robust future land governance and land administration systems. To achieve this, specialised technical and policy capacity on urban and rural land is necessary.
- **Land adjudication and registration processes can often not be completed within Projects' lifespan.** In fragile and highly complex environments, pilot initiatives to secure tenure rights must be incremental, focusing on immediate results and avoiding long term risks. Rushing into adjudication or formal registration in the absence of a sound land governance system or without enough awareness of rights among the public will raise false expectations of durable and final results regarding tenure security among beneficiaries
- **Incremental improvements are better than false expectations.** The project had raised high hopes for women toward definitive economic empowerment through land access. But the beneficiaries consulted were not able to secure all required land documents. Since the project has ended, those who have not received land titles are wary of the inevitable loss of their land to corrupt chiefs and state land officials. They do not know the status of their land titles, and the continued uncertainty of their land titles increases the risk of traumatic degeneration.
- **Proper documentation is the key to learning, assessing impact, and increasing sustainability and adaptation.** In a country where people often lack identification documents, it is very difficult to verify and monitor how their tenure security situation evolves in the absence of complete records of project beneficiaries. The failure to establish a system to document the activities' impact and enabling local authorities to continue following up after the end of the project has undermined not only the capacity to secure the benefits from the project, but as well to capitalize on them for purposes of feeding back into the policy discussion or informing the design of subsequent interventions
- **Projects should avoid creating parallel land administration and management processes that have no local ownership because they will not be sustainable.** Implementing land projects in South Sudan is difficult in the absence of developed computerized systems of land administration, registration and documentation. It is critical to plan for realistic activities and possible delays. The primary and most consistent investment should

be in strengthening local capacity and structure to drive and eventually take over Project activities. This will be the only avenue to ensure sustainability of results.

- **Technical capacity must be leveraged by operational capacity.** UN-Habitat and FAO have the mandate, the relationship with national and local counterparts, and the technical capacity to support land-related initiatives in post-conflict. Yet, their limited operational capacity in the country and Project area has not enabled them to take full advantage of this leverage.
- **Human Resources are the foundation for land tenure project's success in post-conflict.** The low level of representation and high turnover of Project staff created a chain of adverse effects that reduced efficiency in Project implementation, including undermining the coordination and collaboration mechanisms that had been envisaged; limiting the technical capacity in Juba and Wau; no delegation of authority in the country making more cumbersome administrative processes; no technical representation at the UN Country Team level; no Senior counterpart to advocate for land rights and provide technical advice with Government and partners; limited capacity to identify and capitalise on emerging opportunities in this fragile and rapidly evolving context.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, conclusions, and lessons learnt, the Evaluation team formulated some recommendations for UN-Habitat, FAO and their partners' future interventions to secure tenure rights in South Sudan. They are:

1. **For future interventions, a Theory of Change that addresses gender dynamics in land administration and governance should include an adequate set of indicators, measurable and verifiable results, and monitoring mechanisms.** Multiple barriers still exist for women to secure tenure. They include weak land policies and laws, inefficient administrative systems, cultural biases against women's ownership of land, etc. The causal relationship between women's empowerment and peace building through increased tenure security and addressing post-conflict resettlement and peace-building must be better captured and further investigated.
2. **Prioritize activities to secure tenure rights that are incremental, appropriate for the local context and capacity, and focused on immediate positive results and longer-term risk management.** In post-conflict environments, embarking on more formal registration processes -especially when not completing them and in the absence of a sound land governance system, has the potential to jeopardize and threaten beneficiaries' future tenure security.
3. **Perform an after-action review in Wau, investigating the current Project beneficiaries' level of tenure security, the actual impact on the level and intensity of conflict of the recordation activities, and the correlations to peace consolidation.** Options must be identified to secure longer-term sustainability of results for individual beneficiaries of land tenure interventions in Wau and embedded in any scale-up effort.
4. **Continue to support land governance reforms at the county, national and state levels, from land policy development to legal framework adjustment.** The discussion and passing of land policies at the national and state will provide a sense of duty and direction to the political leadership to address challenges facing women on land access. Clear legislations with defined rights of surviving spouses, children and administration of deceased estates will protect widows and children from being denied legitimate rights to inherit the estate and properties of their deceased husbands and parents. This will minimize recurring disputes over land that hinders women's rights to accessing land already acquired by their deceased husbands and further minimize court litigation which is costly to economically vulnerable women.
5. **Support the establishment of a coordination mechanism on land (Land Development Partners Group) in South Sudan.** An increasingly large number of stakeholders are engaging with securing tenure rights in South Sudan directly or to pursue related objectives. The Group will provide a venue for structured dialogue between

the Government and the land sector partners; ensure coordination and alignment to Government strategies in the land sector; minimise duplication of efforts; allow the limited technical expertise available in country to be recognised and made available to a wider audience; act as a catalyst for donors' funding; and ensure land programs contribute to longer-term sustainable national development.

6. **Develop a land indicator to be included as part of the conflict analysis tools used by UNMISS and other partners with a high presence in the field.** There are many different priorities for Government and Partners in emergency and post-conflict contexts. The land is often not one of them, yet it has implications for all aspects, from stabilization to increasing resilience and self-reliance to food and human security. One of the challenges for land programmes in fragile contexts is that the information available is limited and often anecdotal. It is recommended to develop a tool to mainstream land-related data-collection as part of data-collection exercises routinely implemented by stakeholders who have a high operational capacity in post-conflict contexts and help link the data to sound technical and analytical capacity. This will not only improve land programming but as well identify and mitigate land-related risks of any other land-based intervention, actively contributing to conflict mitigation. The tool could be piloted in South Sudan and then adopted in other contexts and would help inform more accurately land activities.
7. **Budget for a Senior Technical Staff to lead the in-country Project team in the context of highly technical projects in volatile and rapidly changing environments.** He/she will act as a technical advisor to Government, strengthening national capacity and ownership over interventions to secure tenure rights, thus increasing future sustainability or results. Will ensure implementing agency/ies capitalise on the results of the Project and fund-raise for follow-up initiatives.
8. **Explore Fit for purpose innovative partnerships for implementing technical projects in fragile contexts.** While the importance of the technical expertise provided by UN-Habitat and FAO is not debatable, their limited human and operational capacity has not allowed them to capitalise on it fully. New modalities for collaboration should be explored, not to have to choose between technical and operational capacity when assigning the lead on PBF or similarly funded projects in emergency or fragile contexts.
9. **Realizing women's rights to land for peacebuilding requires a number of direct and indirect efforts.** Efforts to empower women to overcome physical, cultural, financial, and structural barriers they face in obtaining rights to land and property. And efforts to create an enabling environment for women to succeed through building robust data gathering and information management systems; raising awareness of women land rights; promoting women representation in local, state, regional land planning processes; and strengthening human and land administration capacity for gender sensitive land governance.
10. **There is a need for National Land review process** to provide a basis for legal reform to eliminate inconsistencies and overlapping functions between the different land governance institutions at all levels of government.

1. INTRODUCTION

This evaluation report concerns the evaluation of Women's access to land for peace and development project in South Sudan. The project was a land tenure intervention focusing on increasing secure access to land for women. The objective and outcomes project were to be achieved through capacity building, improving land management and administration systems, and supporting gender-responsive land policies to contribute to peace consolidation in Wau County.

The project was funded through the Peace Building Fund (PBF) under the Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative (GYPI), with a total budget of US\$1.5 million. It was implemented jointly by UN-Habitat and FAO from December 2018 to December 2020.

The final project evaluation was conducted by independent evaluation consultants: Ms. M. Guglielma da Passano and Mr. Wami Mathias Jumi during the months of December 2021 and March 2022. The intended users of the evaluation are the UN-Habitat management and the project team, the PBF, other partners involved in the project, including the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), and United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) and the general public.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The “*Women's access to land for peace and development in South Sudan*” Project (from now on “, the Project”) is a land tenure intervention focusing on increasing secure access to land for women. The objective is to be achieved through capacity building, improving land management and administration systems, supporting gender-responsive land policies to contribute to peace consolidation in Wau County.

2.1 *Legal and policy framework*

While the 2009 South Sudan Land Act provides equal access to land for women and men, protracted instability and conflict have led to continued displacement, tenure insecurity, land grabbing, elite capture, squatting, and secondary occupation. The government remain absent in most rural areas where family relations are mostly regulated through customs and traditions, some of which are repugnant to justice and good conscience.

In practice, the customs and traditions of the people of South Sudan, which are accorded Constitutional recognition as a source of legislation and co-existing with the statutory law, continue to govern land ownership between men and women. The failure by the South Sudan Legislative Assembly to prioritise the enactment of family laws relating to succession, inheritance, wills, bequests, matrimonial relations has hindered women's progressive accessibility to land and property. Even in courts today, the hands of judges are constrained in providing sound judgments for women in the absence of express provisions relating to matrimonial property. Section 6 of the Civil Procedure Act, 2007 provides that “where a suit or other proceeding in a Civil Court raises a question regarding succession, inheritance, legacies, gifts, marriage, divorce, or family relations, the rule for the decision of such question shall be any custom applicable to the parties concerned, provided that, it is not contrary to justice...”.

Most judges are not well versed with the various customs of the 64 ethnic tribes in South Sudan. To reach a decision, judges, when faced with such questions, are obliged to call chiefs to give a testimony from a customary law perspective for the court to reach a judgment. Approximately 99.9% of these chiefs are men, and about 98% of the judges in the High Courts with original jurisdiction over land matters are men. It is written in white and easy to understand and explain what women go through in such an environment of legal setting.

The law reform promise under the Revitalized Peace Agreement has failed to look into serious issues of land relating to women's rights to land. The draft land policy at the national government is meant to address some important aspects of women's access to land throughout the country has not been passed by the Council of Ministers at the time of this evaluation.

In Wau for example, a Land Commission had been established and tasked with drafting Land Regulations to streamline land acquisition procedures, procedures for registration and procedures for land dispute resolution and removing obstacles to women's access to land titles as well as acting as a mechanism of accountability against land officials. The Commission presented a draft, but it was later dismantled, and the Regulation was never endorsed by the state government in Wau.

The delay in passing the land policy, land regulations and enacting family laws continue to impede steady progress on women's rights to accessing land. Women continue to worry about losing their deceased husbands' property to their immediate male relatives who exercise customary law rights by discriminating against women.

2.2 Land in displacement and return

The number of people displaced since 2013 in South Sudan exceeds 4 million individuals, including 1.9 million IDPs, of which 85% are women and children. The conflict in Wau in 2016-2017 alone resulted in the internal displacement of about 100,000 people. Besides armed conflict, natural disasters, including floods, have significantly increased since 2019, affecting several South Sudan states, causing severe displacements and massive relocation of people and cattle and sparking tension amongst communities.

Women in the context of return and integration are particularly challenged due to their limited capacity to secure access to land. Although the 2009 South Sudan Land Act provides equal access to land for women and men, protracted instability and conflict have led to continued displacement, tenure insecurity, land grabbing, elite capture, squatting, and secondary occupation. Procedural difficulties in land registration offices and corruption and financial constraints have affected women's equal access to land. Access to land justice by internally displaced women to reclamation and restitution through the courts is expensive and worsened by the corrupt judicial system.

This situation has undermined the tenure governance system and inhibited its capacity to implement the Land Act promoting and protecting women's land rights. Therefore, the project objective was to provide targeted support to women and facilitate their return and integration into communities through increased access to land while supporting the peaceful resolution of existing and emerging land disputes.

2.3 Project approach in securing access to land

In the past, governance of land and other natural resources has been ignored in times of crisis. The land is recognised as one of the root causes of conflict but has been seen as too political, complex and time-consuming, and thus a secondary priority in the emergency context. Today, however, attention is shifting to interlinked dimensions such as land (and natural resources as a whole) and the people that live or depend on it. If not addressed through inclusive and transparent mechanisms, increasing competition over land can become a root cause of conflict, creating a set of perceived injustices that threaten to undermine the peacebuilding and peace consolidation efforts (FAO, 2016).

Recognising that armed conflicts lead to increased competition for resources with a significant impact on gender, particularly when displacement is involved, PBF has in the last decade increasingly funded land projects. Improved tenure governance can help prevent and manage conflict, improve food security, and increase resilience while reducing dependence on aid. This pilot project was expected to contribute to identifying lessons learnt and formulate recommendations to inform future programming and strategies on using increased tenure security to contribute to peace consolidation and women's return in South Sudan.

The **theory of change** was in line with global and regional best practices. It theorized that increasing tenure security (through capacity development, system strengthening, land adjudication and registration, and disputes resolution) would improve women's access to land tenure and resilience in the context of return while reducing land-related conflicts leading to greater communal peace.

The project **objective** was to contribute to peace, return and reintegration, especially of women and youth, by increasing their tenure security and their capacity to participate in decision-making concerning the land.

The project's **strategy** was to simultaneously increase women's capacity to appreciate what their rights are and how to claim them and create an enabling environment for their efforts to be successful by making the land administration system more responsive and widening the space at local, state and national level for discussing women land rights through awareness-raising and capacity development.

The Project had three expected outcomes:

Outcome 1: Enhanced Capacity of women groups to demand and secure accountability from Government for women's land rights and equitable access to land. This outcome was to be achieved through increased awareness among women, communities and traditional leaders on women's rights and gender-responsive land dispute resolution mechanisms; and enhanced skills and understanding of gender-responsive land rights.

Outcome 2: Improved Land Management and administrative system at country and state levels. This outcome was to be achieved through enhanced skills in gender land management and administration and land dispute resolution, review of existing land management systems to identify obstacles faced by women in accessing land and giving actionable recommendations, and reform of land policy at the national level.

Outcome 3: Increased provision of strategic and effective support for gender-responsive land policies. This outcome was to be achieved through the preparation and adaptation of national land policy and enhanced commitment among national actors for the implementation of gender-responsive land policies. The Project was also supposed to integrate cross-cutting issues of climate change, gender, human rights and the youth.

Key activities focused on:

- Assessing the local tenure context and identifying bottlenecks in women's secure access to land
- Identifying capacity and information gaps at different levels and producing material to address them
- Identifying options to address land administration challenges and piloting them
- Increasing awareness and promoting informed dialogues on women's land rights at different levels
- Ensuring lessons learnt through the project would feed back into the policy dialogue at different levels

The Project targeted women and youth as primary beneficiaries, aligning with SDG5 on gender equality and women empowerment. It further aligned with the African Union Agenda 2063, Goal 17, which recommends that 20% of rural women have access to and control land by 2023.

At the country level, the project aligned with the UN Country Framework 2015-2016 (extended until 2018 in the absence of a recognised Government), which was the only strategy in place at the project design time. It was further framed within the context of the PBF Strategic Plan 2017-19: Addressing critical gaps for sustaining peace and focused on the priorities of the Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative (GYPI) of the Peace Building Fund, initiated to implement the Security Council resolution 2250 (2015) on Youth, Peace and Security.

Partners involved in project implementation included the UN-Habitat Regional Office for Africa (ROAF), Ministry of Land, Housing and Urban Development of South Sudan, Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS), and Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC).

The Project had an overall budget of 1.5 million USD. UN-Habitat received 1 million USD, and FAO received 500,000 USD. The Summary Financial Report as of 30th Oct 2020 report indicates that the reported final expenditure is 1.245.424 USD, corresponding to eighty-three per cent (83%) of the entire budget. With UN-Habitat having disbursed almost ninety-seven per cent (97%) of the assigned budget and FAO having disbursed fifty-eight per cent (58%).

The Project's approved **monitoring and evaluation plan**, included an independent final evaluation (the Evaluation) covering the implementation period from December 2018 to December 2020, including the original 18 months Project lifespan and the six months extension later granted by PBF.

The monitoring and evaluation plan was grounded in the project's logical framework. The outcomes were well aligned to the ToC and global and regional best practices and allowed for sufficient flexibility to encompass a range of context-specific solutions. The outcome indicators and targets, on the other end, failed to reflect incremental progress in securing tenure rights, rather focusing only on end results (approved land policy, signed certificates of occupancy, number of registered plots, etc.). Not only the achievement of these results is often beyond the control of the project, but it may not be desirable within the project lifespan.

On-going monitoring mechanisms were to be developed by the Project team in collaboration with UN-Habitat and FAO Evaluation Units. The logical framework identified the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and provided the M&E framework foundation.

A baseline study, "Baseline study report on Women's land rights in South Sudan," was implemented to benchmark the beginning conditions against these indicators. It was followed by the "Dispute Resolution Mechanisms study", the "Land Administration & Management Systems study", and the "Gender-Responsive Land Dispute Resolution Training Curriculum". The studies were all localized and aimed at identifying fit for purpose and context-appropriate solutions to incrementally start addressing tenure governance challenges with specific attention to women's tenure rights. The design, structure and quality of the studies well reflected the local and project's needs.

3. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION

The Final Evaluation provides an opportunity to capitalise on the Project's experience and ensure a broad sense of ownership over and future uptake of the evaluation recommendations. Therefore, the Implementing Agencies (UN-Habitat and FAO) strived to ensure several stakeholders, including representatives of PBF, RC Office, UNMISS, and other implementing partners, could contribute to the process. UN-Habitat set off to establish an Evaluation Reference Group as a consultative mechanism to this effect. Members from different agencies have contributed to the TORs and the evaluation process design, maximising the recommendations' relevance, credibility, quality, uptake, and use.

3.1 Purpose

The Evaluation is summative and formative, serving the purposes **of accountability and enhancing learning**. It captures information on resources used, results achieved, and how they were achieved by implementing partners; enhances learning on what worked, what did not and why; and give insights on future programming and designs of new programmes/projects or replication of the Project in South Sudan.

3.2 Objectives

The Evaluation **objectives** include:

- Test the TOC and its underlying assumptions
- Identify if external factors beyond implementing partners' control existed and analyse their effect on the Project
- Assess to what extent the programme achieved its planned results at output and outcome levels, including improving women's and youth access to land tenure and reducing land-related conflicts
- Assess the project design, implementation modalities, relevance, collaboration and coordination among key stakeholders, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact
- Identify and analyse constraints, effects of Covid-19, challenges, and critical gaps with respect to delivery
- Assess crossing cutting issues of gender equality, human rights, youth and climate change
- Provide lessons learned, good practices, innovation efforts and recommendations for new projects/programmes and strategies and necessary support for future programming in South Sudan.
-

3.3 Scope

In terms of **scope**, the evaluation covers the Project's implementation period, from December 2018 to December 2020. It focuses on assessing the project design, implementation modalities, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact. In addition, it identifies and analyses constraints, challenges and opportunities and assesses crossing cutting issues of gender equality, human rights, youth and climate change and effects of Covid-19.

4. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The Evaluation TORs include a series of detailed questions in line with the standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of **relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, coherence, and impact** which directly inform the findings. They further include some **overarching questions** which are discussed as part of the conclusions. Additionally, the Evaluation focuses on complementarity, and coordination and relevant **cross-cutting issues** such as gender equality, social inclusion, human rights and environmental issues. Also, the Evaluation analyses the effects of the Covid-19 pandemic and how effectively the Project has managed to mitigate them.

Given that **gender** is a key issue in the South Sudanese land tenure context, and that the funding emanates from an initiative focusing on gender and youth, the Evaluation seeks to identify the extent to which these topics are mainstreamed and integrated into the Project and how effective are the implemented measures to increase women and youth participation. It integrates gender considerations into the evaluation process, from the data collection tools design (e.g. the discussion/interview structure) with due consideration to the local context and conditions to a gender-balanced targeting of key informants and stakeholders selected for the consultation (though challenging given the local cultural and religious context).

The Evaluation Questions are tailored to the objectives of the Evaluation to enable the Evaluation team to identify the value added by the Project and extract valuable lessons for future programming.

The following Evaluation Questions provide the basis of key informant interviews and directly inform the Final Evaluation Report findings and conclusions.

| CATEGORY/ CRITERIA | Question |
|-------------------------|--|
| OVERARCHING | To what extent the programme achieved its planned results at output and outcome levels? |
| | To what extent women and youth improved access to land tenure and this access has contributed to reduction in land-related conflicts or greater communal peace? |
| | To what extent where implementation modalities, collaboration and coordination among key stakeholders appropriate? |
| | What were critical gaps in respect to delivery of the programme and effects of Covid-19? |
| | Recommendations for future programming |
| 1. RELEVANCE | 1.1 To what extent was the Project relevant to the needs and priorities of geographical target beneficiaries of the Project, and key implementing partners and stakeholders including South Sudan institutions, FAO, UN-Habitat, NRC, UNMISS? |
| | 1.2 To what extent was the programme aligned with relevant development strategies of South Sudan? |
| | 1.3 To what extent was the objective of the Project relevant to support resilience, prevention, and sustainability of peace in Wau County? |
| | 1.4 What was UN-Habitat and FAO's comparative advantage and project approach in implementation project compared with other UN entities and key partners? |
| 2. EFFECTIVENESS | 1. To what extent were women targeted by the Project able to successfully claim their land rights in Wau Country? What evidence is there that what was achieved contributed to the objective of women's access to land, land management and administration, and provision of strategic, effective gender responsive land policies? |
| | 2. To what extent was the traditional leaders' capacity strengthened through the Project? |
| | 3. How effectively were the indicators of achievements on the three outcomes of the Project monitored to provide evidence on performance and flag any necessary adjustments to ensure capturing of necessary data on reduction of land-based conflicts? |
| 3. EFFICIENCY | 4. How efficiently were the inputs (financial and human resources), partnerships, policies and implementations strategies used to achieve the planned outputs? |
| | 5. To what extent did the management structure of the project support efficiency for programme implementation? |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| | 6. Were activities and outputs delivered in a cost-efficient and timely manner? Specifically, what was the cost efficiency of UN-Habitat and FAO's technical assistance for the development of capacity within South Sudan? |
| 2. SUSTAINABILITY | 1. Were the results achieved sustainable? |
| | 2. To what extent capacity developed to ensure sustainability of the results and benefits achieved? |
| | 3. What accountability and oversight systems were established to secure the benefits from the Project? |
| 3. IMPACT | 1. What positive changes have occurred because of the Project? |
| | 2. What were unintended effects, if any, of the Project? |
| 4. COHERENCE | 1. Was the Project coherent and implemented in synergy with other capacity building and land management and administration projects? |
| | 2. Was the Project coherent or complement other donors' development interventions? |
| 5. SOCIAL INCLUSION | 1. To what extent were the environmental and social inclusion issues of gender, human rights, climate and youth considerations integrated in project design, implementation, monitoring and reporting on the programme? |
| | 2. Are there any outstanding examples of how these issues were successfully applied in the Project? |

5. EVALUATION APPROACH, METHODOLOGY and CONSTRAINTS

The approach to the Evaluation is guided by the ToRs and evaluation principles and good practices as established in OECD/DAC Principles and the UNEG. The methodological evaluation framework is designed to understand what works well and under which conditions, so that lessons can be learned going forward.

The Evaluation was designed to address the needs and requirements of the UN-Habitat and FAO, adhere to UNEG quality standards, mitigate risks related to the information gathering process and produce a final product with a coherent and thorough analysis. The Evaluation adopts a mixed-method, evidence-based approach, combining qualitative and quantitative data.

The Evaluation Questions were drafted through an inclusive consultation process involving land stakeholders in South Sudan. They provide the basis of key informant interviews and inform the Final Evaluation Report findings and conclusions.

The steps include inception report, literature review and key informants interviews, report drafting, and final revision.

The **Inception report** described the consultants' team understanding of the evaluation scope and objectives and helped create a common vision for the evaluation implementation and deliverables.

The **literature review** contextualises the primary data and reaches a deeper understanding of the land tenure context issues in South Sudan and the project areas. Multiple sources are consulted to provide for various perspectives and minimise threats to evaluability. The Evaluation assesses the available desk evidence through:

- Academic and current literature review: implementing partners' policies and studies on land and conflict; national and regional studies and strategic documents on land; legal and policy framework; situation assessments; other ongoing projects documents; press articles and academic publications
- Grey literature review: Project documents and amendments; budgets; financial reports; project documents/description of the Project; logical framework; indicators; communication and visibility plan; Government reports, if available; interim reports; activity reports; attendance lists; monitoring and meeting reports, if available.

The **key informant Interviews** and follow-up discussions on land rights experiences and on the Project itself must address a wide range of stakeholders and informants given the existing restrictions to travel due to the COVID-19 pandemic. They are necessary to triangulation and verify information from the reports. Interviews are carried out through the computer, telephone, or in-person where possible. Informants targeted include:

- Project implementers and project partners
- Government and other counterparts
- Other land sector stakeholders
- Key informants, especially in Wau State, including traditional and statutory authorities
- As many Project beneficiaries as possible to verify the achievements reported by the Project and assess their perception of the impact of project activities on their livelihoods

The original plan was to interview stakeholders from the agreed key informant list and do rapid phone interviews with at least ten per cent (10%) of the women beneficiaries which to be randomly selected from the 1500 beneficiaries reported by the Project, corresponding to roughly one hundred and fifty (150) women. This strategy was designed to make up for the fact that the team would not perform ground verification due to travel restrictions.

As further explained in the following section, it was not possible to implement this strategy because the Project Implementing partners were unable to share with the Evaluation Team a substantive list of Project partners and stakeholders and a consolidated list of beneficiaries.

Regarding the **key informants**, the team was eventually able to perform eleven (11) interviews.

Regarding the **beneficiaries**, UN-Habitat and FAO did not have an aggregate list. NRC finally provided two partial beneficiaries' lists of one hundred and two (102) beneficiaries and seven hundred ninety-four (794) individuals respectively, totalling eight hundred ninety-six (896) beneficiaries and corresponding roughly to sixty per cent (60%) of the reported project beneficiaries.

The Evaluation team tried to contact all the numbers provided and was able to verify the inaccuracy of those records. Out of a total of eight hundred ninety-six (896) beneficiaries' names, only twenty-three (23) were reachable and interviewed thanks to the accuracy of their contact details.

The **Final Evaluation Report** consists of an introduction including a description of the context and the Project and the Evaluation contents and process, a section on findings organised based on the evaluation criteria, a section of conclusions based on the overarching questions, a section on lessons learnt and a final section summarising lessons learnt and recommendations. Annexes will include the Evaluation Matrix, the list of key informant interviews, the list of documents reviewed, and the Evaluation TORs.

The Evaluation only started more than a year after the end of the Project and took place between January and March 2022. The exercise was clearly time-bound due to the delays in starting the process and the urgent need expressed by the Client to produce recommendations that would inform future programming on land and conflict in the country.

Stakeholders' roles and responsibilities

Given the pilot nature of the Project, one of the important aspects of the Evaluation are the lessons learnt and the recommendations that will influence programming in South Sudan in this thematic area in the future. To ensure wide ownership over the Evaluation's contents and recommendations and increase its usefulness and uptake in the future, a participatory and inclusive process has been designed, which allows a range of actors to have an input in the final product. The roles of the different stakeholders' groups are described below.

The Evaluation Team - Composed by an international consultant and a national expert has been recruited to conduct the Evaluation.

UN-Habitat Independent Evaluation Unit- The Unit, in consultation with FAO Evaluation Office, manages the evaluation process.

The Project Implementation Team is responsible for supporting the Evaluation by providing information and documentation required providing contacts of stakeholders to be consulted to provide evaluation information. Their role is considered critical for the success of the Evaluation.

The **Evaluation Reference Group**, including representatives of FAO and UN-Habitat Evaluation Offices, ROAF, PBF and representative of other implementing partners to maximise the relevance, credibility, quality, uptake and use of the Evaluation.

Limitations to the evaluation

The evaluation has been commissioned more than a year after the Project closure. Follow-up projects have already been designed and are under implementation, weakening the demand for the evaluation itself. Since the Evaluation team was not allowed to travel to the field, this delay has created a huge gap in obtaining information from beneficiaries and stakeholders. The Project team has for the most part been dismantled, and staff have moved on to other assignments creating information gaps. For example, the evaluation team was not provided with a consolidated list of partners and counterparts to interview, nor a beneficiaries' list.

Given the **challenges** experienced by the Project due to the socio-political situation in Wau during the Project implementation time and the still perduring health challenges due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Evaluation Team

has not been allowed to travel to the Project site and perform ground verification. To mitigate the effects of these challenges, the Evaluation Team has expanded the academic and grey literature review and reached out to partners, key informants and beneficiaries remotely. **This strategy has produced sufficient evidence to substantiate answers to many of the evaluation questions, achieving most of the Final Evaluation objectives but not all.**

Overall there is a sense of lack of ownership over this evaluation, translating in limited willingness to engage with the evaluation team by Project stakeholders. While the team has still been able to carry out the assignment and formulate findings and recommendations, the process and impact would have certainly been more successful had the evaluation come earlier, or its scope been changed to capitalize on the delay. Without travelling to the field, it has in fact not even been possible to turn this exercise in a post-impact evaluation and focus it more on learnings and future planning based on the situation assessment one year after the end of the project.

The team intended to make up for the fact that it was not travelling interviewing a high number of Project beneficiaries, but Beneficiaries and partners' contacts have been very difficult to obtain, and once at hand, the greatest majority have changed, are lost or unavailable. The team struggled to reach former Project team members and was not provided with an initial list of contacts. UN-Habitat and FAO did not have in their possession the list of beneficiaries in the field. It took four weeks of email exchanges with different stakeholders to finally obtain from NRC two partial beneficiaries' lists, of one hundred and two (102) and seven hundred and ninety-four (794) beneficiaries respectively, corresponding roughly to sixty per cent (60% of the reported beneficiaries).

From the list of one hundred and two (102) beneficiaries whose complex land cases were resolved through Court or administrative process, the team was able to only talk to five (5) respondents on the phone. Fifty-two (52) respondents have no phone contact, six (6) beneficiaries' phone numbers were not valid, three (3) phone numbers were non-existent, one (1) beneficiary whose phone number was registered for two other beneficiaries does not know them, ten (10) phone contacts were off throughout the interview, two (2) respondents who were interviewed stated that they are not aware of the project nor have their land cases been supported under any project, eleven (11) phone contacts were switched off throughout the interview period, thirteen (13) beneficiaries could not be reached because the contacts given were for the lawyers who represented them and are no longer in touch with them. Out of the seven hundred and ninety-four (794) beneficiaries from the second list, forty-two (42) were registered under the contact number of chief William Mayuen Yel and could no longer be reached by the chief; forty-two (42) more shared one number (unclear who it belong to) which was not correct because it was missing two digits); two groups of one hundred thirteen (113) and ninety-seven (97) beneficiaries respectively were again registered under two phone numbers (unclear who they belong to) which were not available during the period of the interviews. Four hundred and eighty-four (484) names had no telephone contacts. Sixteen (16) beneficiaries were reached and interviewed.

While it is understandable that beneficiaries may not have a phone in the context of return in Wau, registering hundreds of names under one chief, or accepting to register beneficiaries without contact details increased risks of not being able to trace them back. The limited access to beneficiaries and the limited quantitative information available have further hindered the Evaluation Team's capacity to address some of the more complex analytical questions, such as those related to causal relationships between securing access to land and the diminishing number of conflicts.

6. Evaluation FINDINGS

This chapter summarizes the findings emerging from the literature review and the key informant interviews performed by the evaluation team. The findings address the Evaluation Questions and are organized under the standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact. Additionally, the Evaluation focuses on the complementarity, coherence and coordination and the cross-cutting issues of gender equality and social inclusion.

6.1 Achievements of the project at objective and outcome levels

The achievement of the project at the outcome level is illustrated in table 1 below. Achievements are assessed against targets and findings versus what was reported by the Project in the draft reports submitted to the evaluation team, including in particular the draft “Third PBF progress report” (Aug 2020) and the “Land Governance and Peacebuilding in South Sudan: Gender Dynamics, Challenges and Opportunities” Draft 2 consolidated report (August 2021).

Overall, the project achieved four out of nine outcome targets: 1.3: 50% of traditional leaders women leaders perform gender-responsive dispute resolution that enhanced women’s access to land; 3.1: Draft gender-responsive land policy prepared for tabling in parliament; and 3.2: Percentage of women engaged in the workshop and other dialogue on gender responsive land policy).

It partially achieved two out of nine outcome targets: 1.1. 650 women that got access to land by having land certificate dispute resolution mechanism; 1.2: 114 women leaders who participated and claimed women’s rights in land disputes.

The evaluation team did not have sufficient information to independently verify the remaining three targets: 2.1: Number of women Headed IDPs and Returnees resettled with secure land title, non reported; 2.3: 2ha of land allocated from the government to resettle IDPs; and 3.3: 1500 women having access to land through implementation gender-responsive land policies.

| Not achieved | | Partially Achieved | | Achieved | | Impossible to verify due to lack of data | |
|--|---|--|---|----------------------|--|--|--|
| Outcome Description | Indicator of achievement | Baseline target | & | Reported performance | Status of achievement | | |
| Outcome 1: Enhanced Capacity of women groups to demand and secure accountability from Government for women’s land rights and equitable access to land. | Indicator 1.1: Number of women that got access to land by having a land certificate dispute resolution mechanism. | Baseline 0 | | 650 | Partially Achieved | | |
| | Indicator 1.2: Number of women leaders who participated and claimed women’s rights in land disputes | Baseline 0 | | 114 | Partially Achieved | | |
| | Indicator 1.3: Percentage of traditional leaders women leaders that performed gender-responsive dispute resolution that enhanced women’s access to land | Baseline 0 | | 50% | Achieved | | |
| Outcome 2: Improved Land Management and administrative system at country and state levels. | Indicator 2.1: Number of women Headed IDPs and Returnees resettled with secure land title | Baseline 0 | | 0 | Impossible to verify due to lack of data | | |
| | Indicator 1.3: Percentage of traditional leaders women leaders that performed gender-responsive dispute resolution that enhanced women’s access to land | Target: A functional management in place in Wau, at the state and national levels. | | 1 | Achieved | | |
| | Indicator 2.3: Amount of land allocated from the government to resettle IDPs | Baseline 0 | | | Impossible to verify due to lack of data | | |
| Outcome 3: Increased provision of strategic and effective support for gender responsive land policies. | Indicator 3.1: Draft gender responsive land policy prepared for tabling in parliament | Target: Draft Policy | | 1 | Achieved | | |
| | Indicator 3.2: Percentage of women engaged in workshop and other dialogue on gender responsive land policy | Target 50% | | Above 50% | Achieved | | |
| | Indicator 3.3: Number of women having access to land through implementation gender responsive land policies. | 1,500 women | | 0 | Impossible to verify due to lack of data | | |

At the output level, the evaluation was able to confirm the achievement or overachievement of those results related to increased women and public capacity and awareness (Output 1.1. and Output 1.2); those related to the increased administrative capacity to record and protect women's tenure rights (Output 2.1, Output 2.2, and Output 2.3); and those related to policy formulation and strengthened political will (Output 3.1, and Output 3.2).

These results are in line with the overall observation that the project's outcome indicators and targets failed to reflect incremental progress in securing tenure rights, rather focusing only on end results (approved land policy, signed certificates of occupancy, number of registered plots, etc.). Not only the achievement of these results is often beyond the control of the project, but it may not be desirable within the project lifespan. This limitation was partially overcome at the output targets and indicators level, formulated in a way more conducive to capturing incremental progress.

6.2 Performance of the project using OECD-DAC Evaluation Criteria

6.2.1 Relevance

To what extent was the Project relevant to the needs and priorities of geographical target beneficiaries of the Project and key implementing partners and stakeholders, including South Sudan institutions, FAO, UN-Habitat, NRC, UNMISS?

The Project was relevant to the needs and priorities of the geographical target beneficiaries and critical implementing partners.

Despite a legal framework that grants men and women equal access to land holdings, most women in South Sudan continue to access land exclusively through a male relative as prescribed by customary law. In addition, during the conflict and displacement, loss of legal documentation has affected women trying to secure their tenure, specifically displaced women trying to return to their villages of origin.

Furthermore, the process of replacing lost documentation is lengthy and bureaucratic. It often requires resources and the presence of a male relative as expected by traditional leaders, local council courts or the Ministry of Physical Infrastructure. Hence forth results in landlessness amongst women in towns. Armed conflict and violence experienced in Wau in 2016 and 2017 have only exacerbated this situation.

Securing women's land rights, especially in the context of displacement and return, is recognised in South Sudan as a fundamental step towards stabilisation and strengthening the rule of law. In Wau, landlessness and land conflict were exacerbated in the context of return. State-level policy makers, administrators, and local authorities welcomed the Project, stating that it addressed a fundamental challenge in their communities.

There is an ongoing debate on which national institution should lead in policymaking, with the Ministry of Lands, Land Commission and Parliamentary Committee on Land claiming this responsibility. But despite this lack of clarity, stakeholders from key Government institutions in Juba provided positive feedback about the Project and its impact. They stated that they had played an active role in the Project. The Project findings increased awareness of women's land rights in Wau. The appointment of a female Governor, Madame Sarah Cleto Hassan, in Western Bahr el Ghazal further increased advocacy for women's land rights in Wau. The Project is calling for the implementation of 35% affirmative action provided in the Peace Agreement and the Transitional Constitution of South Sudan.

Both FAO and UN-Habitat have invested consistently in the last decade to develop strategies and approaches targeting land in fragile contexts to address tenure insecurity as an underlying cause of conflict and a bottleneck for inclusive development in protracted crises. This work is built on the growing recognition that secure access to land provides a fundamental contribution to food security, resilience, and self-reliance.

NRC has a long history of addressing tenure conflicts through alternative land dispute resolution mechanisms under its ICLA Programme in the region and South Sudan specifically. ICLA has been developed at scale to recognise that addressing land disputes in conflict can contribute immediate peace dividends and help increase human and food

security within communities, increasing protection for the most vulnerable and reducing the number of disputes that escalate into violence.

UNMISS has identified land disputes as one of the primary sources of conflict in Wau and sheds light on the extreme vulnerability of women-headed households to land grabbing and land conflicts.

To what extent was the programme aligned with relevant development strategies of South Sudan?

The project was aligned with the UN Country Framework 2015-2016, the only strategy in place at the project design time.

The Project was designed under the first PBF round in 2016, in the almost total absence of national strategic frameworks. The UN Country Framework of 2015-2016 was extended until 2018 in the absence of a recognised Government. As a result, there was no National Development Strategy or strategies for Wau returnees.

The Project is framed within the context of the **PBF Strategic Plan 2017-19: Addressing critical gaps for sustaining peace, and in particular focuses on the priorities of the Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative (GYPI)** of the Peace Building Fund, initiated to implement the Security Council resolution 2250 (2015) on Youth, Peace and Security.

It targets women and youth as primary beneficiaries, aligning with **SDG5 on gender equality and women empowerment**. It further aligns with the **African Union Agenda 2063, Goal 17**, which recommends that 20% of rural women have access to and control land by 2023.

The Project strengthens peace and security by enhancing efforts to address land governance issues. It focuses on addressing one of the recognised underlying causes of insecurity in South Sudan, tenure conflicts, in line with the national and regional agendas.

The Project retrospectively is therefore well aligned with the Strategic documents now in place in South Sudan, including the **National Development Strategy** (objective 1, facilitating return and objective 2, develop laws and enforce the rule of law; the **United Nations Cooperation Framework (UNCF)** objective a, strengthening peace and objective d, empowering women and youth; and the **Strategic Framework for the Creation of a Protective and Enabling Environment for Return Home of the IDPs in POC and Collective sites**. The mainstreaming of land in the Peace Building programmes is further in line with the **PBF Strategic Plan 2017-19: Addressing critical gaps for sustaining peace**.

To what extent was the objective of the Project relevant to support resilience, prevention, and sustainability of peace in Wau County?

The Project objective was relevant to the broader objectives, targeting land tenure insecurity as an underlying cause of instability, food insecurity and limited resilience in protracted crises.

Local stakeholders confirmed that land disputes, especially those involving dispossession of women-headed household rights, increased drastically in return. The Project responded to an urgent need of the community, and strengthening the security of tenure granted the women-headed household an increased sense of security and safety, which improved their food security and resilience.

Some beneficiaries built a shelter on the land, others rented it out and created an income, others cultivated it directly with an immediate positive effect on their livelihoods. Moreover, the women's understanding of their rights and how to claim them increased, jointly with their capacity to advocate within their communities and with local and state authorities.

The Project increased local land disputes resolution capacity. In addition, it increased local authorities' awareness of women's land rights, creating an enabling environment for those rights to be claimed and upheld in the long term.

What were UN-Habitat and FAO's comparative advantages and project approaches in the implementation project compared with other UN entities and key partners?

The aggregate value of the Joint Project implementing Agencies resides in their expertise in land tenure issues in crisis – in both urban and rural areas.

Land projects always entail many challenges and risks that must be managed carefully, especially in fragile contexts. UN-Habitat and FAO have the mandate to address land and tenure security issues (in urban and rural areas, respectively) and the technical expertise in an area that is fast evolving and entails high risks.

The Fit-for-Purpose (FFP) "revolution" in land administration and the use of simple, cost-effective technology for mapping has dramatically increased the accessibility of land interventions. But a land administration system is only helpful if it is up-to-date and able to protect the tenure rights it captures. Land recordation without participation, inclusion and structural support to the land governance system has proven once and again to generate more negative effects than immediate positive dividends in protracted crises.

The implementing agencies have a history of solid relationships with local and national authorities – which is not common among emergency actors. They are recognised and credible as neutral convenors of multi-stakeholder discussions and policy dialogues. In addition, they have significant experience as advocates for mainstreaming land issues in crisis programming within and outside the UN Family.

While their operational capacity under the Project has been limited by structural and contextual factors, their technical and policy role has been critical to the success of the Project.

6.2.2 Effectiveness

To what extent were women targeted by the Project able to successfully claim their land rights in Wau Country? What evidence is there that what was achieved contributed to the objective of increasing women's access to land, land management and administration, and provision of strategic, effective gender-responsive land policies?

Thanks to the work of the Project, the process to obtain land in Wau for women returnees is now better understood, more accessible and transparent. Targeted local authorities are better equipped to manage land recordation and land disputes resolution. The space for policy dialogue on women and returnees' land rights has increased, and the lessons learnt in Wau have enriched the State and National level debate on tenure. The number of projects to secure tenure rights is growing steadily with an increasingly ambitious scope, and land is more and more present in the national development strategies.

It has not been possible for the evaluation team to independently assess individual land certificates' existence, quality, number, and effectiveness in protecting tenure rights. The evaluation was not able to assess whether the individual women beneficiaries targeted by the Project were still in possession of the land one year after the end of the intervention and what percentage of them had successfully gone through the entire process and had the land and the physical registered certificate. The phone contacts provided were mostly for chiefs who could not trace the beneficiaries for an interview. Phones were off most times; numbers were either less or more in digits or were non-existent or not reachable. While more instruments are now available to women and youth to claim land in Wau, the evaluation established that some women though possessing all land documents are not certain of the security of their land from land grabbers as they continue to take shelter in the UN Protection of Civilians Sites in Wau.

The initial evaluation plan was to randomly select beneficiaries among the reported total number of 1500 women who had received the land occupancy certificate. To interview in order to verify the information reported. Despite the numerous requests of the evaluation team, UN-Habitat and FAO were not able to produce the beneficiaries list. After four weeks and numerous requests, NRC finally provided the evaluation team with two separate lists of beneficiaries comprising respectively one hundred and two (102) names of beneficiaries whose complex cases were either litigated in court or resolved through administrative dispute resolution mechanisms and seven hundred ninety-four (794) landless beneficiaries pre-selected to be allocated land and issued certificates of land ownership.

Of the contacts provided, only a minimal number belong to beneficiaries themselves. Out of the one hundred and two (102) women on the first list, some did not own a phone and had provided a relative or community member's phone number and were not reachable. In addition, some of the numbers had since then been disconnected. As a result, the team was only able only to interview seven (7) beneficiaries, which is not considered a high enough number to be representative.

Out of the seven hundred and ninety-four (794) beneficiaries from the second list, forty-two (42) were registered under the contact number of chief William Mayuen Yel and could no longer be reached by the chief; forty-two (42) more shared one number (unclear who it belong to) which was not correct because it was missing two digits; two groups of one hundred thirteen (113) and ninety-seven (97) beneficiaries respectively were again registered under two phone numbers (unclear who they belong to) which were not available during the period of the interviews. Four hundred and eighty-four (484) names had no telephone contacts. Sixteen (16) beneficiaries were reached and interviewed.

To legally retain the land in Wau, three documents are required: the allotment document (Land Lease), the Search Certificate of title, and the Croquis (the map showing the dimensions of the land). What emerged out of the twenty-three (23) interviews was that none of the women had at the time of the interview obtained all the documents required by law to secure full ownership. Five (5) of the women beneficiaries did not have land titles; the remaining women were, at the time of the interview, still missing one or two of the land documents required by law to secure tenure.

Even though most of the respondents did indicate that they felt their tenure security had improved as compared to before engaging with the Project, many shared concerns regarding their future tenure rights in the absence of the complete paperwork.

In a country where people often lack identification documents, in the absence of complete records of project beneficiaries, it is very difficult to verify and monitor how their tenure security situation evolves in the future.

To what extent was the traditional leaders' capacity strengthened through the Project?

Targeted traditional leaders' capacity and their awareness and understanding of women's land rights were significantly strengthened thanks to the Project.

The Project used community dialogues with traditional leaders, women and youth groups. These dialogues were instrumental in shaping traditional leaders' role to recognise women's rights to land. In addition, the traditional leaders were instrumental in understanding and identifying women's issues related to land within their communities.

The interviewed chiefs confirmed the positive results reported by the Project in this area. They felt they were consulted and involved at different stages in the Project and that the Project was well designed to target their changing needs. For example, they identified women beneficiaries and issued resident permits, advocating with the women the importance of formalising their tenure rights and building their capacity to understand the process and their rights.

They declared that their understanding of women's land rights had increased and their capacity to manage land disputes. They recommended that the Project be implemented at scale and extended to men since the exclusive targeting of women had generated friction in their communities.

Despite the positive results, the chiefs lamented the delay in issuing land titles. Moreover, they were being blamed and accused by the women beneficiaries for "conniving with the partners and the state land administration to be planning to sell their lands to rich people in the state and foreign investors".

How effectively were the indicators of achievements on the three outcomes of the Project monitored to provide evidence on performance and flag any necessary adjustments to ensure capturing of necessary data on the reduction of land-based conflicts?

The Project was successful in monitoring the implementation of activities but failed to develop and implement adequate data-collection tools and monitoring mechanisms to provide insights into the relationship between project activities and conflict and to monitor beneficiaries' future tenure security.

One important weakness has been identified in the project's logical framework, in the outcomes indicators and targets. While the outcomes were well aligned to the ToC and global and regional best practices and allowed for sufficient flexibility to encompass a range of context-specific solutions. The outcome indicators and targets on the other end failed to reflect incremental progress in securing tenure rights, rather than focusing only on end results (approved land policy, signed certificates of occupancy, number of registered plots, etc.). Not only the achievement of these results is often beyond the control of the project, but it may not be desirable within the project lifespan.

This limitation was partially overcome at the output targets and indicators level, formulated in a way more conducive to capturing incremental progress.

6.2.3 Efficiency

How efficiently were the inputs (financial and human resources), partnerships, policies and implementations strategies used to achieve the planned outputs?

The inputs were used quite efficiently, allowing for the implementation of most project activities and achieving most of the project objectives. However, the limited presence in the field, the lack of a Chief Technical Advisor and the high staff turnover rate undermined efficiency.

Overall activities' progress as reported is in line with the expenditures and budget, thus showing the cost-efficiency of the project. In addition, variations in expenditures versus the original budget align with normal project implementation adjustments.

The specialised technical expertise in land had to be mobilised externally during the Project because the project document did not envisage the deployment of a Senior Chief Technical Advisor, planning instead to mobilise this expertise internationally due to its local unavailability.

External periodic technical backstopping on land could have been an expensive but viable option in a development context, but its efficacy in volatile contexts is debatable. When the security and health crisis limited travelling options, the limited technical capacity at the field level and in Juba became a hindrance to Project implementation.

Project implementation progressed slowly during the first year. However, despite the challenges related to limited field presence and the limited number of project field staff, activities have been implemented cost-effectively in line with the budget, building synergies between the different components of capacity development strengthening land administration system and policy.

Notwithstanding the extension of the project implementation period by six months, the Project expenditure was in line with the budget. However, one of the activities and the number of experts' backstopping visits were limited by COVID 19.

Reporting to the development partner (PBF) was streamlined and timely, except for the final financial report, which PBF has not yet approved.

To what extent did the management structure of the project support efficiency for programme implementation?

The Project's management structure seemed to be over-complicated for the PBF quick impact projects, leading to delays in activities start-up.

UN-Habitat draws its technical capacity on land from GLTN, but engagement is not automatic. Instead of requiring the signature of an In-House Agreement. Despite the Project being approved in September 2018, UN-Habitat only signed the In-House Agreement with GLTN to mobilise critical technical support in September 2019.

Around the same time, UN-Habitat signed the Letter of Agreement with NRC, which successfully delivered field activities and piloting initiatives to secure women returnees' tenure rights. However, the NRC felt that the lack of available technical support at the field level, and lack of delegation of authority at the country level, negatively impacted project activities and did not allow the Project to capitalise on emerging opportunities.

Similarly, on the FAO side, challenges were linked to Human Resources. The high turnover and limited seniority in land expertise mobilised caused delays in Project implementation and frictions with project partners.

Working on land issues in a fragile context requires building an intricate net of relationships, institution building, capacity development, and great flexibility to capitalise on windows of opportunity. Having a non-technical junior project team supported by external technical backstopping has not been ideal in the volatile South Sudanese context.

Were activities and outputs delivered in a cost-efficient and timely manner? Specifically, what was the cost efficiency of UN-Habitat and FAO's technical assistance for the development of capacity within South Sudan?

The cost of UN-Habitat and FAO technical assistance for capacity development was in line with the technical expertise required for the assignment. It was unavoidable given the lack of specialised technical expertise and the political implications of land tenure.

The tenure domain in post-conflict is a specialised and easily politicised area of work that may bring high dividends in terms of contribution to peace processes but may exacerbate existing tensions leading to a protracted crisis. These kinds of interventions, especially in pilot projects, require seniority, experience and skilled expertise to help national counterparts identify the optimal solutions for their immediate tenure challenges while setting the foundations for longer-term sustainability of legitimate tenure rights. This level of expertise can only be attracted for the longer term in fragile contexts with adequate compensation and job security.

In the absence of a unified budget for a resident Chief Technical Advisor with adequate representation and technical expertise, the implementing agencies needed to fragment the budget and mobilise less experienced consultants, thus increasing the risk, later materialised, of high turnover.

6.2.4 Sustainability

Were the results achieved sustainable?

In terms of sustainability, the Project partially achieved its objectives. The results of the **policy** work have contributed to opening a space for dialogue that remains and is being further developed. The **land administration** results, based on improving business processes and record management, are likely to require some follow-up technical support to ensure systematic uptake. For the **land allocation and registration**, the evaluation team was not able to independently verify whether the increased tenure security for beneficiaries would be sustained in time.

The Project invested systematically into building capacity at the local level, among beneficiaries and local authorities, thus increasing the sustainability of results and benefits. Still, it never developed a contingency plan or hand-over strategy to cater for delays related to the land registration process. This has left project beneficiaries with incomplete documentation, thus undermining their tenure security in the medium and long term.

To what extent was capacity developed to ensure the sustainability of the results and benefits achieved?

The Project successfully increased the system's capacity to identify, allocate and register women returnees' land rights. The project catered to the capacity development needs of the women beneficiaries, the chiefs, and the state administrative officers involved. It helped link beneficiaries with legal and para-legal aid to move their cases through litigation when needed. It fostered political will and helped raise awareness among policymakers at different levels.

The Project did not set up a system to monitor individual women beneficiaries' improvement in tenure security, nor to follow them through the registration process beyond the life of the project itself. Moreover, not having a consolidated beneficiaries' database, it was similarly unable to hand over the follow-up responsibility to local authorities.

What accountability and oversight systems were established to secure the benefits of the Project?

While the project was implemented within the two-year period, it never put in place a plan to address post-project issues such as the delay in the acquisition of all land documents for the beneficiaries. The beneficiaries are calling on the chiefs to provide them with information about the land titles, but the chiefs have little information to give since they have also lost contact with the project implementers since the project came to an end. The UN-

Habitat local staff on the ground at the time has since relocated to Juba. The lawyers who represented beneficiaries in trial courts no longer pursue and monitor the appeal cases. NRC is no longer engaging with these activities.

The Project did not prioritize the design and implementation of data collection tools, thus making it harder to analyse the project's impact. As a result, the immediate dividends of the project, such as the linkages between increased tenure security and resilience or conflict mitigation, were not sufficiently investigated, captured and documented.

Limited documentation and the failure to establish accessible beneficiaries' databases make it much harder for local authorities to take responsibility for follow-up and gain insights into the medium- and long-term impact of the activities.

Given the activities implemented directly by UN-Habitat and those delegated to NRC in Wau, the failure to establish a system to document the activities' impact and enable local authorities to continue following up after the end of the project has undermined not only the capacity to secure the benefits from the project, but as well to capitalize on them for purposes of feeding back into the policy discussion or informing the design of subsequent interventions.

6.2.5 Impact

What positive changes have occurred because of the Project?

The Project opened a space for debate on land rights and women's land rights when most stakeholders did not think this would be possible. The Project was a bold undertaking for both the implementers and the donor. However, the process to raise awareness and build consensus around the simple fact of addressing land in such an unpredictable and evolving context like South Sudan in 2016-2017 was the first success of this initiative.

The Project contributed to increasing women's awareness of land rights and their capacity to demand their fulfilment at the local level. At the state level, it opened a dialogue that increased political awareness and political will to deal with landlessness and land grabbing issues. Finally, it increased awareness of the importance of land at the national level in the stabilisation and development processes. It helped catalyse funding for the land sector even during security and health crises.

Thanks to the wide range of stakeholders involved in different activities at different levels, the Project helped increase awareness and knowledge about the land-related challenges in South Sudan and the possible ways to address them.

The piloting of context-appropriate incremental solutions to improve the land administration and land governance capacity at the state and local levels has provided good insights into the range of options that could be adopted.

The Project instigates profound social changes, with an increasing number of men now receptive to women and girl children inheriting their property, such as land. Single mothers are also now accessing land, and the Western Bahr el Ghazal State Governor, Madame Sarah Cleto, is herself a champion and vocal advocate for women's rights.

What were the unintended effects, if any, of the Project?

The most visible unintended effect of the project is its failure to provide accountability to individual beneficiaries and to monitor after-project progress and impact on tenure security in the absence of a sound beneficiaries' database.

Project partners highlighted other unintended effects. The Project did not disseminate the baseline study findings, and the recommendations from the validation workshop undermined local ownership denying the right to information and participation in the land rights debate and setting a negative precedent for future projects. In addition, the Project only supported women. This brought some risks and criticisms from the local people, predominantly male counterparts that there were landless men living in abject poverty who felt they too should have been assisted as well through the Project.

Most of the beneficiaries have not received their land titles until a year after the project ended because they were not able to complete the administrative process with the Project's support, and this is a serious concern of uncertainty. This state of affairs has left women beneficiaries' hope hanging in the balance, exacerbated by no clear feedback from the project implementers. Their fears grow daily as they have no legal documents to guard their land against the elite and the powerful rich. Further, there are uncertainties about the status of the court cases that were lost and sent to the Court of Appeals. In the absence of lawyers to make follow-ups and lodge applications for expeditious disposal of the appeals, it is not feasible for the beneficiaries to follow their cases in the Appeals Court to a conclusion on their own.

Lastly, the chiefs lamented the delay in issuing land titles and were being blamed them. The women beneficiaries accused them of "...conniving with the partners and the state land administration to grab their land and give it to local and foreign investors". Leaving the land registration process incomplete increases the risks of tenure insecurity for women beneficiaries in the medium and long term.

6.2.6 Coherence

Was the Project coherent and implemented in synergy with other capacity building and land management and administration projects?

The Project built synergies with the existing land management and administration institutions.

The partnerships envisaged during the design focused almost exclusively on UN stakeholders since there was no recognised National Government in place, and stakeholders' consultations were impossible due to the security environment. Moreover, there were no other ongoing land interventions.

The apparent complementarity with the NRC ICLA programme was developed through the partnership in Wau. Under the partnership, effective collaboration was established through an MoU with local authorities to fast-track legal verification of existing land rights in the context of the beneficiaries' land claims.

Even though the Project was later used to influence the design of new Projects (i.e., a follow-up initiative under PBF), there is no evidence of formal collaboration with the projects established by other partners such as IGAD or OXFAM during the project lifespan.

Was the Project coherent or complemented other donors' development interventions?

The Project was designed as a result of consultation with development actors and recognised national and local authorities. There were no ongoing partners interventions on land at the time of the design., but the Project was aligned with existing peacebuilding interventions.

7. SOCIAL INCLUSION

To what extent were the environmental and social inclusion issues of gender, human rights, climate and youth considerations integrated in project design, implementation, monitoring and reporting on the programme?

The Project had a very defined focus on women returnees, and it developed mechanisms to identify and target those that most needed support in accessing land.

It assessed women beneficiaries' capacity and developed flexible and customized tools to increase it through awareness-raising and outreach. These were later modified to adapt to the COVID-19 imposed restrictions.

The Project strived to foster an enabling environment for women to gain space in the tenure governance arena and increase their capacity to advocate for their rights. This was achieved by working with the traditional chiefs and local authorities, increasing their awareness of women's land rights, and helping women litigate their cases in courts.

The Project provided insight into women returnees' specific challenges in accessing land and the land disputes they are involved with. NRC received one hundred and two (102) cases which they distributed to ten (10) law firms, each handling on average ten (10) cases pro bono. Fifty per cent (50%) of these cases were inheritance cases on land, and women were suing male relatives. The other cases range from multiple allotments of the same plot to two or three people and illegal occupation of privately owned land by encroachers. Ninety-eight per cent (98%) of all these cases were between women and men. The majority of these cases were resolved in formal courts of law in favour of the women claimants.

The evaluation also established that some of the cases that were taken to court were lost, but appeals were lodged in the Court of Appeals by the pro-bono lawyers on behalf of the beneficiaries. However, the evaluation team could not verify the outcome of those cases on appeal from the lawyers who represented the beneficiaries because the project came to an end in 2020, and the lawyers have ceased to follow them.

Lastly, the Project was able to identify bottlenecks linked to customs and misinformation that represented an additional bottleneck for women trying to access land. For example, it was common practice to expect women to go to the land office with a male relative in order to attend to their queries.

Are there any outstanding examples of how these issues were successfully applied in the Project?

The Project developed customized tools to increase women beneficiaries' capacity through awareness-raising and outreach. These were later modified to adapt to the COVID-19 imposed restrictions. Particularly successful were the land help lines established under the UN-Habitat / NRC partnership that allowed women to seek legal and paralegal council anonymously and privately. The substantive radio campaign also seemed well designed, context-appropriate, and effective.

The project, through implementing partners, also identified female lawyer organizations that pro-bono helped to litigate women's land rights-related cases in court on matters of inheritance, multiple allocations of same plots, encroachment on lands and land grabbing.

8. CONCLUSIONS

These Conclusions reflect the evaluation team's judgements concerning the main evaluation questions and add value to the findings; focus on significant issues and answer the evaluation's overarching questions of the TOR.

Overarching questions

To what extent the programme achieve its planned results at output and outcome levels?

The Project was overall successful, achieving most of its intended results at the outcome and output levels and providing as a pilot the required space for learning for land programmes in the South Sudanese context.

Analysis of self-reported performance through the results framework, progress and financial reports, as well as key informant interview responses, indicate that, after a slow implementation start-up, the Project has made good progress towards achieving its objectives and targeted outputs.

However, as indicated in the following paragraphs, the progress has been uneven among and within the three outcome areas: results were **good in** policy and capacity development; **promising** in the land administration system's gradual improvements (through the land adjudication and recording processes); not verifiable in terms of impact and sustainability for individual women beneficiaries due to poor documentation.

The original project design was realistic, although a "no-cost" extension was needed to accommodate initial delays in project implementation and emerging COVID-19 related challenges.

Overall, the Project successfully established a precedent, demonstrating the space exists for an informed dialogue on land rights for women and returnees in South Sudan and piloting field measures to improve tenure governance and access to land.

The impact is visible and expected to be sustainable regarding the land administration system, the business process transparency and accessibility, the public's awareness, and the inputs into the land policy discussion. However, at the level of the individual women beneficiaries, it is unclear what percentage of them has acquired the full suit of documents required for the land full ownership and what will be the repercussions in time for those that did not. For now, the respondents who do not have all the documents do seem to feel more tenure insecure and worried about the future.

Capacity development activities were considered well designed, appropriately targeted and beneficial by beneficiaries, though they were recognised to be limited in scale, being the Project, a pilot.

The envisaged activity under Output 2.3, piloting of digital fit-for-purpose technology for mapping land rights and establishing a digital database, was not implemented. Activities under this output instead focused on preliminary and foundational elements in terms of the land administration and governance system assessments, promoting measures to enhance participation, understanding of the existing level of knowledge and capacity on land, and increasing awareness and political will to support women rights.

Digital land mapping should not be rushed in a complex environment without having first completed all the above activities. In the context of limited capacity to access the field with technical experts and the volatile governance situation, the risks involved with piloting digital land mapping could have been higher than the possible benefits.

Conclusions on findings for each outcome area are outlined below.

Under Outcome 1, Women's groups have enhanced capacity to demand and secure accountability from government for women's land rights and equitable access to land from traditional authorities and governments, capacity development and outreach activities increased women's capacity to claim land upon their return, and the stakeholders' awareness of women land rights (statutory and customary authorities, State Ministries, Parliament, etc.).

The key informant interviews confirmed that the land administration intervention improved the land allocation process, increasing the public's awareness and accountability, especially of local officers. In addition, overall capacity development beneficiaries were satisfied with the Project activities and felt their knowledge and skills had improved thanks to the Project.

While there is evidence (reports, attendance lists, interviews) that the Project targeted 1500 women beneficiaries to directly increase their tenure security, it was not possible to establish how many of these women have gone through the entire process and acquired in their names the three documents that are today indispensable in Wau to secure full ownership: the allotment document which is the Land Lease, the Search Certificate of title, and the Croquis which is the map showing the dimensions of the land size. The lack of full documentation may affect the sustainability of results in the medium to long term.

Under *Outcome 2, Improved land management and more gender-responsive administrative system at the state and county level and reform of land policy at the national level, facilitate/enhance secure access and ability of women to negotiate tenure security for the most vulnerable women groups returning from IDP camps*, the Project analysed the existing business processes to acquire land and worked with local authorities to improve and streamline them (i.e. development of standardised forms for land certificates, improvement of filing system and archives at the state level), while informing the public to increase process transparency. The Project did not achieve the intended objective of piloting a Gender Responsive community-based mapping and documentation of tenure rights, including disputes, natural resources and livelihoods, using Fit for Purpose technology.

Under *Outcome 3: Policy makers provide effective, strategic support for gender-responsive land policies*, based on the land policy debate evolution across African countries. The policy discussion was the most appropriate entry-point to use the lessons learnt in Wau to feed into the national level discussion. While the policy itself did not progress much thanks to the Project support, that was linked to circumstances outside the Project control. Many of the stakeholders consulted agree that the support to the policy dialogue did help put the land discussion in a more central space within the Parliamentary discussion. It has increased policymakers' capacity on the issue and generated a common foundation that is likely to lead to the policy approval in the near future.

To what extent women and youth improved access to land tenure and this access has contributed to reduction in land-related conflicts or greater communal peace?

Thanks to the work of the Project, the process to obtain land in Wau for women returnees is now better understood, more accessible and more transparent than before. More information is similarly available on types of land disputes affecting women returnees, their intensity, and consequences. However, assessing how much tenure security has increased and how durable these improvements will be is impossible.

Based on global experience, this is expected to contribute to stability and food security. Still, the Project has not been put in place sufficient monitoring mechanisms to produce evidence to establish with certainty the tenure security contribution to the reduction in land-related conflicts and peace consolidation.

To what extent were implementation modalities, collaboration and coordination among key stakeholders appropriate?

The mixed implementation (direct and through partners) modality required a longer time to set up. Eventually, it proved to be flexible and able to adapt to the emerging challenges to delivery. The envisaged collaboration and coordination mechanisms were appropriate, but they were not implemented throughout the project's entire life, undermining their effectiveness.

UN-Habitat adopted a hybrid implementation modality. It kept the overall management of the Project in the Regional Office for Africa but contracted through formal agreements GLTN and NRC for the implementation of most activities.

The Project was designed to take maximum advantage of the technical and operational capacity of UN-Habitat and FAO, while establishing a functional partnership with UNMISS and NRC which were the stakeholders with highest capacity on the ground in Wau and receiving support from the RC Office.

The coordination between UN-Habitat, FAO, UNMISS and RCO worked well during the Project preparation and inception phases. It led to efficient collaboration and an adequate information flow that increased the system's capacity on land issues in the context of return and created an enabling environment to tackle women's land rights to sustain stabilisation efforts.

The Project duration was limited, yet, it was implemented in a rapidly changing environment, including governance in the making at the state and national levels, and security and health crises. These circumstances, coupled with a high turnover of in-country staff and limited field presence, undermined the coordination capacity during the latter parts of the Project lifespan.

The collaboration with NRC proved successful in taking advantage of the organization's capacity in Wau and even leading to new opportunities, such as attracting lawyers to provide pro-bono support to women claiming land. The partnership was not as successful in documenting and setting up mechanisms to monitor the impact of Project activities on individual women beneficiaries during and after the Project's lifespan.

What were critical gaps in respect to delivery of the programme and effects of Covid-19?

The critical gaps related to human resources, field presence and unclear division of responsibilities among project partners.

Three gaps were identified that negatively affected delivery. First, the lack of a Senior Project Coordinator based in Juba throughout the Project and the high staff turnover deteriorated the otherwise well-structured coordination mechanism between project stakeholders. The limited field presence in Wau led to seconding to NRC of most field level activities without capitalising fully on the technical expertise, global experience, and convening capacity available to UN-Habitat and FAO. Third, some inconsistency in the division of responsibilities between FAO and UN-Habitat in the Project Document (Out-put 2.3, to be implemented by FAO using a UN-Habitat tool) eventually led to the output not being delivered.

COVID-19 exacerbated these challenges by minimising the Partners' presence on the field, increasing staff turnover, and becoming a barrier to a collaboration that was often based on trust and personal relationships built over time i.

However, the strategies put in place to mitigate COVID-19 effects under the partnership with NRC in Wau seem to be effective and allowed the outreach and awareness-raising activities to continue.

9. LESSONS LEARNT

The Project learnt important lessons, especially the space for land dialogue and reforms at national, state and local levels. The lessons learnt are derived from the findings and conclusions and help inform the evaluation's recommendations.

- **The Project was received much better than what could have been expected in a highly fragile and conservative context like Wau. The space exists to discuss women's land rights in general and in the context of return.** There is a higher-than-expected level of understanding among policymakers and community leaders of how addressing women's land rights can actively contribute to peace consolidation and resilience building. Strong champions among policymakers can contribute significantly to the advancement of women's land rights.
- **Women and their communities are often unaware of their land rights or how to secure them.** There is a need to educate the public, specifically those actors such as policy makers, traditional leaders, or administrators who can become champions for women's land rights. However, targeting women alone is not enough.
- **The Land Administration system is not equipped to advance women's land rights. Still, an incremental approach can help Government counterparts and local authorities address immediate gaps while strengthening the system itself.** The land administration system is outdated and dysfunctional, with an enormous capacity gap between the community and state levels and limited operational capacity, leading to a weak tenure governance system unable to protect people's rights to land. Under the Project, small operational measures were adopted that already increased transparency and accountability. An incremental approach can help Government counterparts and local authorities find the solutions that best address their immediate challenges and act as building blocks for a more robust future land governance and administration systems. To achieve this, specialised technical and policy capacity on urban and rural land is absolutely necessary.
- **Land adjudication and registration processes can often not be completed within the Projects' lifespan.** In fragile and highly complex environments, pilot initiatives to secure tenure rights must be incremental, focusing on immediate results and avoiding long term risks. Rushing into adjudication or formal registration in the absence of a sound land governance system or without enough awareness of rights among the public will raise false expectations of durable and final results regarding tenure security among beneficiaries.
- **Incremental improvements are better than false expectations.** The project had raised high hope for women toward definitive economic empowerment through land access. But the beneficiaries consulted were not able to secure all required land documents. Those who have not received land titles are wary of the inevitable loss of their land to corrupt chiefs and state land officials since the project has ended. They have no knowledge of the status of their land titles, and the continued uncertainty of their land titles increases the risk of traumatic degeneration.
- **Proper documentation is the key to learning, assessing impact, and increasing sustainability and adaptation.** In a country where people often lack identification documents, in the absence of complete records of project beneficiaries, it is very difficult to verify and monitor how their tenure security situation evolves. The failure to establish a system to document the activities' impact and enable local authorities to continue following up after the end of the project has undermined not only the capacity to secure the benefits from the project but as well to capitalize on them for purposes of feeding back into the policy discussion or informing the design of subsequent interventions.
- **Projects should avoid creating parallel and more efficient land administration and management processes that have no local ownership because they will not be sustainable.** Implementing land projects in South Sudan is difficult in the absence of developed computerized systems of land administration, registration and documentation. It is critical to plan for realistic activities and possible delays. The primary and most consistent investment should be in strengthening local capacity and structure to drive and eventually take over Project activities. This will be the only avenue to ensure the sustainability of results.
- **Technical capacity must be leveraged by operational capacity.** UN-Habitat and FAO are the only UN Agencies that have the mandate, the relationship with national and local counterparts, and the technical capacity to adequately support land-related initiatives in post-conflict. Yet, their limited operational capacity in the country and Project area has not enabled them to take full advantage of this leverage.

- **Human Resources are the foundation for land tenure project's success in post-conflict.** However, the low level of representation and high turnover of Project staff created a chain of negative effects which reduced efficiency in Project implementation, including: undermining the coordination and collaboration mechanisms that had been envisaged; limiting the technical capacity in Juba and Wau; no delegation of authority in country making more cumbersome administrative processes; no technical representation at the UN Country Team level; no Senior counterpart to advocate for land rights and provide technical advise with Government and partners; limited capacity to identify and capitalise on emerging opportunities in this fragile and rapidly evolving context.

10. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **For future interventions, a Theory of Change that addresses gender dynamics in land administration and governance should include an adequate set of indicators, measurable and verifiable results, and monitoring mechanisms.** Multiple barriers still exist for women to secure tenure. They include weak land policies and laws, inefficient administrative systems, cultural biases against women's ownership of land, etc. The causal relationship between women's empowerment and peace building through increased tenure security and addressing post-conflict resettlement and peace-building must be better captured and further investigated.
2. **Prioritize activities to secure tenure rights that are incremental, appropriate for the local context and capacity, and focused on immediate positive results and longer-term risk management.** In post-conflict environments, embarking on more formal registration processes -especially when not completing them and in the absence of a sound land governance system, has the potential to jeopardize and threaten beneficiaries' future tenure security.
3. **Perform an after-action review in Wau, investigating the current Project beneficiaries' level of tenure security, the actual impact on the level and intensity of conflict of the recordation activities, and the correlations to peace consolidation.** Options must be identified to secure longer-term sustainability of results for individual beneficiaries of land tenure interventions in Wau and embedded in any scale-up effort.
4. **Continue to support land governance reforms at the county, national and state levels, from land policy development to legal framework adjustment.** The discussion and passing of land policies at the national and state will provide a sense of duty and direction to the political leadership to address challenges facing women on land access. Clear legislations with defined rights of surviving spouses, children and administration of deceased estates will protect widows and children from being denied legitimate rights to inherit the estate and properties of their deceased husbands and parents. This will minimize recurring disputes over land that hinders women's rights to accessing land already acquired by their deceased husbands and further minimize court litigation which is costly to economically vulnerable women.
5. **Support the establishment of a coordination mechanism on land (Land Development Partners Group) in South Sudan.** An increasingly large number of stakeholders is engaging with securing tenure rights in South Sudan directly, or to pursue related objectives. The Group will provide a venue for structured dialogue between the Government and the land sector partners; ensure coordination and alignment to Government strategies in the land sector; minimise duplication of efforts; allow the limited technical expertise available in the country to be recognised and made available to a wider audience; act as a catalyst for donors' funding, and ensure land programs contribute to longer-term sustainable national development.
6. **Develop a land indicator to be included as part of the conflict analysis tools used by UNMISS and other partners with a high presence in the field.** There are many different priorities for Government and Partners in emergency and post-conflict contexts. The land is often not one of them, yet it has implications for all aspects, from stabilization to increasing resilience and self-reliance to food and human security. One of the challenges for land programmes in fragile contexts is that the information available is limited and often anecdotal. It is recommended to develop a tool to mainstream land-related data-collection as part of data-collection exercises routinely implemented by stakeholders who have a high operational capacity in post-conflict contexts and help link the data to sound technical and analytical capacity. This will not only improve land programming but as well identify and mitigate land-related risks of any other land-based intervention, actively contributing to conflict mitigation. The tool could be piloted in South Sudan and then adopted in other contexts and would help inform more accurately land activities.

- 7. Budget for a Senior Technical Staff to lead the in-country Project team in the context of highly technical projects in volatile and rapidly changing environments.** He/she will act as technical advisor to Government, strengthening national capacity and ownership over interventions to secure tenure rights, thus increasing future sustainability or results. Will ensure implementing agency/ies capitalise on the results of the Project and fund-raise for follow-up initiatives.

- 8. Explore Fit for purpose innovative partnerships for implementing technical projects in fragile contexts.** While the importance of the technical expertise provided by UN-Habitat and FAO is not debatable, their limited human and operational capacity has not allowed them to capitalise on it fully. New modalities for collaboration should be explored, not to have to choose between technical and operational capacity when assigning the lead on PBF or similarly funded projects in emergency or fragile contexts.

- 9. Realizing women's rights to land for peace-building requires a number of direct and indirect efforts.** Efforts to empower women to overcome physical, cultural, financial and structural barriers they face in obtaining rights to land and property. And efforts to create an enabling environment for women to succeed through building robust data gathering and information management systems; raising awareness on women land rights; promoting women's representation in local, state, regional land planning processes; and strengthening human and land administration capacity for gender-sensitive land governance.

- 10. Prioritize a National Land review process** to provide a basis for legal reform to eliminate inconsistencies and overlapping functions between the different land governance institutions at all levels of government.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: Evaluation TORs

TERMS OF REFERENCE

END-TERM JOINT PROJECT EVALUATION OF WOMEN'S ACCESS TO LAND FOR PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTH SUDAN: 2018-2020.

1. Background and project context

Evaluation represents a key component for the programming cycle of the United Nations. It enhances accountability and learning for stronger performance and results, as defined in the UN Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of the Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation (PPBME- ST/SGB/2016/6). This Terms of Reference is for final project evaluation of women's access to land for peace and development in South Sudan. The Project was approved with a monitoring and evaluation plan, including an independent final evaluation of the Project. It was jointly implemented by UN-Habitat and FAO, during the period of December 2018 to December 2020.

The Project was funded through the UN Secretary General 's Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), under the Gender and Youth Promotion Initiative (GYPI), which is a funds commitment to support the meaningful participation of women, youth people and the marginalised in peace building. It was funded with a total budget of US\$1.5 million. UN-Habitat received US\$ 1 million while FAO received US\$500,000. It was a pilot project that was implemented in Wau County. Wau is one of the towns in South Sudan where about 100,000 Internal Displaced People (IDP) need support to return and integrate into communities. The Project was implemented jointly by UN-Habitat and FAO in coordination with Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) and Ministry of Land, housing and urban development of South Sudan.

The PFB has been funding peace building initiatives since 2006 and it remains the UN-system wide funding mechanism of first resort for peace building initiatives. Focusing on gender and youth is an expression of the PBF's commitment to inclusive peacebuilding. In this context, the project aimed at enhancing women's access to land through capacity building, improving land management and administration systems, and supporting gender responsive land policies. The Project was aligned with the South Sudan National Development Strategy (NDS); the United Nations Cooperation Framework (UNCF), and the Wau response plan towards the creation of a protective and enabling environment for return home of the IDPs.

Although the 2009 South Sudan Land Act provides that men and women should have equal access to land holdings, decades of conflict have led to continued displacement and lack of secure land tenure. This has led to increased land related disputes and land grabbing by local power holders. Various studies have indicated that the common causes of land disputes include squatting, secondary occupation, boundary disputes between individuals and between communities. According to the South Sudan humanitarian needs overview analysis, the number of people displaced since the start of the conflict in 2013 has reached more than 4 million, including 1.9 million IDPs, of which 85% are women and children. The conflict that broke out in Wau in 2016 and 2017 resulted in insecurity and internal displacement of about 100,000 people.

1.2 Description of the Project

There is lack of adequate provisions for women to hold land rights independently of their husbands or male relatives in South Sudan. Both the statutory and customary laws often do not provide for women's independent rights and although the Land Act and draft Policy do exist, there are no clear mechanisms on how some of the provisions can be enforced. This has resulted in women's direct access to land through purchase or inheritance is being limited, yet the majority of women are involved in management and use of land. Another significant barrier for women is that chiefs, magistrates, and other office holders are often not familiar with the right of women to own property, or chose to ignore existing law on the subject. This Project was therefore formulated with the following Theory of change (TOC):

If (1) awareness on Women's Land Rights increases among Wau county people and women are able to claim their rights; and if (2) women leaders and their counterparts in traditional authorities are equipped with appropriate skills and understanding on gender responsive land conflict/dispute resolution; and if (3) land management and administrative system are well managed with appropriate technical capacities within government institutions ; and if (4) women's tenure security is improved by obtaining land occupancy certificate; and if (5) policy makers at national level are committed to implement gender sensitive land policies; **then** (a) women's access to land will be enhanced and will contribute to conflict prevention and peace building in South Sudan; because (b) discrimination against women to own, control and use of land for livelihoods and other activities will be mitigated, and land related grievances would be addressed; and (c) women will be facilitated to return to their place of origin and live peacefully within communities.

The evaluation team should test if the building blocks in the TOC worked under underlying assumptions and external factors that could have been beyond control implementing partners control to achieve the objective of the Project. On overarching question on connection between women's improved access to land tenure and the reduction in land-related conflicts or greater communal peace should be answered by this evaluation.

The Project had the following Expected Accomplishments (outcomes):

Outcome 1: Enhanced Capacity of women groups to demand and secure accountability from Government for women's land rights and equitable access to land.

This outcome was to be achieved through increased awareness among women, communities and traditional leaders on women rights and gender responsive land dispute resolution mechanism; and enhanced skills and understanding on gender responsive land rights.

Outcome 2: Improved Land Management and administrative system at country and state level

This outcome was to be achieved through enhanced skills in gender land management and administration and land dispute resolution, review of existing land management systems to identify obstacles faced by women in accessing land and giving actionable recommendations, and reform of land policy at national level.

Outcome 3: Increased provision of strategic and effective support for gender responsive land policies

This outcome was to be achieved through preparation and adaptation of national land policy and enhanced commitment among national actors for implementation of gender responsive land policies. The Project was also supposed to integrate cross-cutting issues of climate change, gender, human rights and the youth.

Key stakeholders of the Project included the UN-Habitat Regional Office for Africa (ROAF), Ministry of Land, Housing and Urban Development of South Sudan, Food and Agricultural organisation (FAO), United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS), and Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC).

2. Purpose, Objectives and scope of the Evaluation

The end-term project evaluation will be conducted by an independent consultant. It will be both summative and formative, serving purposes of accountability and enhancing learning. It will support accountability on resources used, results achieved and the way they were achieved by implementing partners; enhance learning on what worked, what did not and why; and give insights on future programming and designs of new programmes/projects or replication of the Project in South Sudan.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are to:

- (i) Assess the performance of the Project in terms of the extent to which Project achieved planned results at the outcome and output levels;

- (ii) Assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact, coherence and synergies of the Project;
- (iii) Assess the implementation modalities, including working arrangements and how the Covid-19 situation affected delivery of the Project;
- (iv) Assess how cross-cutting issues of gender equality, youth and human rights and climate change were integrated in the programme;
- (v) Identify lessons and propose recommendations for future programming or replication of such Project;

The evaluation covers the implementation period of the Project, from December 2018 to December 2020. It will focus on assessing the project design, implementation modalities, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability of the programme and its impact. It will identify and analyse constraints, challenges and opportunities for the Project. Further, the evaluation will assess crossing cutting issues of gender equality, human rights, youth and climate change and effects of Covid-19. Ultimately the evaluation will provide lessons learned and recommendations for new projects/programmes and strategies and necessary support for future programming in South Sudan.

3. Evaluation Questions

The evaluation will seek to answer the following overarching evaluation questions:

- (i) To what extent the programme achieved its planned results at output and outcome levels;
- (ii) To what extent women and youth improved access to land tenure and this access brought reduction in land-related conflicts or greater communal peace?
- (iii) To what extent were implementation modalities, collaboration and coordination among key stakeholders appropriate;
- (iv) What were critical gaps in respect to delivery of the programme and effects of Covid-19;
- (v) What were lessons learned, good practices, innovation efforts and recommendations for future programming in South Sudan;

The proposed evaluation questions will be supplemented with sub-questions along the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact and coherence.

Relevance: The extent to which the objective of Project is consistent with the beneficiaries' requirements, national and local needs, priorities, UN-Habitat and donor policies.

- To what extent was the Project relevant to the needs and priorities of geographical target beneficiaries of the Project, and key implementing partners and stakeholders including South Sudan institutions, FAO, UN-Habitat, NRC, UNMISS?
- What extent was the programme aligned with relevant development strategies of South Sudan?
- To what extent was the objective of the Project relevant to support resilience, prevention, and sustainability of peace in Wau County?
- What were UN-Habitat and FAO's comparative advantages and project approach in implementation project compared with other UN entities and key partners?

Effectiveness: The extent to which the project objective was achieved:

- To what extent were women able to successfully claim their land rights in Wau Country? What evidence is there that what was achieved contributed to the objective of women's access to land, land management and administration, and provision of strategic, effective gender responsive land policies?

- To what extent was the traditional leaders capacity strengthened through the Project?
- How effectively were the indicators of achievements on the three outcomes of the Project monitored to provide evidence on performance and flag any necessary adjustments to ensure capturing of necessary data on reduction of land-based conflicts?

Efficiency: A measure of how economically resources/ inputs are converted to results.

- How efficiently were the inputs (financial and human resources), partnerships, policies and implementations strategies used to achieve the planned outputs?
- To what extent did the management structure of the project support efficiency for programme implementation?
- Were activities and outputs delivered in a cost-efficient and timely manner? Specifically, what was the cost efficiency of UN-Habitat and FAO's technical assistance for the development of capacity within South Sudan?

Sustainability: The continuation of benefits from Project after pilot project completed.

- Were the results achieved sustainable?
- To what extent capacity developed to ensure sustainability of the results and benefits achieved?
- What accountability and oversight systems were established to secure the benefits from the Project?

Impact: Positive and negative long-term effects produced by Project, intended or unintended.

- What positive changes have occurred because of the Project?
- What were unintended effects, if any, of the Project?

Coherence: The consistency of the Project with other stakeholders interventions in the same context and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort.

- Was the Project coherent and implemented in synergy with other capacity building and land management and administration projects?
- Was the Project coherent or complement other donors' development interventions?

Social inclusion and environmental issues: The extent to which the Project integrated needs of different groups and promoted social inclusion and environmental issues.

- To what extent were the environmental and social inclusion issues of gender, human rights, climate and youth considerations integrated in project design, implementation, monitoring and reporting on the programme?
- Are there any outstanding examples of how these issues were successfully applied in the Project?

4. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

Approach

The evaluation will be conducted in line with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for evaluation in Nations System. The evaluation consultant will decide on the concreted approach and methodology, considering the COVID-19 situation. It is anticipated that the evaluation will apply results-based approach (Theory of Change).

The evaluation team will review and analyse the Project's Theory of Change (TOC) and reconstruct it (if necessary) to ensure that the problem the Project was to address, the objective it intended to achieve through the building blocks of its activities, outputs and outcomes, under the underlying assumptions and risks; and the external factors that could have been beyond the control of the Project were well understood. The evaluation team will then test and verify whether the theoretical chain of building blocks and underlying assumptions hold true during the implementation of the Project to enhance women's access to land and contributed to peace building and conflict

prevention in Wau county. The evaluation should also use participatory and utilisation focused approach, to enhance the utilisation of evaluation results and engagement of the stakeholders in the evaluation process.

Methodology

- (i) The Evaluation needs to be evidence-based and be able to demonstrate triangulated evidence from a variety of methods used, including desk review, interviews and surveys. Desk review of relevant documents, including project document, work plans, progress and monitoring reports, cooperation agreements, activity reports, financial reports, training and capacity building reports and materials, publications, outreach and communication materials, website, etc should be able to provide secondary data on answering the evaluation questions.
- (ii) Key informant interviews and consultations with donors, beneficiaries and implementing partners project managers and those involved in project delivery will provide primary qualitative data
- (iii) Surveys, if deemed feasible may provide both quantitative information and qualitative information on stakeholders' views and perceptions.
- (iv) Field visits are not going to be feasible in this Covid-19 situation.

5. Stakeholder Involvement

The evaluation will be participatory and involving key stakeholders. Stakeholders will be kept informed of the evaluation processes including design, data collection and evaluation reporting and results dissemination. Some key stakeholders will be involved in online interviews and surveys and those involved will be given opportunity to comment on evaluation deliverables.

6. Management and Conduct of the Evaluation

The evaluation will be conducted by an international evaluation consultant. Impartiality is an important principle of evaluation because it ensures credibility of the evaluation and avoids a conflict of interest. For this purpose, those officers responsible for design and implementation of the Project will not manage the evaluation process. The Independent Evaluation Unit in consultation with FAO Evaluation Office will manage the evaluation process, ensuring that the evaluation is conducted by a suitable evaluator, providing technical support and advice on methodology, explaining evaluation process and standards, ensuring contractual requirements are met, approving all deliverables (TOR, Inception Report, Draft and Final Evaluation Report), sharing the evaluation results, supporting use and follow-up of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations.

The project implementation Team will be responsible for supporting the evaluation by providing information and documentation required as well as providing contacts of stakeholders to be consulted to provide evaluation information.

The Evaluation Reference Group, will be established as a consultative mechanism and will have representatives of FAO and UN-Habitat Evaluation Offices, ROAF, PBF and representative of other implementing partners to oversee the evaluation process, maximise the relevance, credibility, quality, uptake and use of the evaluation. Responsibilities of the ERG will include:

- Acting as source of knowledge for the evaluation;
- Assisting in identifying other stakeholders to be consulted during the evaluation process;
- Participating in meetings of the reference group;
- Providing input and quality assurance on the key evaluation products: TOR, inception and draft evaluation report; and
- Participating in validation meeting of the final evaluation report.

7. Qualifications of the Lead Evaluator

Education

- At least a master's degree in international development, social sciences, public administration, land management, municipal governance, statistics, information technology, project management, evaluation or related fields.

Work experience and knowledge requirements

- Extensive evaluation experience. The consultant should have ability to present credible findings derived from evidence and putting conclusions and recommendations supported findings.
- A minimum of 6 years of professional practical experience in results-based management working with projects/ programmes.
- International track record of project evaluation work for different organisations and familiar with United Nations and UN-Habitat's mandate.
- Peacebuilding and conflict resolution
- Land tenure and gender equality

Language

- Excellent proficiency in spoken and written English is required.

8. Work Schedule/ Time Frame

The evaluation will be conducted over the period from September to December 2021. A negotiated lumpsum will be paid to the consultants upon satisfactory delivery of specified deliverables. The evaluation team is expected to prepare inception report that will operationalise the evaluation. The provisional timetable is as follows. Due to the Covid-19 related restrictions on travel, interviews and consultantions will be by remote and there will be no field visit related travels.

Time Frame

| # | Task Description | Sept 021 | | | | October 2021 | | | | November 2021 | | | | December 2021 | | | | |
|---|---|----------|---|---|---|--------------|---|---|---|---------------|---|---|---|---------------|---|---|---|--|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | | | |
| 3 | Inception Phase Request for documentation and review | | | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Data collection Phase Conduct interview Implement surveys | | | | | | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Report writing and review phase | | | | | | | | | | X | X | X | X | | | | |
| 6 | Finalisation of the evaluation report | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | X | X | |

9. Deliverables

The three primary deliverables for this evaluation are:

- a) **Inception Report** /evaluation work plan. Once approved, it will become the key management document for guiding the evaluation process. The inception report shall include background and context, evaluation purpose and objectives, evaluation matrix, approach, including the Theory of Change, and methods, limitations to the evaluation, proposed outline of the evaluation report, as well as work schedule and delivery dates of key evaluation deliverables.
- b) **Draft Evaluation Report**. The evaluator will prepare a draft evaluation report (s). The draft(s) should follow UN-Habitat's standard format for evaluation reports (the format will be provided). The format is intended to help guide the structure and main contents of evaluation reports .
- c) **Final Evaluation Report**. A final evaluation report of not more than 50 pages, including Executive Summary, but excluding Annexes, will be prepared in English. The report should be technically easy to comprehend for non-evaluation specialists.

Resources

The evaluation consultants will be paid an evaluation fee based on the level of expertise and experience. DSA is not expected due to restrictions on travel due to Covid-19.

ANNEX 2: List of informant interviews

| Project stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries | | Names and contacts | Type of interview (in person, phone, skype) |
|--|--|--|---|
| Project team | Team | 1. Thomas Chiramba 2. Grace Nyoka | Skype Phone |
| | UN-Habitat Regional Office | 3. Oumar Sylla | Phone |
| | GLTN | 4. Hellen Ndungu 5. Evelyne Naeresiae | Skype Phone |
| | FAO | 6. Meshack Malo | Skype |
| Partners | NRC | 7. Anne Ngunu 8. Thiep Mayuot Deng | In person Phone |
| | PBF Secretariat | | |
| | IOM /former RCO | 9. Benjamin Moore | Zoom |
| | Land Commission | 10. Hon. Robert Lado | |
| Counterparts state | State Ministry of Physical Infrastructure | | |
| | Technical Officers | | |
| | Others? | | |
| Beneficiaries WAU | Women returnees who obtained a certificate of land occupancy | 11. Carmela Augustino Yandatu 12. Margaret Stephen Ulau 13. Vowudu Alfred Shaleh 14. Ijur Chol Makeny 15. Angelina Victor Edwar Achuil Dur 16. Achuei Bol Lau 17. Lucia Thomas Ngerezo Noro 18. Thereza John Manfreto 19. Bakhita Alim Chok 20. Jashinta Gabriel Gilo 21. Rebecca Elario Kano 22. Veronica Arkangelo Ufo 23. Amalia Philip Nuri 24. Christina Ferino Kang 25. Helena Michael Juma 26. Martha Juma Unango 27. Abuk Mawien Guot 28. Angelina Nyibol Atak 29. Mary Aduak Atak 30. Stella Deng Akech 31. Viola ThiepMalek 32. Lusia Peter Urai 33. Mary Achu Ugauak 34. Adut Ugundo Ubana | |
| | Local Government Officers | | |
| | Traditional authorities | 35. James Mungu | |

| | | | |
|--|-----------|---|--|
| | | 36. Malek Uchalla 37. Mathew Charles 38. William Mayuen Yel | |
| | Local CSO | 39. James Kulang Nyariel | |

ANNEX 3: Data collection instruments

The approach to the evaluation is guided by the ToR as well as evaluation principles and good practices as established in OECD/DAC Principles. The evaluation model and its methodological framework are designed with the purpose to understand what works well and under which conditions, so that lessons can be learned going forward. The approach will ensure that the evaluation addresses the needs and requirements of the EU, adheres to OECD quality standards, avoid risks related to the information gathering process and produces a final product with coherent and thorough analysis.

The evaluation adopts a mixed-method, evidence-based approach, combining qualitative and quantitative data.

The UN-Habitat evaluation methodology will be applied. The analysis will use the standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability. Impact will not be measured for the mid-term evaluation as this Project is ongoing and no impact is considered as long as the Project has not been finished. Additionally, the evaluation will pay attention to the 3 C's (complementarity, coherence and coordination), to EU added value and visibility and to relevant cross-cutting issues such as gender equality. Given that gender is a key issue in the Pakistani context, the evaluation will seek to identify the extent to which it is mainstreamed and integrated into the Project and how it is effectively implemented. This will be achieved by integrating gender considerations into the evaluation process, from the selection of data collection tools (e.g. the discussion/interview structure) with due consideration to the local context and conditions to a gender balanced targeting of key informants and stakeholders selected for the consultation (though challenging given the local cultural and religious context).

Data analysis and collection methods

The following data collection and analysis methods will be used as part of the methodology:

Documentation analysis:

Desk review of primary and secondary data will be used to strengthen causal relationships, based on a mixed-methods approach. An in-depth desk review will enable the evaluators to contextualise the primary data and to reach a deeper understanding of the issues at stake. Multiple sources will be consulted to provide for a variety of perspectives and minimise threats to evaluability. The evaluation will assess the available desk evidence through:

Background documents: EC and partners' policies or guidelines; other ongoing projects documents; press articles and academic publications.

Project documents: Contract and possible amendments; budgets; financial reports; project documents/description of the Project; logical framework; indicators; the communication and visibility plan.

Progress/monitoring reports: Interim reports; minutes of Steering Committees; minutes of coordination meetings (between EU Delegations, national and local authorities, and other agencies); activity reports; table of achievements versus objectives; monitoring reports; EC independent monitoring reports; monitoring mission reports; evaluation reports of project activities, if available. A ROM Review was conducted in March 2019, the conclusions and recommendations of which will only be partially referred to because the Project had only recently started real implementation following long delays; and because of the lack of substantial analysis of the fundamentals that this MTR is endeavouring to address.

Semi-structured interviews with key informants: Interviews with the project management team and interviews of key informants outside of management are among the sources of information for the evaluation. The selection process of the informants will be based on the stakeholder mapping. Key informant interviews will serve to collect and triangulate information on the main issues outlined in the evaluation matrix and to identify causalities, validating hypotheses and key assumptions, and bridging information gaps. This approach is subject to significant reservations. Land Tenancy is highly sensitive at various levels as district representatives, landowners and final beneficiaries have conflicting interests. We will conduct working sessions with FAO senior management, FAO social mobilisers and fieldworkers, provincial authorities, district authorities, landowners and final beneficiaries.

Consultation with counterparts and beneficiaries:

The political and social context is highly sensitive, with the interests of the political class and landowners pitted against those of the Haris. The social and economic status of the latter along with their dependence from the former will almost certainly result in the focus group meetings yielding little relevant and useful information, since the Haris will be reluctant to speak out – out of fear to lose their income generating potential. For this reason, we will actively engage with individuals on a strictly confidential basis outside of the general meetings described above, in their villages and preferably in their households.

Direct observation of activities in the field / on site.

Sampling: will be representative and purposeful, i.e. the selection of persons to be interviewed is based on considerations by the evaluators and the project team about the potential value of the information. Last-minute deviations from the official schedule are planned in order to avoid manipulation by the implementing agency.

As with all mixed-method evaluations, this evaluation will rely on triangulation of sources, methods, researchers, and analytical approaches, to ensure the robustness of the findings and verification of data. The evaluators will triangulate the data and draw on multiple sources to ensure that findings are not the result of bias or views of a single agency or single type of actor involved in the response. The following types of triangulation will be used:

Source triangulation: comparing information from different sources, e.g. perspectives of different stakeholder groups defined through the stakeholder mapping.

Method triangulation: comparing information collected by different methods, e.g. interviews, document reviews and impact/outcome analyses.

Geographic triangulation: comparing information collected from the various districts, to ensure that emerging findings can be generalised and are not confined to a particular area context.

In addition to learning and accountability purposes, the inclusion of stakeholder perspectives is important for grounding the evaluation within the institutional context and for triangulation and validation purposes. Confidentiality is guaranteed for every single person interviewed. No person will be identified by name, function, and position or otherwise, and no information provided shall be shared with others.

ANNEX 4: List of documents consulted

1. Concept note
2. Project documents (PBF, UN-Habitat)
 - a. PBF Concept Note
 - b. PBF Project Document
 - c. No Cost Extension
3. Project reports
 - a. PBF Project Progress Report (3)
 - b. PBF Project Financial Report (3)
 - c. PBF Project Final Report
 - d. NRC Final Narrative report
4. Partners Agreements
 - a. In house Agreement GLTN
 - b. Agreement of Cooperation NRC
 - c. MoU with Voice of Hope
5. Baseline and other surveys
 - a. Baseline study report on Women's land rights in South Sudan, Produced by Marc Wegerif for UN Habitat, January 2020
 - b. Beneficiary selection criteria
6. Activities reports (workshops, trainings, awareness raising meetings, etc.)
 - a. CRITERIA FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF WOMEN WITH SPECIFIC NEEDS FOR HOUSING, LAND & PROPERTY SOUTH SUDAN, ENHANCING WOMEN'S ACCESS TO LAND TO CONSOLIDATE PEACE IN SOUTH SUDAN ,WORKSHOP REPORT, 4 - 5 DECEMBER 2019, UNIVERSAL GAB HOTEL - WAU, SOUTH SUDAN
 - b. Open Tenure 07May2020- Overview (Presentation)
 - c. Webinar on "Women land rights and sustaining peace in South Sudan (Recording and Presentation) 19Nov2020
7. Training /outreach material
 - a. Concept note Training on Gender sensitive Land Dispute Resolution Mechanisms and Land management/administration
 - b. Gender Responsive Land Dispute Resolution (Curriculum, Presentation)
 - c. Wau Land Disputes Resolution Map (Leaflet – chiefs level)
 - d. Wau Land Disputes Resolution Map (Leaflet – state level)
 - e. Land disputes in South Sudan (Presentation)
 - f. Process to obtain rural land (Leaflet)
 - g. Process to obtain urban land (Leaflet)
 - h. ICLA client registration form
8. Attendance lists and participants contacts
 - a. Selected land certification intervention beneficiaries
 - b. Webinar participants
 - c. Land Administration training participants
 - d. Women land rights training participants
 - e. List of 162 identified landless women (no contacts, no means to verify)
9. Beneficiaries list and contacts
10. Land administration recommendations report
 - a. Land Governance and Peacebuilding in South Sudan: Gender Dynamics, Challenges and Opportunities
11. Land disputes resolution recommendations and plan of action
12. FAO, 2016, GUIDANCE NOTE Land and people in protracted crises Building stability on the land