

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

FOR



PBF END OF PROJECT EVALUATION IN SOUTH SUDAN - "PROTECTING WOMEN AND GIRLS IN SOUTH SUDAN: ADDRESSING GENDER BASED VIOLENCE (GBV) AS CATALYST FOR PEACE PROJECT" SOUTH SUDAN

FRIDAY 26TH NOVEMBER, 2021

FUNDED BY UNITED NATION PEACEBUILDING FUND (PBF)



United Nations
Peacebuilding
Peacebuilding Fund

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	4
0.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
1.0 INTRODUCTION AND OPERATIONAL CONTEXT	10
1.1 Project Introduction	10
1.2 Organizational Background	11
1.2.1 UN joint project 'Protecting women and girls in South Sudan: Addressing GBV as catalyst for peace'	11
1.3 Project Operational Context	11
1.3.1 The Context of GBV in South Sudan	12
1.4 The Project Theory of Change (ToC)	13
1.4.1 The Theory of Change Critical Assumptions	13
2.0 EVALUATION RATIONALE, PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE	20
2.1 Rational for the End of Project Evaluation	20
2.2 Purpose of the Evaluation	20
2.2 Evaluation Objectives	20
2.3 Evaluation Scope	20
3.0 TECHNICAL APPROACH AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	21
3.1 Technical Evaluation Approach	21
3.2 Data Collection Methodologies	22
3.3 Design of Data Collection Tools	23
3.4 Data Processing and Analysis	23
3.5 Study Limitations	24
3.6 Ethical Considerations	24
4.0 EVALUATION FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	25
4.1 The project relevance, appropriateness and strategic positioning	25
4.2 Effectiveness of the Project	28
4.2.1 Project Outcome and Output Indicators Assessment	29
4.3 Efficiency of the Project	38
4.4 Likelihood of Project Impact	40
The Project Contribution Structural Institutional and Societal Changes	40
4.5 Project Sustainability	44
4.6 Coherence of the Project	45
4.7 Project Coverage	45
4.9 Good Practice	49
4.10 Lessons Learnt	49
5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	51
5.1 Conclusions	51
5.2 Recommendations	51
APPENDICES:	54
Appendix 1: Performance Achievement	54

Appendix2: List of KIIs and FGD participants 57

 CC Programme Consultant 57

Appendix 3: Terms of Reference (ToR) 60

Appendix 2: PBF End of Project Evaluation Work Plan and Timelines..... 77

Appendix 3: Qualitative Study Tools – KIIs and FGD Guides 79

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AIRD	African Initiative for Rural Development
ACDF	Action for Children Development Foundation –South Sudan
ARC	American Refugee Committee (International NGO)
CAGs	Community Action Groups
CO	Country Office
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DPP	Directorate of Public Prosecutions
FGDs	Focus Group Discussions
FPC	Family Protection Centre
GBV	Gender Based Violence
GoSS	Government of South Sudan
HDC	Humanitarian and Development Consortium
HACT	Humanitarian Aid for Change and Transformation
IDIs	In-depth Interviews
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
IPs	Implementing Partners
IPV	Intimate Partner Violence
IRC	International Rescue Committee
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
UNCF	United Nations Cooperation Framework
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNMISS	United Nations Mission in South Sudan
UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment
UNSCR	United Nations Security Council Resolution
UNYMPDA	Upper Nile Youth Mobilization for Peace and Development Agency
MoH	Ministry of Health
MoGCSW	Ministry of Gender, Child and Social Welfare
MoJCA,	Ministry of Justice and Judicial Affairs,
JCC	Justice and Confidence Centre
JP	United Nations Joint Programme
JoSS	Judiciary of South Sudan
KIIs	Key Informant Interviews
PBF	Peacebuilding Fund
PPA	Public Prosecutor Attorney
PSUs	Primary Sampling Units
PSS	Psycho-Social Support
PSEA	Protection against Sexual Exploitation and Abuse
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OSC	One Stop Centre
R-ARCSS	Revitalized Agreement for Resolution of Conflict in South Sudan
RCO	Resident Coordinator’s Office

SGBV	Sexual and Gender Based Violence
SOP	Standard Operating Procedures
SPU	Special Protection Unit
SSNPS	South Sudan National Police Service
TGoNU	Transitional Government of National Unity
ToC	Theory of Change
TOR	Terms of Reference
WEC	Women's Empowerment Centre
WHO	World Health Organization

o.o EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Four United Nations (UN) Agencies including United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) as lead agency, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (UN WOMEN) led the direct and indirect implementation of a joint three-year project '*Protecting Women and Girls in South Sudan: Addressing Gender Based Violence (GBV) as Catalyst for Peace*' from September 2018. The project which was funded by the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund (UN PBF) to a tune of US\$ 3,000,000 as part of the UN Joint Programme on prevention of and addressing gender-based violence (2017-2020) scheduled to end in February 2021 but with approved 6 months no-cost extension until August 2021 to complete implementation of the activities. The project aimed at addressing the alarming situation of Gender Based Violence - that is driven by gender inequality, deep patriarchal beliefs, values and norms; civil and inter-communal conflicts and weak institutional and technical capacities to prevent and respond to GBV through an integrated approach to achieve increased empowerment of women in South Sudan by strengthening prevention mechanisms for GBV and transforming harmful social norms into positive behavior that promotes gender equality in Bor, Aweil and Akobo areas of South Sudan.

The project entailed provision of life-saving integrated services through One Stop Centers /Family Protection Centers in Aweil, Bor and Akobo; strengthening women's groups participation in local peace processes in Bor, Aweil and Akobo and increase civic engagement on GBV Prevention and response; increasing access to justice mechanisms for the GBV survivors; and transforming communities' harmful social norms that contribute to GBV into positive norms that promote gender equality.

The evaluation results were to demonstrate accountability to stakeholders on performance in achieving development results and on invested resources; support evidence-based decision making on the progress made against the results outlined; and contribute key lessons learned to the existing knowledge base on how to carry forward and possibly upscale the gains made through the intervention. This was to be achieved through two objectives: to provide the project participating agencies, national stakeholders with an independent assessment of the performance of the project and key lessons learned, based on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project towards the expected outputs and outcomes set forth in the results framework and to draw key lessons from past and current cooperation and provide a set of clear and forward-looking options leading to strategic and actionable recommendations for the next project.

The evaluation adopted a participatory, mixed methods and a theory-based approach that relied on an explicit theory of change, which depicted how the interventions supported by the project were expected to contribute to a series of results (outputs and outcomes) that would lead to the overall goal of the project. The evaluation followed the SWAP and Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)/ Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria - *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, coverage, coherence and well as cross-cutting issues of Gender Equality and Human Rights*. The evaluation data was mainly collected through desk research, key informant interviews, focus group discussions and observation, case study.

The evaluation determined that the project was relevant to the needs of the target beneficiaries and its objectives were in sync with the Government of South Sudan policies, the implementing UN Agencies policies and the donor (PBF) policies and objectives as it was the link between Fund and UN. The evaluation established that despite the contextual changes and COVID-19 challenges, the project achieved its purpose through key output indicators, though there were inadequate data to determine the achievement of the outcome indicators. The project was effective as demonstrated by the following key findings:

- 87%, women's perception of their inclusion and equality in society;
- 2,126, the number of GBV survivors accessing and using the integrated GBV services in One Stop Centre against a target of 1,000;
- 2, the number of GBV One Stop Centers established and operational against a target of 2;
- 152, number of service providers with increased skills and other capacity in providing integrated response services against a target of 100;
- 54,980, number of People (SADD) which are aware of the existence and services of the One Stop Centre in the intervention areas against a target of 20,000;
- 5, number of advocacy issues raised by women through 5 peace huts initiatives on early marriage, wife inheritance, property ownership, girl-child education and revenge killings;
- 441, number of women and girls trained on facilitation skills on women participation in peace process against a target of 350;
- 33.7%, of cases prosecuted to completion against a target of 5%;
- 85%, of target population that views GBV as less acceptable after participating in the Community perception survey against a target of 75%;
- 20, number of community action groups addressing GBV, peacebuilding, social cohesion and social norms and negative cultural practices against a target of 16;
- 200, number of trained community action group members with increased knowledge on addressing negative social norms, & increasing women and girls' engagement in peace building and social cohesion against a target of 200;
- 16, number of implemented community action plans addressing peace building, social cohesion and negative social and cultural norms and practices that contribute to GBV against a target of 16;
- 173,400 number of people (women, men, girls and boys) reached through weekly and monthly community dialogues and awareness raising on social norms, peace building, reconciliation, stigma reduction and GBV prevention and response against a target of 30,000.

The evaluation through the primary and secondary data were all these assumptions in the theory of change were found to hold.

Good practices

- Inception joint project design and joint field mission assessment and service mapping and regular interagency coordination meetings contributed to the success of the project as well.
- Flexibility of the project to cover hitherto uncovered areas such as – Akobo and the project replication of the interventions in Akobo.

- The role of Special Protection Units in handling of SGBV related incidents was one of the key good practices
- Use of a hotline number for GBV case reporting and management.
- Integration of GBV, peacebuilding and aspects of livelihood programming.
- The innovation and ability to adopt and integrate the COVID19 messaging in the programme.
- The 'Joint learning exchanges and programming' was phenomenal in that it is rare for UN agencies to come together in designing, planning, commissioning, monitoring and evaluation of one project. This was one of the biggest joint programs in South Sudan with four UN agencies coming together for joint envisioning and implementation and regularly meeting and learning from each other.

Lessons learnt

- Partnership and collaborations of the relevant MGAs and local community leaders in programming provided an entry point to the community ensuring project acceptability and ownership resulting in achievement of results and desired impacts to the beneficiaries with enhanced sustainability.
- Strengthened positive working relationship with government counterparts, through their dedication by achieving results under trying circumstances. A key lesson learned is the critical importance of maintaining and building upon these relationships, in order to sustain and further improve results for ending GBV, child protection, social cohesion and sustainable peace strengthen the engagement of communities with the government and local authorities.
- Enhanced coordination is crucial and important for a multi-agency programming – despite the success of this project it could have been more organized if there was better coordination between the national and field level.

The following key recommendations were made based on the evaluation findings;

- a. The need for continued capacity building for the different community GBV and peace structures on change advocacy, conflict resolution and leadership skills, and more practical-focused areas such as change on negative social norms, mediation and reconciliation, and peace building.
- b. The need to form a consortium of all the participating agencies and implementers for harmonized start of activities, enhance networking by local IPs, knowledge sharing and learning, and ensure ease of reporting results.
- c. There is need to influence power structures transformation particularly patriarchal moral and social orders and notions of "hyper-masculinity," which in South Sudan are heavily impacted by bride wealth-based local economies, denial of resources, to reduce on the drivers of GBVs and conflicts.
- d. Longer term consistence funding, and where possible a multi-donor funds is necessary to support peace-building initiatives and to provide a space for dialogue, healing and reconciliation, which in the long run could lead to cohesion and peaceful co-existence
- e. There should be effective implementation and administration of legal frameworks, policy and strategies e.g. the National GBV Strategy, a National Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for GBV which have been developed to guide the implementation of the prevention and response to GBV.

- f. It is critical for all the project implementing partners to integrate gender-based violence and peacebuilding into their programming in order to enhance effectiveness of the project for better results.
- g. There is need for a joint roving M&E officer for the effective and timely monitoring and tracking of results as well as capacity assessment and enhancement of the IPs on project monitoring and management since M&E is the basis for strengthening the understanding around the many multilayered factors underlying GBV.

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND OPERATIONAL CONTEXT

1.1 Project Introduction

Since September 2019, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (UN Women) in collaboration with international¹ and national² NGOs have been implementing the Peace Building Fund (PBF) project, *"Protecting Women and Girls in South Sudan: Addressing Gender Based Violence (GBV) as Catalyst for Peace"* which is part of the United Nations Joint Programme (JP) on prevention of and addressing gender-based violence (2017-2020) supported by Peacebuilding Fund.

The project was implemented from September 2019 to February 2021, with a total budget of US\$ 3,000,000, aimed at addressing the alarming situation of Gender Based Violence (GBV) - driven by gender inequality, deep patriarchal beliefs, values and norms; civil and inter-communal conflicts and weak institutional and technical capacities to prevent and respond to GBV. Through an integrated approach to achieve increased empowerment of women in South Sudan by strengthening prevention mechanisms for GBV and transforming harmful social norms into positive behavior that promotes gender equality in Bor, Aweil and Akobo areas of South Sudan. The project entails:

- (i) Provision of life-saving integrated services through One Stop Centers (OSC)/Family Protection Centers (FPC) in Aweil, Bor and Akobo,
- (ii) Strengthening women's groups participation in local peace processes in Bor, Aweil and Akobo and increase civic engagement on GBV Prevention and response,
- (iii) Increasing access to justice mechanisms for the GBV survivors, and,
- (iv) Transforming communities' harmful social norms that contribute to GBV into positive norms that promote gender equality.

In line with its mandate, the PBF project contract stipulates to conduct an end of project evaluation. The project had a life cycle from September 2019 to February 2021 with a no cost extension of 6 months to August 2021. This prompted the contracting entity, UNFPA, as a lead agency, to publish the request for proposals (RFP) and terms of reference (TOR) for the end of project evaluation on the relief web³ on 18th June 2021. This was followed by rigorous selection process for competent consultancy firm or individual to lead the evaluation process which is to be implemented in line with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards and international good practice for evaluation, which offers step-by-step guidance to prepare methodologically robust evaluations and sets out the roles and responsibilities of key evaluation stakeholders at all stages in the evaluation process.

¹ INTERSOS, CARE, ALIGHT,

² ADAFIN, StewardWomen, IMA, Upper Nile Youth Mobilization for Peace and Development Agency (UNYMPDA), African Initiative for Rural Development (AIRD), Action for Children Development Foundation –South Sudan (ACDF), Humanitarian Aid for Change and Transformation (HACT) and Upper Nile

³<https://reliefweb.int/job/3748172/pbf-end-project-evaluation-national-consultant>

1.2 Organizational Background

1.2.1 UN joint project 'Protecting women and girls in South Sudan: Addressing GBV as catalyst for peace'

The UN joint project brought together 4 UN agencies to deliver on the prevention and response to GBV, recognizing that it is a part of the Revitalized Agreement for Resolution of Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan, National development strategy of South Sudan, the UNSCR 1325 and its National Action Plan and the UN Nations Peacebuilding plan, all advocating for and promoting Women, Peace and Security agenda; peacebuilding, Gender equality and respect for, and protection of, human rights and fundamental freedoms is at the core of the resolutions. This project further contributes to progress on the implementation of Agenda 2030 on Sustainable Development, particularly on goals 5 (gender equality and women's empowerment) and 16 (peace, justice and strong institutions) by strengthening women's participation at all levels (target 5.5), addressing violence against women (target 5.2) and strengthening the promotion of the rule of law and access to justice for all (target 16.3).

The project, contributes to the four priority areas of the UN Joint GBV Programme, 1) Increased access to health & psychosocial support services, 2) Protection and security, 3) Justice and Rule of law, 4) Community engagement & social norms; and considers existing GBV interventions coordinated under the GBV sub-cluster mechanism.

1.3 Project Operational Context

South Sudan being one of the world's newest nations having attained independence a decade ago (July 9, 2011) is still characterised with protracted and unprecedented conflicts reversing some of the gains that have been made since independence. The dire situation of protracted and ongoing conflict in South Sudan has a profound impact on individuals and communities as it has further weakened and destabilized coping mechanisms, GBV prevention and response systems, and peace building initiatives.⁴ Limited capacity and participation of women in local peace processes and activities geared towards social cohesion has been exacerbated by the wide spread acceptance of gender inequality and gender based violence in South Sudan.⁵ This is in herence notwithstanding availability of policies to streamline gender issues, for instance the vision for the abridged version of National Gender Policy Strategic Plan (2013-2018) was to "have a country that is just and free from all forms of discrimination and violence; in which women, men and children enjoy their human rights on the basis of equality and non-discrimination in all spheres of life".⁶ Political representation of women in South Sudan both at the National and State levels is still low at 26.3⁷ notwithstanding the 35% affirmative action for South Sudan which was passed during IGAD Peace Agreement in Addis Ababa to increase women's political participation and representation in the executive arm of the Transitional Government of National Unity (TGoNU) and establishment of critical transitional institutions.⁸ The transitional constitution includes rights protection of children and women. "*Women are the peace makers and are in opportune*

⁴ Protecting Women and Girls in South Sudan-Revised for submission 12 June.2019

⁵ UN Cooperation Framework-South Sudan (2017)

⁶ National Gender Policy Strategic Plan (2013-2018), Ministry of Gender, Children & Social Welfare, Republic of South Sudan

⁷ UN Cooperation Framework-South Sudan (2017)

⁸ IGAD (17 August 2015), Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

positions to discourage husbands and men to end fighting". Women need to be supported and educated through adult education.⁹The September 2018 Revitalized Agreement for Resolution of Conflict in South Sudan (R-ARCSS) signed in September 2018 serves as a fundamental guide to the project title: "Protecting Women and Girls in South Sudan: Addressing GBV as a Catalyst for peace", as it provides a national framework *Chapter 2* and *5* of the peace agreements prioritizes efforts on GBV prevention and response to which this project aligns.¹⁰

1.3.1 The Context of GBV in South Sudan

Gender-based violence (GBV) is one of the most critical threats to the protection and wellbeing of women and children in South Sudan as a whole and the situation is more critical at the states level.¹¹ Culture and traditions have not been kind to women in South Sudan and in particular Jonglei State since disparities between men and women, especially in the areas of power sharing and decision making, legal rights and access to and control over productive resources are the key to imbalanced gender relations not only in the urban South Sudan but also the rural setting.¹² The social conditions resulted in high insecurity for women and girls and overall risks faced by women, specifically regarding women healthcare, access to economic resources, customary practices, domestic violence and sexual violence remained the most frequently reported protection concerns, women and girls are often at risks outside of the home due to their household role of finding alternative sources of livelihoods such as collecting wild foods outside of the settlements and farming. Instances of rape of school girls and child marriage are sporadic.¹³

According to Gender Based Violence Information Management System (GBVIMS) annual report 2019, a total of 7,931 GBV incidents were reported during the year, of which 98 percent female survivors. In South Sudan, the 2019 GBVIMS data analysis of all reported GBV incidents by alleged perpetrator –survivor relationship indicated that 44% of the incidents were perpetrated by intimate partner violence. Of the total reported incidents involving children, 21 per cent were perpetrated against minors below the age of 11 years while adolescents constitute 79 per cent of child survivors. In 2019 alone, 603 incidents of child sexual abuse were reported through the GBVIMS accounting for 46 per cent of the total GBV incidents affecting children. In 2019, 3% of reported incidents of GBV were perpetrated against survivors with a disability. Similarly, 3% of the reported incidents were perpetrated against unaccompanied or separated children. Because of their specific vulnerabilities, people with disabilities and unaccompanied minors are further exposed to various forms of GBV. In 2019, 17% of incidents were reported by survivors of prior GBV incidents. This is common in contexts of intimate partner violence (IPV) and forced marriage, where the survivor is subject to multiple forms of GBV over a period of time.

Criminal proceedings when dealing with rape case is guided by the Penal Code Act 2008. Majority of reported cases are related to women and girls protection with rape being the most reported.¹⁴ The challenge in handling cases of GBV including rape to their completion through application of

⁹ Report on Joint UN Mission to Northern Bahr el Ghazal (Aweil): Project title: "Protecting Women and Girls in South Sudan: Addressing GBV as a Catalyst for Peace"

¹⁰ Ibid

¹¹ Report on the Joint UN Inception Mission to Bor – Jonglei State (16 – 20 September 2019): Project title: "*Protecting Women and Girls in South Sudan: Addressing GBV as a Catalyst for Peace*"

¹² Ibid

¹³ Supra

¹⁴ Supra

the full enforcement of the law is brought by cultural norms since communities prefer to follow traditional legal mechanisms or customary laws than statutory legal systems. When they follow the traditional legal system, they end up asking for cows instead of pursuing legal redress notwithstanding the limited capacity of the police to handle cases involving women and children and or investigating these cases.¹⁵ Continuous sensitization of communities on what GBV entails and the design of existing laws to protect them is inherent and this should be done through radio broadcast or workshops.¹⁶

1.4 The Project Theory of Change (ToC)

The South Sudanese population consists of 50% women and are central actors in peacebuilding and in society in general. GBV and the related culture of impunity threaten women's participation in peacebuilding efforts and transformation of society. GBV further undermines any progress towards sustainable peace in South Sudan. Gender equality is an essential factor in a country's security and stability. Excluding women from actively participating in society can increase the risk of instability and relapse into conflict. Therefore, prevention of GBV, strengthening the rule of law and supporting women's participation in peacebuilding, and policy-making is paramount. The project aims to enhance women's agency and space for meaningful participation without risk of GBV perpetrated against women. Women's enhanced ability will help their participation as central actors that shape local and national policy for sustaining peace.

1.4.1 The Theory of Change Critical Assumptions

The project was built on the theory that women are key actors in peace building and other processes in the society in general, and that GBV and related crimes, harmful social norms and culture of impunity threatens women's sense of security and safety thus limiting their participation in peace building and transformational processes in society. This situation grossly undermines any progress towards sustainable peace in the society. Gender equality is an essential factor in a country's security and stability since excluding women from actively participating in society increases the risk of instability and relapse into conflict. Therefore, prevention of GBV, strengthening the rule of law and supporting women's participation in peace building and policy-making processes is paramount. The assumptions were:

1. *That if GBV and related culture of impunity are prevented, then women will feel safe to actively participate in efforts geared towards peace building and society transformation.*
2. *That when GBV and harmful social norms and acts are prevented and controlled, then women will participate more actively in the local and/or national peace processes in a safe and conducive environment and that women's participation will increase social cohesion, stability and sustainable peace.*
3. *That through capacity building efforts targeting men, boys and community leaders on their role as active agents of normative change towards gender equality and condemnation of GBV, they will be more willing to accept and promote women's role and participation in local justice and peace processes*
4. *That when the integrated services are provided, survivors feel safe to report the violence and seek redress.*

¹⁵ Supra

¹⁶ Supra

1.4.2 Outcome Statement

The project's aim was to *strengthen the response and prevention mechanisms to GBV and enhance women and girls' participation in local peace processes, contributing to social cohesion and peace in Bor, Aweil and Akobo*. The project was to address the gendered impact of violence, weak governance, lack of accountability and protection, lack of women's access to multi-sectoral GBV services including justice and the consequence thereof on women's access to participation in peace building processes. This project was to strengthen women's agency and participation in local peace initiatives, including GBV prevention efforts, justice solutions, social cohesion and stability efforts.¹⁷ It was designed to address the social and structural barriers that prevent women's participation both in the formal and informal peace process and in bottom-up peacebuilding processes through fostering social cohesion between communities in Bor, Aweil and Akobo. This will be achieved by: i) addressing *Protection* issues through increased coordination and governance of the Essential Services Packages as well as the delivery of safe and integrated GBV response services in strong collaboration with Government partners, security and justice actors and civil society organizations, especially, women led CSOs.¹⁸ ii) addressing *Prevention* issues through community mobilization work with community leaders, men, boys, women and girls as well as relevant institutional actors, such as law enforcement and justice institutions, towards a change to positive social norms condemning GBV, including ensuring accountability of perpetrators of GBV and ending impunity, thereby unfolding a deterrent effect on potential perpetrators.

1.4.3 Project Outcome and Outputs

The project was designed to achieve the following outcome and the outputs mentioned below:

Overarching Outcome: Increased empowerment of women in South Sudan by strengthening prevention mechanisms for GBV by transforming harmful social norms into positive behavior that promotes gender equality.

The project has the following four results, **theory of change, project outcomes and outputs**:

In order to achieve the intended results (outcomes), the project came up with a theory of change that starts with creating prerequisite (**IF**) conditions that would cause positive change (**Then**) leading to desired effect (**Because**). In the TOC, the prerequisite condition creates positive change when such conditions are enhanced through interventions resulting into the desired transformation.

Output 1: Increased access to comprehensive GBV support services in Akobo and Aweil

Establishment of two GBV One Stop Centers, one in Akobo and one in Aweil which will:

1. Provide survivors with access to critical GBV services (medical, psychosocial, continuous legal advice) and;

¹⁷ Protecting Women and Girls in South Sudan - Revised for submission 12 June.2019

¹⁸ UN Women, UNFPA, UNDP, UNODC, *Essential Services Package for Women and Girls Subject to Violence*, 2016.

2. Increase capacities of staff to address survivor needs in a timely and comprehensive manner.

Psychosocial support offered to GBV survivors in One Stop Centers is critical for healing, recovery and re-integration of survivors into society. Thus, under this output the focus was on supporting women to take back control of their lives by ensuring access to medical, psychosocial and legal services, to support them in participating in local decision-making and in contributing to the stability and rebuilding of their communities. The staff of One Stop Centers and other stakeholders were to be supported with capacity building trainings on various GBV management related topics to increase quality of the services they would provide to the survivors.

Theory of Change:

***IF** comprehensive integrated gender based violence (GBV) support services are provided to GBV survivors; if the staff of GBV support services centers are well equipped with skills and knowledge on GBV survivor management; **Then** the GBV survivor would be prepared to embark on healing, recovery and re-integration into society; **Because** comprehensive integrated GBV support services will improve the confidence of GBV survivor to take back control of her life and start contributing to decision-making, rebuilding and stability of her community.*

Theory of Change: Output 1.

Prerequisite Condition Created (IF)	Desired Positive Change (Then)	Desired Effect (Because)
(If) Comprehensive integrated support services are provided to GBV Survivor	(Then) the process of healing, recovery and re-integration into society begins – may include reporting the GBV incident to the relevant authorities for necessary action to be taken	(Because) improved confidence – takes back control of her life, starts contributing to decision-making, rebuilding and stability of her community.

Output 1: Project achievements

Establishment of two GBV One Stop Centers, one in Akobo and one in Aweil which will:

1. Provide survivors with access to critical GBV services (medical, psychosocial, continuous legal advice) and;
2. Increase capacities of staff to address survivor needs in a timely and comprehensive manner.
3. 2 One Stop Centers established and functional in Akobo and Aweil.
4. 7,063 (4,412 women and 602 girls; men 1661 and 388 boys) community members, 71% of whom were women and girls, were reached on GBV response and importance of women participation on peace building processes.
5. 70 Service providers, 25 females and 45 males have increased skills and necessary capacity in providing integrated response services to GBV survivors, and
6. 54,980 people are aware of the existence and services provided by the One Stop Centers. The awareness attributed to radio talk shows and road show micro-phone rallies.

Output 2: Strengthened women groups participation in local peace processes in Bor/Akobo and Aweil and increase civic engagement on GBV Prevention and response.

The output focuses to strengthen capacities of local women's groups at the community level to engage in local peace processes. Women groups and Peace huts will be established at community level in Aweil and Bor/Akobo to serve as safe spaces for dialogue on all issues and topics which women would like to raise related to their needs and concerns regarding security, safety, including on GBV prevention and available service. In these spaces, local capacity of women will be strengthened on community advocacy of selected issues and topics which concern women. This will also assist in creating networks across a wide range of government, justice and civil society actors around shared understanding of GBV and elevating GBV as an issue of national importance for the stability and legitimacy of the peace agreement.

Theory of Change:

(If) women groups are established and capacitated to engage in local peace processes; and safe spaces and conducive environment created for women groups to meet and discuss their most urgent needs and concerns including GBV, the harmful social norms that reinforce it and available response services; (Then) a culture of dialogue, tolerance and peaceful engagement will develop and women groups will play greater roles on increasing social cohesion, stability and sustainable peace both at local and national levels; (Because) women groups will be empowered and recognized as central actors in peace building and reconciliation.

Theory of Change: Output 2.

Prerequisite Condition Created (IF)	Desired Positive Change (Then)	Desired Effect (Because)
(IF) women groups are established and capacitated to engage in peace processes at the local level, safe spaces and conducive environment created for women for women groups to address most urgent peace and justice concerns – GBV, harmful social norms and available response services	(Then) culture of dialogue, tolerance and engagement develop, a conducive environment for women groups to play greater roles on increasing social cohesion, stability and sustainable peace	(Because) women groups are empowered and recognized by key stakeholders as central actors in peace building and reconciliation at all levels; women groups engaged in peace building and reconciliation processes within a conducive environment.

Output 2: Achievements

1. The Women Empowerment Centers and 5 Women Peace Huts established and functional in the intervention areas. The facilities offer safe spaces for women and girls where GBV and harmful social norms are freely and confidentially discussed. Harmful social norms discussed included early and child marriages, wife inheritance, property ownership, girl-child education and revenge killings, among others. These form the number and type of advocacy issues raised.
2. 2,080 community members, 64% of whom were women and girls, were reached on GBV response and importance of women participation on peace building processes.
3. 441 women and 22 girls trained on facilitation skills on women participation in the peace process.

Output 3: Increased access of GBV survivors to justice mechanisms

Under this output, several initiatives were to be supported through the One Stop Centers and Justice Confidential Centers to make local justice processes more accessible for women and ensure that these structures are sensitive to women's justice needs and foster effective legitimacy, engagement and cooperation with women and other vulnerable groups. Through technical support and capacity training on GBV to informal and formal authorities, especially security and justice actors such as law enforcement and prosecutors, access to justice for GBV survivors will increase. Measures will focus on creating a setting where GBV survivors feel confident to report crimes and where law enforcement and justice actors have increased capacity to prosecute cases and to hold perpetrators accountable. Working through the Women and Children's Unit of the Directorate of Public Prosecutions (DPP) of the Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs, the project will introduce concepts of criminal justice, which strengthen responses to GBV. This includes the development of a manual on the investigation and prosecution of GBV cases which provides emphasis on concepts including sexual violence as a weapon of war, providing trainings for investigators, judges and prosecutors and linking the Women's and Children's Units with a mobile court specially dedicated to deal with GBV. This also includes mechanisms to protect victims that come forward and reintegration mechanisms into their communities among others, in cooperation with One Stop Centers. This institutional capacity building will be complemented by support to local CSOs and NGOs, bar associations and legal aid providers, to carry out strategic and practical initiatives that increase access to justice for women, survivors of GBV, including legal advice information, mediation and representation in courts.

Theory of Change:

*IF local justice system is accessible, seen as sensitive and fosters legitimacy, engagement and cooperation with GBV survivors; and the relevant authorities especially justice and security actors and institutions are equipped with skills and capacity to appropriately interact and provide the necessary services to the GBV survivors, the local justice processes will be perceived to be fair and actors committed to their mandate; **Then** a conducive environment will be created where the GBV survivor feel confident to report crimes and where law enforcement and justice actors have increased capacity to investigate and prosecute case to hold perpetrators accountable; the GBV survivor will be encouraged to follow the process to a logical conclusion; **Because** such interactions and interventions can establish a foundation to build trust and confidence between the GBV survivors and justice, law enforcement and other actors, on the other hand, to pursue justice to a logical conclusion.*

Theory of Change: Output 3.

Prerequisite Condition Created (IF)	Desired Positive Change (Then)	Desired Effect (Because)
(IF) local justice system is accessible, sensitive and fosters legitimacy, engagement and cooperation with the GBV survivor; and	(Then)a conducive environment will be created where the GBV survivor feel confident to report the crime to the law enforcement and justice actors;	(Because)such interactions and interventions can establish a foundation to build trust and confidence between the GBV survivors and justice, law

justice and security actors are equipped with necessary skills and capacity to appropriately interact and provide the necessary services to the GBV survivors, the justice system will be perceived to be fair and committed to its mandate,	and where law enforcement and justice actors have increased capacity to investigate and prosecute case to hold perpetrators accountable; the GBV survivor will be encouraged to follow the process to a logical conclusion;	enforcement and other actors, on the other hand, to pursue justice to a logical conclusion.
--	---	---

Output3: Achievements

1. 32.7%, representing 51 SGBV cases (43 female and 8 male), were reported to the relevant authorities and prosecuted. This achievement surpassed the project target of 5%. The success is attributed to the sensitization by the formal and informal justice actors and the target communities resulting in the increase in the number of cases reported and subsequently prosecuted.
2. 22 women were trained as community-based paralegals acquiring skills to support dispensation of justice. The revised project target of 20, 10 per state. However, the target requirement that, at least, 25% be men was not met.
3. The evaluation did confirm establishment of a number of functional mobile courts to adjudicate the GBV cases. However, neither the number nor their locations could not be ascertained.

Output 4: Communities in Bor and Aweil transform harmful social norms that contribute to GBV into positive norms that promote gender equality.

GBV is a structural problem that affects the entire community, and the conditions that sustain it are rooted in values, beliefs and practices of men and women of all ages. It thus takes the whole community to successfully counter it. This output area will engage the whole community including local CSOs (both women led and other CSOs), including men and boys, to enable sustainable behavior and social change by transforming gender unequal relationships. Selected communities- particularly men and boys will be engaged and trained as agents of change advocating for positive norms that uphold women and girls' equality, safety and dignity. Training of trainers and cascaded training of community members to facilitate community actions including dialogues, individual and public commitments, laws and bylaws will be supported to tackle harmful social norms, and other patriarchal biases that contribute to GBV. These community members together with well-trained community discussion leaders will form community champions of change and continue to advocate for transformation of laws and bylaws/ordinances that promote GBV prevention, support survivors and promote the critical role of women and girls in the peacebuilding and reconciliation process.

Theory of Change:

(If) the structure of values, beliefs and practices that inform gender and power relations and creates the conditions in which GBV thrive are transformed; and community leaders, local CSOs led by both men and women including youth initiate advocacy campaigns for behavior and social change to transform gender unequal relationships; and selected community members especially men and boys are engaged and trained as agents to advocate for positive norms which uphold women and girl's safety, dignity and equality; and training of trainers conducted to identify agents to facilitate

community actions, dialogue, laws and by-laws; **(Then)** these community members, together with well-trained community discussion leaders and community champions of change would continue to advocate for transformation and by-laws/ordinances that promote GBV prevention, support survivors and promote the critical role of women and girls in peace building and reconciliation, GBV and reinforcing harmful social norms would be transformed to positive norms that promote gender equality **(Because)** a critical mass of community change agents, activists, professionals and champions would emerge to mobilize a sustainable change movement against GBV and the harmful social norms.

Theory of Change: Output4.

Prerequisite Condition Created (IF)	Desired Positive Change (Then)	Desired Effect (Because)
(If) the structure of values, beliefs and practices that informs gender and power relations and creates conditions for GBV to thrive are transformed and community empowered to coordinate its transformative agenda against GBV and harmful social norms,	(Then) community members led by the well-trained community leaders, change agents and champions would continue to advocate for transformation, support survivors and promote the critical role of women and girls in peace building and reconciliation processes; GBV and harmful social norms would be transformed to positive social norms which promotes gender equality,	(Because) a critical mass of community change agents, activists, professionals and champions would emerge to mobilize and coordinate a sustainable change movement against GBV and harmful social norms.

Output4: Achievements

1. 85% of the target population viewed GBV as less acceptable after participating in the Community Perception Survey. This was against the project target of 75%.
2. There were 20 Community Action Groups addressing GBV, peacebuilding, social cohesion, social norms and negative cultural practices. This was against the project target of 16.
3. There were 200 (100 females and 100 males) members of Community Action Group trained and thus having increased knowledge to deal with negative social norms, and increasing women and girls' engagement in peace building and social cohesion.
4. A number of Community Action Plans were developed to address the issues peacebuilding, social cohesion and the negative cultural norms and practices that reinforce GBV. By March 2020, 12 CAPs had been developed but it was not clear how many of the plans were implemented.
5. 173,400 people (32,750 girls, 23,750 boys, 75,900 women, 41,000 men) were reached through weekly and monthly community dialogue and awareness raising on social norms, peacebuilding, reconciliation, stigma reduction and GBV prevention and response. This was against the project target of 30,000 people. The success was attributed to use of multiple forums including radio talk shows, peer to peer discussions, community dialogue and discussion during commemorative days such as 16 days of activism, International Women's Day, among others.

2.0 EVALUATION RATIONALE, PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

2.1 Rational for the End of Project Evaluation

The results of the '*Protecting women and girls in South Sudan: Addressing GBV as a catalyst for peace*' end of project evaluation was to contribute to the PBF end of project final report by assessing how well the project interventions achieved the intended aim, objectives, outcome and outputs and the likelihood of impact to the beneficiaries as well as to be used as a benchmark for UNFPA and UN Joint agencies' programming.

2.2 Purpose of the Evaluation

The end of the project evaluation was to serve the following three main purposes:

- (i) Demonstrate accountability to stakeholders on performance in achieving development results and on invested resources;
- (ii) Support evidence-based decision making on the progress made against the results outlined; and
- (iii) Contribute key lessons learned to the existing knowledge base on how to carry forward and possibly upscale the gains made through the intervention.

2.2 Evaluation Objectives

The objectives of the end of project evaluation were twofold:

1. To provide the project participating agencies, national stakeholders with an independent assessment of the performance of the project and key lessons learned, based on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project towards the expected outputs and outcomes set forth in the results framework.
2. To draw key lessons from past and current cooperation and provide a set of clear and forward-looking options leading to strategic and actionable recommendations for the next project.

2.3 Evaluation Scope

- a. **Geographic Scope:** The evaluation entailed interventions at the national level and in locations in Bor and Akobo in Jonglei State, and Aweil in Northern Bahrel Gazel State.
- b. **Thematic Scope:** The evaluation covered the following thematic areas as outlined under the four outcomes envisaged as per the results framework. In addition, under the evaluation criteria noted above, the evaluation covered cross-cutting issues such as gender equality, human rights and peacebuilding, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), coherence and coordination, communications, innovation; resource mobilization and strategic partnerships.

3.0 TECHNICAL APPROACH AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

3.1 Technical Evaluation Approach

Theory of change-based approach: The evaluation adopted a theory-based approach that relied on an explicit theory of change, which depicted how the interventions supported by the project were expected to contribute to a series of results (outputs and outcomes) that would lead to the overall goal of the project. The theory of change played a central role throughout the evaluation process, from the design and data collection to the analysis and identification of findings, as well as the articulation of conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation team interrogated and verified the theory of change and used it to determine whether changes at output and outcome levels occurred (or not) and whether assumptions about change hold true. The analysis of the theory of change also served as the basis for the evaluators to assess how relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable was the support provided by the project.

Participatory approach: This was applied in undertaking this end of project evaluation where to a great extent all the stakeholders were be involved. The approach allowed for increased ownership of the process and outcome by all the stakeholders including the implementors and the beneficiaries, empower the involved parties, provide room for diverse data collection and analysis methods and increased accuracy to local realities that yielded valid evidenced-based results to provide robust direction for improvement of the project impacts efforts for future programming. In addition, through relevance criteria, the evaluation assessed how the stakeholders had been able to participate in the design, implementation and monitoring of the intervention and through likelihood of impact, measure stakeholder group participation in the process as well as how they benefited from results.

The Use of Mixed-Evaluation Methods¹⁹: The mix-method or multi-pronged approach entailed desk review and majorly qualitative techniques²⁰ which allowed triangulation of results from different data sources and techniques ensuring greater validity of information to generate a robust comprehensive evaluation report. The relevant UN project documents²¹ were reviewed to capture secondary data triangulated with analyzed primary data collected through key informant interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions (FGDs) and observation based on the study indicators and evaluation questions to produce robust evaluation report. The evaluation team focused on the PBF GBV project result framework and project theory of change. The evaluation approach was in a seamless sequential phase from the inception meeting to the delivery of the final report. Qualitative method will assist in explaining how those results are achieved and also allow for the voice of the most vulnerable to be heard. Information from mixed methods will assist in the triangulation of data, increasing reliability and validity, as well as being useful for exploring whether/why different stakeholders' groups benefited differently. Finally, mixed methods will help to compensate for bias in privileging certain ways of knowing and

¹⁹ Quantitative phase was not be employed due to limited resources and time to recruit, train and deploy the data collectors.

²⁰ Qualitative methods served to provide a more in-depth analysis of project issues, which were difficult to measure through quantitative methods.

²¹ United Nations Cooperation Framework (UNCF) (2019-2021), UN System Wide Peacebuilding plan 2018-2021, UNCT Core Contribution 2019-202, Community mechanisms for peacebuilding in South Sudan, UNCF Joint Workplans, UNFPA, UNW, UNDP, UNICEF annual work plans, PBF Project/Donor Proposal Documents, Joint programme documents (JP GBV), Project progress reports Donor reports and Field mission reports.

communicating (e.g., literacy, ability to speak publicly and conceptualization by the targeted beneficiaries.

3.2 Data Collection Methodologies

The evaluation methodology was developed in line with evaluation approach and guidance provided in accordance with the *UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation*²², *Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation*²³, *Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System*²⁴, and *Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations*²⁵. The evaluation team focused on upholding objectivity and impartiality while following the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)/ Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria - *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, coverage, coherence and well as cross-cutting issues of Gender Equality and Human Rights*. Additionally, the evaluation approach was aligned with *SWAP*²⁶.

The evaluation methodology included design and planning, document review, consultations, data collection, analysis and reporting. The qualitative design was used to represent the participants' reality as accurately as possible. However, due to limited resources and time, quantitative methodology was not used to determine pre and post intervention levels by use of statistical data and thus produced quantifiable results. Both in design and implementation, care was taken to ensure methods and approaches used 'Do No Harm' to the target groups. The consultant used a practical approach that included use of an evaluation matrix to specify data source and how it was collected. The evaluation covered project conceptualization, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of results focusing on extent to which the various indicators were met and contribution towards social inclusion and gender equality.

To collect reliable information, fieldwork was conducted through participatory a process with the data collection process being consultative, interactive and transparent taking into consideration all the key project stakeholders. The data was collected from secondary and primary data sources. Preliminary data collection tools/guidelines were developed, shared with the Project Managers and UNEG team for approval before commencement of data collection. The evaluation team worked closely with the evaluation focal points throughout the process. The execution of this work was solely along the lines of the set objectives anticipated in the TOR. A stakeholder map and an evaluation matrix were developed, individual and group interviews including checklists or semi-structured interview protocols for each type of interview; and virtual briefing and debriefing sessions were conducted with the UNEG and UN Joint agencies project team in Juba.

With regard to the current Covid-19 pandemic situation globally and in particular South Sudan where the study was conducted, the evaluation deliberately decided to adopt methodologies which were responsive, sensitive and appropriate to the prevention and control of the spread of the Corona virus. The data was collected mainly through desk review of project reports and literature and qualitative techniques involving in-depth interviews with key informants (KIIs) and

²² <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

²³ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>

²⁴ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

²⁵ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/980>

²⁶ Guidance on the SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator and its application to evaluation can be found at <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1452>

focus group discussion (FGDs) with purposively sampled project beneficiaries.

The targeted audience for the evaluation were 95 Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), with an achievement of 85 KIIs respondents, purposefully selected from the PBF donor, implementing agencies and change actors. Qualitative methods served to provide a more in-depth analysis of project issues, which were difficult to measure through quantitative methods. The lead Joint Program UN agencies (UNFPA, UN Women, UNDP, UNICEF) – 10 (from the 4 agencies at the national and field levels); Collaborating/Implementing Partners – International NGOs 10; Collaborating/Implementing Partners – National NGOs 24; Service Providers and Duty Bearers for Capacity Building 5 (2 per program location/community); Women Trained as Community Paralegals 16 at project location/community in Bor and Aweil; GBV Response at OSC, WEC and Family Protection Unit 8 (social workers, case manager/workers, advocates); GoSS: 1 Director of County Health Department MoH, Director of Social Development, Gender and Child Welfare 4; 2 SSNPS, 1 Legal Admin, 2 Community Policing Director, 4 SPU Director/Investigation; 15 Chief and Local Leader at Project Location, 4 CDLs, Community 3 Action Groups, 2 Champions of Change Representatives.

There was a total of 18 FGDs were conducted with participants evenly drawn from the 3 locations of Aweil, Bor and Akobo taking part in the evaluation exercise. The respondents were purposely and randomly selected from the project locations of the 3 target counties of Aweil, Akobo, Bor in South Sudan. 9 (3 from each of the locations) primary beneficiaries – women and girls including GBV survivors participated in the FGDs. 3 (1 from each of the 3 locations) GBV Working Groups participated in the FGDs. Another category was composed of 3 (1 from each of the locations) men, boys and community leaders. The last category of participants in the FGDs was composed of 3 (1 each from the 3 locations) Community Discussion Leaders (CDLs), Community Action Groups and Community Volunteers/Champions of Change. The number of those who participated in FGDs were limited to a maximum of 8 in order to be able observe the GOSS protocol on prevention of Covid-19. The evaluation team ensured that the participants and the moderator kept social distance of 1.5 meters, wore face mask throughout the discussion as well as ensuring that there was hand washing facility at the venue of the FGD.

3.3 Design of Data Collection Tools

The data collection tools (KII and FGD Guides) were designed to address information needs and expectations of the TOR. Questions in the study instruments were worded in such a way as to be easily understood and sought information that responded to the evaluation objectives, shared, discussed and approved by UNFPA Project Manager and UNERG before the commencement of the field work. The evaluation was managed by the UN lead agency for the project, UNFPA, with guidance and support from the Country Office (CO) M&E Manager, Resident Coordinator's (RC) Office as the portfolio manager, and in consultation with the (ERG) throughout the evaluation process. A team of independent external evaluators conducted the evaluation and prepared this report in conformity with TOR.

3.4 Data Processing and Analysis

The consultant aggregated the information that emerged from all the evaluation data sources (desk review, KIIs and FGDs), and analyzed based on the objectives and indicators. The qualitative data was analyzed through data reduction methods (systematically) using emerging themes and issues highlighted by different stakeholders.

3.5 Study Limitations

- Primary quantitative data was to be collected but due to limited resources and time to recruit, train and deploy enumerators, the decision was shelved posing a major weakness to the evaluation. This has meant that the evaluation was limited by lack of quantitative household data; however, the primary qualitative data and secondary data from desk review were triangulated to yield pertinent information for reporting.
- Owing to their busy schedules, some of the target respondents mainly drawn from the *key informant group*²⁷ were not immediately available within the proposed set timelines necessitating fieldwork to take longer than anticipated.

Despite these challenges, the consultants were quick to find viable alternatives to ensure the validity and reliability of the evaluation exercise.

3.6 Ethical Considerations

The study ensured the design and implementation of the end-line evaluation took into consideration and abided by UN's *Do No Harm* strategic principles and comply with the UN's child protection policy as well as Quality Standards and Principles for assessing the quality of evidence; internationally recognized Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and UN's various policies and signed it as a sign of compliance and commitment. As per the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria, the evaluation assessed relevance, effectiveness and efficiency and sustainability of the project. The consultant committed to respect UN's and internationally recognized Risk Management Policies including: Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA), Safeguarding children, vulnerable groups (including people with disabilities) and protection policy, safety and security policy, conflict of interest, anti-fraud/corruption policy and whistle blowing policy; and safeguarding the interests of those in fragile context and conflict affected states.

²⁷ Relevant GoSS, JoSS at state and National level, CSO managements and Juba level stakeholders including the RCO office.

4.0 EVALUATION FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

4.1 The project relevance, appropriateness and strategic positioning

Generally, based on the local context and looking at the precarious socio-cultural, political and economic situation in South Sudan and in particular the project areas of Bor, Akobo in Jonglei State and Aweil in Aweil State, the PBF Project “Protecting women and girls in South Sudan: Addressing GBV as catalyst for peace”, project objectives, inputs and activities were adequate and highly relevant in its design to the needs of the target vulnerable groups (target beneficiaries) in unstable fragile context with wanting environment for gender equality, GBV prevention mechanisms, insecurity, harmful social norms promoting GBV, health and livelihoods challenges.

The evaluation established that the project objectives were in sync with and aligned to the Government of South Sudan (GoSS) legal, policy, guiding frameworks and action plans including the 2011 South Sudan Transitional Constitution (SSTC), Complimentary Legislations and Policies in the form of the Penal Code Act (2008), the Child Act (2008) and the National Gender Policy (NGP). Further, the project design was consistent with and aligned to the treaties ratified and signed by the GoSS including the UN Resolution 1325 and the South Sudan National Action Plan (NAP) 2015- 2020. The Joint Programme on GBV is aligned to 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development as well as the South Sudan National Development Strategy which both recognize the need for gender equality and protection of women and girls from GBV and harmful practices including forced and child marriage.

The UN Joint Program implementing partners of UNFPA, UN Women, UNDP and UNICEF strategically positioned the project at a time when the revitalized national peace agreement has been signed, the September 2018 Revitalized Agreement for Resolution of Conflict in South Sudan (R-ARCSS) serves as a fundamental guide to the project, as it provides a national framework Chapter 2 and 5 of the peace agreements prioritizes efforts on GBV prevention and response to which the project aligns. Further, GoSS is a signatory to the UNSCR 1325 treaty and has formulated a national constitution and national policy papers ²⁸ with very explicit commitments on gender relations. Peace Building and Reconciliation is one of the key strategic agenda for the GoSS as reflected in many of its policy documents ²⁹ and government functionaries. Peace and development are related and the lack of one affects the other – this project finds strategic relevance with Sustainable Development Goals (5) and (16). The fact that the major UN implementing agencies involved have strong mandates in ending GBV, peace building, the rule of law and access to justice, protection of women and children during armed conflicts and other humanitarian crisis cannot be overemphasized.

That the UN PBF is the donor and overall coordinator of the project is a key aspect of strategic positioning. The UN is well resourced and capacitated and could easily ensure both financial and institutional sustainability of the project. The collaboration frameworks bringing together the

²⁸ 2011 South Sudan Transitional Constitution (SSTC), Complimentary Legislations and Policies in the form of the Penal Code Act (2008), the Child Act (2008) and the National Gender Policy (NGP).

²⁹ South Sudan Vision 2040; National Development Strategy (2018/19-2020/21); National Health Policy (2016-2026); Strategic National Action Plan for Ending Child Marriage (2017-2027); The South Sudan Humanitarian Response Plans (2019, 2020); SSPDF, SPLA-IO, NPSS National Action Plans for ending conflict related sexual violence.

UN agencies, the GoSS at both national and state levels, the international and national NGO implementing partners, the community-based change agents and an agitated primary beneficiary group of Southern Sudanese women and girls makes a strong case for the relevance, appropriateness and strategic position of the project. The project design and strategies were found to be in sync with the donor (UN/PBF) policies, particularly the UN Secretary-General's Peacebuilding Fund 2020 -2024 strategy -March 2020³⁰. It also emerged from the evaluation that the project was relevant to the Peacebuilding Fund as the organization's financial instrument of first resort to sustain peace in countries or situations at risk or affected by violent conflict such as South Sudan. The Fund works across pillars and supports integrated UN responses to fill critical gaps; respond quickly and with flexibility to peacebuilding opportunities; and catalyze processes and resources in a risk-tolerant fashion. The project was cited to have been with relevance to key focus areas of the PBF such as implementing and sustaining peace agreements through political dialogue, rule of law and transitional justice; and dialogue and peaceful coexistence through reconciliation, conflict prevention and management.

Further, it was established that the PBF's main objectives are in line with the objectives of the project thus making it very relevant to the implementation of the project, for instance, both the fund and the project have a major focus on women empowerment. The fund fosters inclusion through women empowerment - to help achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development's commitment to "leave no one behind", and to recognize the critical role of women in peacebuilding. The PBF also focuses major efforts on conflict prevention as a way of building and sustaining peace in fragile environments like South Sudan. The project was therefore aligned to the fund's main objective, which is to increase investment in prevention efforts in achieving peacebuilding and sustaining peace before, during and after an escalation of violent conflict.

It is also important to note that the project funding is in alignment to the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 (S/RES/1325), on women, peace, and security, adopted unanimously by the UN Security Council on 31 October 2000. The resolution acknowledged the disproportionate and unique impact of armed conflict on women and girls, and calls for the adoption of a gender perspective to consider the special needs of women and girls during conflict, repatriation and resettlement, rehabilitation, reintegration, and post-conflict reconstruction. The resolution further requires parties in conflict to prevent violations of women's rights, support women's participation in peace negotiations and in post-conflict reconstruction, and protect women and girls from wartime sexual violence. The Resolution 1325 has since become an organizing framework for the women, peace, and security agenda, which focuses on advancing its components. The operational items in Resolution 1325 broadly call upon member states to address the needs of women and girls in armed conflict and support their participation in peace negotiations. Among the key components and recommendations of the resolution are:

- Preventing sexual and gender-based violence in armed conflict; that all parties to conflict to take special measures to protect women and girls from violence in armed conflict, particularly sexual and gender-based violence. It also calls for states to end impunity for crimes against humanity, particularly sexual violence, and prosecute offenders;

³⁰ https://www.un.org/peacebuilding/sites/www.un.org.peacebuilding/files/documents/pbf_strategy_2020-2024_final.pdf

- Peace negotiations: Including a gender perspective in peace negotiations and increasing women's participation in peace negotiation, with particular attention to supporting local women's peace initiatives; and
- Women's political participation: The member states to increase women's participation at all levels of decision-making in national, regional, and international institutions.

The project was found to be consistent with the policies of all the participating UN Agencies collaborating and supporting this project have, as their core mandates, themes that are key to the successful implementation of the project. This provided a major opportunity for synergy and learning from one another though this aspect didn't come out as strongly as would be expected.

The project is relevant and strategically positioned to the pillars of the UN Joint Agencies – i.) *UNFPA's Health and Psycho-Social Support (PSS) through access to quality survivor centred health and PSS support services to GBV survivors. It's also aligned to UNFPA's new strategic plan (2018-2021), focusing on three transformative results: to end preventable maternal deaths; end unmet need for family planning; and end gender-based violence and harmful practices; ii.) UN Women's Protection and Security pillar through protection and security sectors are strengthened to prevent and respond to GBV; iii.) UNDP's Justice and Rule of law through a conducive and supportive legal and policy environment for addressing GBV; and iv.) UNICEF's pillar on community engagement and social norms ensuring communities in South Sudan taking action to prevent GBV and promote positive social norms.*

The implementing partners are grounded with strong presence within the project contexts of Bor, Aweil and Akobo. The conceptualization and design of the implementation organizational, which requires that organizations contribute, based on their own financial, institutional and technical competencies and mandates makes a strong case for the relevance of the project. Evidence from this evaluation indicates that the project has received overwhelming response from the primary and indirect beneficiaries in the target areas of Bor, Akobo and Aweil. This has been shown not only in appreciation of the services delivered by the project through structures such as OSC, Special Protection Units and Women and Girls Friendly Spaces but records of attendance or participation in project activities.

The involvement of the target communities through local leaders especially willingness to establish structures for the implementation of the project was an indicator of the relevance of the project. That Akobo local authorities invited the project to their area may further explain the relevance and underlying demands and need for the project upscaling. The fact the project was designed to enhance the participation of women and girls in the peace building processes both at the local and national levels makes this project relevant to the GoSS. The good will by the GoSS especially the active involvement of relevant ministries, departments and authorities was an indicator of the government interest. Indeed, there were recommendations that certain structures created by the project be incorporated into relevant government institutions. For instance, one of the OSC was already attached to a government hospital.

That among the project's output areas is to protect women and girls from GBV using the rule of law and access to justice, is an idea whose time has come. This evaluation has evidence, through testimonies of women and girls who have suffered injustices in the traditional courts. That the patriarchal system was so deeply entrenched and inclined against the rights and dignity of women and girls that even parents would rather opt to be "paid cows" instead of seeking justice

in a court of law for a crime committed against a daughter. This kind of inadvertently encouraged GBV especially rape...*a case is told of young man who raped a teenage girl with an intention of marrying because his father had enough cows to bride wealth.* The project has acted as an eye-opener in the sense that now women and girls are aware that GBV is a crime punishable under the statutory courts, and that decisions made by the traditional courts are not binding when the complainant is not in agreement.

South Sudan hosts more than 300,000 refugees, with gender-based Violence (GBV) in particular widespread sexual violence, as one of the largest crises emanating from the conflict. Anecdotally all forms of Gender Based Violence such as rape, sexual harassment, physical violence, psychological violence, early and child marriages, denial of resources, and others, remain prevalent and widespread across South Sudan. The use of sexual violence and the brutalization of women and girls, even in displacement settings, threats and risks of GBV against women and girls persist particularly sexual violence, growing levels of intimate partner violence (IPV), sexual exploitation, harassment and early and forced marriage. High prevalence of GBV hinders women's participation in the peace process and undermines any progress to sustainable peace in South Sudan as it prevents an inclusive process and exemplifies the general lack of security, justice and protection for the population. The project was found to be highly relevant in addressing GBV as an obstacle to women and girl's meaningful participation in peace and peace building processes and mechanisms.

4.2 Effectiveness of the Project

The effectiveness of a project measures the extent to which an activity, a project, or a programme has timely achieved its objectives, results (including differential results across groups), or purpose or whether this can be expected to be executed based on the outputs independent of the costs required for implementing the activities. Overall, the project was successful and effective in achieving its objectives, outcomes and output results and had made commendable progress towards anticipated goal. This has been proved by the scores obtained from the key performance indicators, which were mostly over 70%. However, it's important to note that evaluation findings were majorly based secondary and primary qualitative data.

The effectiveness of the project was witnessed through the achievement of the outcomes and indicators. The project was effective in its implementation through a participatory process with the key stakeholders, including the implementing partners (lead UN Agencies and their partners) project beneficiaries/participants, the government at the state, county and local levels and the donor agency. The project was well planned and executed, whereby the implementation of the actions led to the achievement of the expected results notwithstanding the effects of COVID-19 as well as contextual changes which could have affected implementation of some activities.

The project design was holistic thus addressing the needs, concerns and interests of different stakeholders especially the women and girls' issues in relation to GBV as a catalyst to peace while creating platforms for dialogue and opportunities for building bridges and nurturing cohesion. The project was effective in building human, social, psychological, physical and financial capital thereby empowering the women and girls. Further, the effectiveness of the project was evidenced in the redesign of the project avoiding duplication of services of the OSC in Bor to target and reach an additional 119,430 women and girls among them 20% (24,284) IDPs. In Akobo, the main GBV service providers who were operating in Akobo then (IMC and INTERSOS),

had closed business and the only organization operating in the State and there was no service provider for Clinical Management of Rape (CMR) which is an important and highly needed service.

The project was evidently effective in achieving the desired outputs as indicated. It reached 2,126 survivors through the integrated GBV response services at the One Stop Centers (OSC) and four auxiliary help desks situated at police stations through 44 community volunteers, and community GBV response and prevention mechanisms. Total 1335 women and girls, including the survivors of GBV were provided with skills development; 63 (61 girls and 2 boys) survivors of child marriage were provided with temporary protection, legal and psychosocial support. Total 152 duty bearers and service providers (68 women) were trained on legislations and policies governing GBV investigation, prevention, prosecution and case management, PSS and referrals. The engagement with men and boys reached to 745 community members, including traditional leaders. Fifty two (52) community discussion leaders (CDLs) were trained during this period and in close working relationship and guidance from the already existing community discussion leaders, reached a total of 1,201 people (112 girls, 178 adolescents, women: 451 and 59 boys, 129 Adolescent, 268 men) were reached through community awareness raising on social norms change as part of implementation of the agreed 11 community level action plans on positive social norms transformations launched in December 2020 as public declaration in Bor and Aweil during the celebration to mark the International Human Rights Day. Total 973 925 community members (approximately 53% women) were reached out through community outreach. Fifteen (15) Radio talk shows on positive social norms agreed on, engagement of women in peace building and decision making, promotion of the rights of women in property ownership or inheritance, child marriage and child labor were held in radio stations in Jonglei and Aweil. Total 32 copies of GBV/CP referral pathways were distributed to all the champions of change for dissemination of information on services available that can be accessed by communities. The outcome and output indicators assessment is presented in a table as *annex 1*.

Evidently, the physical and structural establishment of the Police Special Protection Unit (SPUs), Police Gender/Help Desk, Women and Girls Friendly Spaces, Peace Huts and One Stop Centers in Bor, Akobo and Aweil worked to reduce GBV cases evidenced by individual survivors, community volunteers of caseworkers, social workers and groups increase in reporting of sexual and gender-based violence. The project facilitated the formation and/or strengthening of a number community structures and platforms for building cohesion and sustaining peace. It established avenues and points of service provisions with referral pathways for the victims and the survivors of the GBV. These structures not only provided avenues for women and girls participation but also ensured that the opinions, needs and interests of the different groups are included.

However, it is noteworthy, that there was no benchmarking through a baseline, nor mid-term evaluation of the tracking the desired change and inform learning by the actors. Consequently, the project lacked a joint monitoring by the UN joint agencies.

4.2.1 Project Outcome and Output Indicators Assessment

Overall, the project was successful and effective in achieving its objectives/results and has made commendable progress towards anticipated outcomes and outputs for the activities. It is however noted that the perception surveys were not done at the baseline, during

implementation and at the end-line for the three outcome indicators which made it difficult to ascertain their achievements. The effectiveness of the project is however visible through the measurement of the output indicators as well as from the qualitative interviews and discussions with the various project stakeholders.

The performance assessment of the outputs and indicators are rated on the scale below:

Scale: 1-5	Scores Range %	Grading/Qualification
1	0% - 24%	Below Expectation
2	25% - 39%	Approaching Expectation
3	40% - 54%	Meeting Expectation
4	55% - 69%	Above Expectation
5	70% - 100%+	Exceeding Expectation

Summary Performance Achievement Per Output Indicator

Output Indicator	Scale: 1-5	Actual Score (#) & (%)	Grading/Qualification	Remarks
Output 1: Increased GBV Support Services in Bor & Aweil				
Output Indicator 1.1: No of GBV Survivors Accessing and Using Services at the OSCs.	5 (70%-100%+)	2126 people (Score = 212.6%)	Exceeding Expectation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive GBV Services Provided to Survivors at OSCs is one of the most popular innovations of the project that generated great interest.
Output Indicator 1.2: No of GBV OSCs Established and Operational.	5 (70%-100%+)	2 OSCs (Score = 100%)	Exceeding Expectation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project plan of 2 OSCs was achieved. The two OSCs were established and operational in Aweil and Akobo.
Output Indicator 1.3: No of Service Providers (Disaggregated by Sex and Profession) with increased Skills and Capacity required at the OSCs.	5 (70%-100%+)	70 Service Providers (Score = 70%)	Exceeding Expectation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 70 Service Providers (25 Females and 45 males) had increased Skills and Capacity required. The project had set a target of 100 Service Providers.
Output Indicator 1.4: No of People Aware of Existence of Services at the OSCs.	5 (70%-100%+)	54,980 people (Score = 274.9%)	Exceeding Expectation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54,980 people were aware of existence of services at the at the OSCs against the project target of 20,000 people.
Output 2: Strengthened Women Group's Participation in Local Peace Processes in Bor and Aweil; and Increased Civic Engagement in GBV Prevention and Response.				
Output Indicator 2.1: No of Issues Raised by Women through Peace Huts Initiatives.	5 (70%-100%+)	5 Issues (Score = 100%)	Exceeding Expectation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 Issues were raised through the Peace Hut Initiatives against the project target of 5. Issues raised included wife inheritance, early marriage, property ownership, child education and revenge killings.
Output Indicator 2.2: Number of Women's Peace Huts/ Women Centers Functional.	5 (70%-100%+)	5 Women Peace Huts (Score = 100%)	Exceeding Expectation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 Women Peace Huts were functional against the project target of 5 thus the expected result was achieved.
Output Indicator 2.3: No of Community Members Reached on GBV Response and Importance of Women Participation.	3 (40% - 54%)	2,080 community members (Score = 41.6%)	Approaching Expectation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2080 community members representing 41.6% were reached on GBV response and importance of women participation against the project target of 5000 community members. However, the gender target of 60% for women and girls was surpassed at 64.1%.
Output Indicator 2.4: No of Women Trained on Facilitation Skills on Women Participation in Peace Process.	5 (70%-100%+)	441 women trained (Score = 126%)	Exceeding Expectation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 441 women including 22 girls were trained exceeding the project target of 350.
Output 3: Increased Access of GBV Survivors in Bor and Aweil to Justice Mechanisms.				

Output 3.1: Existence of Functional Mobile Court System to Adjudicate GBV cases.	1 (0% - 24%)	No functional mobile courts (alternative dispute resolution mechanisms used successfully).	Below Expectation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of the mobile courts was established, 2 Justice and Confidence Centers (JCCs) and revamped 4 previously existing ones both in Bor and Aweil. However, at the time of the evaluation none of these facilities was functional.
Output Indicator 3.2: Percentage of Cases Prosecuted and Followed Through to Completion.	5 (70%-100%+)	32.7% representing 51 cases (Score = 654%)	Exceeding Expectation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 32.7% of cases were followed through to completion against the project target of 5%. The result hugely exceeded expectation at 654%. Out of the 51 cases followed through to completion 43 were for females and 8 for males.
Output Indicator 3.3: No of Community-Based Paralegals with Skills to Support Justice Dispensation for GBV Survivors.	5 (70%-100%+)	22 Community Based Paralegals (Score = 55%)	Meeting Expectation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 22 community-based paralegals (100% women) were trained against the target of 20 per state and 40 in the two states. However, the gender target of at least 25% males was not achieved. There also other justice actors not included here because they aren't paralegals.
Output 4: Communities in Bor and Aweil Transform Harmful Social Norms that Contribute to GBV into Positive Norms that Promote Gender Equality.				
Output Indicator 4.1: % of Target Pop. Viewing GBV as Less Acceptable after Participating in Community Perception Survey.	5 (70%-100%+)	85% of Target Pop Viewing GBV as less acceptable after participating in the community perception survey (Score = 113.33%)	Exceeding Expectation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 85% of the target population viewed GBV as less acceptable after participating in the community perception survey. This was against the project target of 75% of the target population. The result of the output indicator has thus exceeded expectation at 113.33%.
Output indicator 4.2: No of Community Action Groups addressing GBV, Peacebuilding, Social Cohesion and Social Norms and Negative Cultural Practices.	5 (70%-100%+)	20 Community Action Groups (Score = 125%)	Exceeding Expectation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were 20 Community Action Groups addressing GBV, Peace Building, Social Cohesion and Social Norms, and Negative Cultural Practices. This was against the project target of 16 Community Action Groups. Result of the output indicator has exceeded expectation at 125%.
Output Indicator 4.3: No of Trained Community Action Groups Members with Increased Knowledge on Addressing Negative Social Norms, & Increasing Women and Girls' Engagement in Peace Building and Social Cohesion.	5 (70%-100%+)	200 Trained Community Action Groups (100 Females and 100	Exceeding Expectation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were 200 trained community action groups with increased knowledge on addressing negative social norms, and increasing women and girl's engagement in

		Males); (Score = 100%)		peace building and social cohesion. This was against project target of 200 trained community action groups members. The result was achieved.
Output Indicator 4.4: No of Implemented Community Action Plans Addressing Peace Building, Social Cohesion and Negative social and Cultural Norms and Practices that Contribute to GBV.	No data on Community Action Plans implemented	–	–	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was evidence of community action plans being implemented. Although the project had set a target of 16 community action plans to be implemented, there was no evidence that the target was missed, achieved or exceeded.
Output Indicator 4.5: No of People Reached through Weekly and Monthly Community Dialogues and Awareness Raising on Social Norms, Peace Building, Reconciliation, Stigma Reduction and GBV Prevention and Response.	5 (70%-100%+)	Number of people reached through weekly and monthly community dialogues and awareness raising was 173,400 (Score = 578%).	Exceeding Expectation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 173,400 people including 32,750 girls, 23,750 boys, 75,900 women and 41,000 men were reached through weekly and monthly dialogues and awareness raising. The project target of 30,000 was hugely exceeded. The performance result for the indicator was 578%.

Output 1: Increased access to comprehensive GBV support services in Bor and Aweil.

Under this there are four sub-outputs namely Outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4. In this evaluation, we assessed each sub-output using the criteria given by DAC for this parameter of evaluation and the key questions of the evaluation.

Output Indicator 1.1: No of GBV Survivors Accessing and Using the Integrated GBV Services in One Stop Center (OSC).

The One Stop Center (OCS) was one of the structures established under this project to provide comprehensive integrated services to the survivors of GBV. The range of services included psycho-social support, medical care support, medical supplies and equipment, anti-rape kits and referral pathways, among others. The evaluation found the 2 OSC established and functional in Bor and Aweil. The main question of *effectiveness* was around the functionality and performance of these structures. To determine the effectiveness of the OCS, the question was the number of people (women and girls) receiving services from the OCS. The project had set a control target that 1,000 people should be receiving services at the time of evaluation. The evaluation found that 2,126 people, mainly women and girls, had received support services from the facilities exceeding expectation, at 212.6%. This further depicts the relevance of the interventions to the women and girls. The finding also implies that the survivors are more aware of the referral pathways however, the continued effectiveness of these structures would depend much on their sustainability.

Output Indicator 1.2: Number of GBV One Stop Centers Established and Operational.

As indicated above, the evaluation found that the 2 OCSs were established and operational in Akobo and Aweil. The performance indicator for the above output is 100%. Although the target was achieved, it would be important to compare how the OCSs are operating considering they are in different locations and they were not established at the same time. The two established OSC in Aweil and Akobo continue to provide integrated medical, psycho-social and legal services for the survivors of gender-based violence. These centers continue to serve as platform for coordination meetings and safe place for the survivors of GBV.

Output Indicator 1.3: Number of Service Providers (Disaggregated by Sex and Profession) with Increased Skills and Other Capacity in Providing Integrated Response Services.

The above performance indicator was set to determine the effectiveness of a capacity building training carried out to equip service providers with skills other capacities required for one to work at the OSC. The evaluation found out that 70 service providers, including 25 females and 45 males, had the skills and other capacities required for a person to provide services at the OSC. The project target was set at 100%. It means the performance indicator was 70%.

Output Indicator 1.4: Number of People (SADD) Who are Aware of the Existence and Services of the One Stop Centre in the intervention areas.

The evaluation determined that 54,980 people were aware of the existence and services provided by the OCS. Against the project target of 20,000, this was a major achievement, exceeding expectation. The performance score for the indicator is 274.9%. The success is attributed to community awareness conducted through radio talk shows and road shows through microphone rallies. These new strategies also create an opportunity to sensitize the communities and create

awareness on COVID-19 and how best the community could keep their families and friends safe from COVID- 19.

Output 2: Strengthened Women Groups' Participation in Local Peace Processes in Bor and Aweil and Increase Civic Engagement on GBV Prevention and Response.

Output Indicator 2.1: Number of Advocacy Issues Raised by Women through Peace Huts Initiatives.

Peace Huts was one of the structures, actually it's a physical structure established by the project to create a safe space and platform where women and girls good meet and discuss the most important issues that affect their lives. Such issues could include but not limited to their wife inheritance, early marriage, property ownership, child education, revenge killings, among others. Under this project the peace huts fall under protection, which is supported by UN Women.

From the above question, the evaluation established that a number of advocacy issues including the ones listed above had been raised by the women. The target set by the project was 5 issues and it was achieved 100%. That's the performance exceeded expectation. The result is attributed to the great interest women developed in the project especially on issues of protection, security and safety. The safe space created by the peace hut provides opportunities for women to discuss issues, some of which are too sensitive to be discussed in the open especially in the presence of men... *"we are able to discuss issues pertaining GBV and peaceful co-existence thanks to this space, furthermore, from the IGA skills trainings, we are able to provide for our families and the level of dependency on our husbands have reduced"* women fgd at Aweil East by Alight.

Output indicator 2.2: Number of Women's Peace Huts/ Women Centers Functional.

The evaluation established that 5 Women Peace Huts/Women Centers are functional. The target set by the project was 5 peace huts so the performance for the indicator was 100%. The explanation for the achievement is as above in output 2.1

Output Indicator 2.3: Number of Community Members Reached on GBV Response and Importance of Women Participation (SADD).

The evaluation established that 2,080 community members were reached on GBV response and Importance of Women participation, and that out of the community members reached 64.1% were women and girls. This was lower than the project target at 5,000 community members out of whom 60% should be women and girls. The performance for the output indicator was 41.6%. The target was not met for the number of community members reached but was slightly above expectation for the number of women and girls reached at 64.1%.

Output Indicator 2.4: No of Women Trained on Facilitation Skills on Women Participation in Peace Process.

The evaluation found that 441 women including 22 girls were trained on Facilitation Skills on Women Participation in Peace Building Process. The project target of 350 women was exceeded at 126%. The performance for the output indicator exceeded the expectation.

Output 3: Increased Access of GBV Survivors in Bor and Aweil to Justice Mechanisms.

Output Indicator 3.1: Existence of Functional Mobile Court System to Adjudicate GBV cases.

The evaluation established existence of the mobile courts, two Justice and Confidence Centres (JCCs) and revamped four previously existing ones both in Bor and Aweil. At the time of the evaluation these facilities were not- functional. The partnering CSOs³¹ provided legal aid which encompassed legal representation and legal awareness while simultaneously providing counselling and referral services for GBV survivors to institutions that provide psychosocial support. The CSOs employed various approaches to ensure wide accessibility for SGBV survivors including: establishing four auxiliary help desks situated at police stations, recruiting, training and deploying Forty-Four community volunteers, strengthening their links with Special Police Units, Women and Girls' Friendly Spaces and other relevant government institutions. The mentioned approaches ensured increased accessibility for SGBV survivors to receive speedy and timely reporting, investigation, and processing of SGBV cases for prosecution and referral to relevant services for their recovery including medical, psychosocial and counselling support. Additionally, UNDP provided capacity building of justice actors who included judges, investigators, prosecutors and social workers and customary chiefs was undertaken to empower them to conduct fair investigation, prosecution and prevention of GBV related cases.

Output Indicator 3.2: Percentage of Cases Prosecuted and Followed Through to Completion.

The evaluation established that 32.7% representing 51 cases were prosecuted to completion, and that out of the 51 cases prosecuted to completion 43 were for females while 8 were for males. This was against the project target of 5%. The target has been exceeded at 654%. The explanation for the achievement was a major sensitization by the formal and informal justice actors and communities on SGBV resulting in an increase in the number of cases reported and subsequently prosecuted. This performance shows the effectiveness of the community change agents recruited by the project.

Output Indicator 3.3: Number of Community-Based Paralegals with Skills to Support Dispensation of Justice for Survivors (SADD).

The evaluation established that there were 22 trained Community Based Paralegals, all (100%) of them women. The project target was 20 per State with at least 25% men. The project target of 20 per State was exceeded but the gender ratio requiring at least 25% of the Community Based Paralegals to be men wasn't met. This performance may mean that women showed greater interest to be trained as Community Based Paralegals. That would be consistent with a general finding that women showed more interest in the project than men. This is not particularly a good sign though because it's important that both genders participate in the project.

A total 40 (11 F and 29 M) investigators, social workers, chiefs, prosecutors, and judges received training on investigation, prosecution, prevention, response, and adjudication of SGBV and related offences. Additionally, two GBV community dialogues were conducted in Twic East 35 (12 females and 23 Males) and Duk 33 (5 females and 28 males) led to designing of key messages related to GBV advocacy and to raise awareness on the evils of GBV.

³¹ The partner CSOs are Action for Children Development Foundation –South Sudan (ACDF) and Humanitarian Aid for Change and Transformation (HACT) implementing in Aweil while Humanitarian and Development Consortium (HDC) and Upper Nile Youth Mobilization for Peace and Development Agency (UNYMPD) are implementing in Bor

Output 4: Communities in Bor- Jonglei and Aweil Transform Harmful Social Norms that Contribute to GBV into Positive Norms that Promote Gender Equality.

Output indicator 4.1: Percentage of Target Population that Views GBV as Less Acceptable after Participating in the Community Perception Survey.

The evaluation found that 85% of the target population view GBV as less acceptable after participating in the Community Perception Survey. The project target of 75% was surpassed. The performance for the output indicator was 113.33%. The performance for the indicator exceeds expectation. This is a good indicator for the effectiveness of the project. It shows that the Community Perception Survey might have been effective enough to influence the opinions, views and beliefs of participants. However, it might be difficult to make any conclusions that it's the Community Perception Survey that influenced the participants because there is no indication that there was an assessment on their views on GBV before the survey.

Output indicator 4.2: Number of Community Action Groups addressing GBV, Peacebuilding, Social Cohesion and Social Norms and Negative Cultural Practices.

The evaluation established there were 20 Community Action Groups addressing GBV, Peace Building, Social Cohesion and Social Norms and Negative Cultural Practices. This was above the project target of 16 Community Action Groups. The performance for the output indicator exceeds expectation at 125%. The performance for the indicator may reflect the effectiveness of the Community Action Groups in addressing the above-mentioned advocacy issues.

Output Indicator 4.3: Number of Trained Community Action Groups Members with Increased Knowledge on Addressing Negative Social Norms, & Increasing Women and Girls' Engagement in Peace Building and Social Cohesion (SADD).

The evaluation established that there were 200 (100 women and 100 men) members of the Community Action Groups with increased knowledge on addressing the negative social norms, and increasing women and girl's engagement in peace building and social cohesion. The project target of 200 was met, and the gender ratio of at least 25% has been surpassed. The performance for the indicator exceeds expectation at 100%. This performance indicates that the capacity building trainings on the advocacy issues have been effective, and as result the community action groups can transfer the same knowledge acquired to others. Or perhaps, the project recruited people who had appropriate experience and qualifications for the job.

Through trainings and building of capacities of various stakeholders the project was able to empower different stakeholders with awareness creation on GBV and harmful social norms which discriminate against women and girls such as early forced marriage, sexual assault including defilement; referral pathways including the agency to report the incidences whether or not the victim know the perpetrator and respect for human rights.

Output Indicator 4.4: Number of Implemented Community Action Plans Addressing Peace Building, Social Cohesion and Negative social and Cultural Norms and Practices that Contribute to GBV.

The evaluation was not able to establish the number of community action plans on the advocacy, which have been implemented, although on related questions, the evaluation was able to establish that the Community Action Groups have been implementing plans. Inadequate data has been a major limitation for this evaluation. The baseline was 8 plans and the project target was 16 plans, however, there was no indication that the target was reached. In the absence of data on results, it was not possible to score the performance of this output. Lack of baseline data or clearly stated targets, and inability of respondents to state the results achieved is a major limitation on the ability of this project to measure and determine success or failure

Output Indicator 4.5: Number of People (Women, Men, Girls and Boys) Reached through Weekly and Monthly Community Dialogues and Awareness Raising on Social Norms, Peace Building, Reconciliation, Stigma Reduction and GBV Prevention and Response.

The evaluation found that the number of people reached through weekly and monthly community dialogue and awareness raising on social norms, peace building, reconciliation, stigma reduction and GBV prevention and response was 173,400 including 32,750 girls, 23,750 boys, 75,900 women and 41,000 men. The project target of 30,000 was surpassed. The performance for the output indicator exceeds the expectation at 578%. The great achievement was attributed to the multiple forums including radio talk shows, peer to peer discussions, community dialogues, discussions during the commemorative 16 days of activism and the International Women's Day. Community dialogues and awareness raising was one of the most successful activities in the project. Due to the many community groups involved and each playing their roles, the advocacy campaigns for peace building and against GBV and harmful social norms many grassroots community leaders including CDLs, volunteers, Community Action Groups for a common cause. It's one of the most effective activities of this project.

4.3 Efficiency of the Project

The assessment criterion of the project efficiency highlights how well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results or outputs, in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness with the comparison being made against what was planned, taking into account sound management and value for money. In total, this project will have spent US\$ 3,000,000 (100%)³² as part of the UN Joint Programme on prevention of and addressing gender-based violence (2017-2020) scheduled to end in February 2021 but with approved 6 months no-cost extension until August 2021 to complete implementation of the activities.

³² PBF Project financial reports



The UN Joint Programme on GBV implementation within the selected locations was based on the existing UN agencies presence as an entry point in the project areas ensuring ease of engagement with the GoSS, Implementing Partners (IPs) and the communities. This offered cost saving in terms of re-establishing a physical infrastructure.

Overall, the project demonstrated efficiency and value for money in the redesign from the two initial proposed implementation locations of Bor in Jonglei and Aweil to replicate the interventions to Akobo without budgetary increment thereby reaching more beneficiaries while adapting to the changing contexts. Renovation and use of

the already existing physical structures for the OSC in Akobo and Aweil other than putting up new ones was a prudent use of resources and saved on time. This provided capacity base for GBV interventions in the area with minimal start-up costs and lowered running costs as well as reduced transaction costs.

Efficiency was also evidenced in the innovativeness in the activity implementation through awareness campaigns delivered door to door and vocational skill training practiced safely at home with different social categories³³ of women ensured timely completion of the intended plans despite the impacts of COVID 19 that hindered large gatherings.

Use of radio in local dialects, sports, cultural dances and songs, in all the three locations to reach wider audiences with targeted messaging on awareness and sensitization of the communities on ending GBV issues, behavior change from harmful social norms, upholding of human rights and access to justice and peace. These messages reached a wider population of both the direct and indirect beneficiaries.

However, despite the level of the project efficiency, as much as the project envisioned a one stop shop service for the survivors, there were gaps in the service delivery such as lack of lab reagents at the OSC, lack of mobility in most cases for the survivors seeking the services, lack of privacy for the survivors at the SPUs especially in Bor and Aweil as the facilities are open to the communities and in contradiction to the GBV SOPs.

Despite the joint inception missions, the project got off to different start by different UN agencies and IPs, with each UN agency focusing on their mandate e.g. UNFPA conducted two partner workshops to monitor the progress where the PBF project partners also participated and a field mission was conducted by Field Hub Coordinator to Bor; UN Women participated in the technical working group meetings; UNDP participated in the technical working group meetings with field staff in the areas of implementation holding regular monitoring meetings with the implementing partners to assess their progress regular team debrief through a weekly virtual meeting; and UNICEF undertook a monitoring visit in November to Bor and Aweil to support the implementing partner as well as provide technical oversight in implementation. Subsequently, different UN Joint agencies signed contracts with the IPs, with different durations, at different periods of implementation meaning the interventions were implemented at different times of

³³Widows, Single parents, Elderly, Women with disability

the project life cycle. Further, the 3-year project lifespan was not witnessed at implementation with IPs engagements being short as three months resulting into the interventions not yielding greater impact to the beneficiaries within the project life.

With the fragile government in South Sudan, the risk and assumptions were not fully assessed such as the changes and transfer of government officials resulting in the delay of approval of certain project activities as evidenced in Bor by the delay in the construction of the WGFS. During 2020, South Sudan established the transitional government as per the Revitalized agreement on the resolution of the conflict in the Republic of South Sudan (R-ARCSS) and there were however delays in appointing state local authority. UN Women's approach that before establishing the centres, consultations on consensus of ownership needed to be conducted with the state local authority and state Ministry of Gender and the Women association in the respective location. This negatively impacted on the project time and accountability to the beneficiaries.

4.4 Likelihood of Project Impact

The Project Contribution Structural Institutional and Societal Changes

The project narrative reports showed that there was a steady increase in the number of GBV survivors accessing the GBV response services across all the entry points, i.e. One Stop Centers, Justice and Confidence Centers (JCC), Women's Empowerment Centers (WEC) and Community Action Groups which was seen as a positive move towards achieving the project objective. Behavior change was particularly observed in administration of justice by the traditional leaders as they were referring GBV cases to the Justice and Confidence Centers as opposed to making rulings as had previously been the case. This was an indication that traditional leaders understood and acknowledged that GBV is a crime and should be prosecuted in a court of law as opposed to their previous decisions on GBV cases. The shift in mind set by the communities and traditional leaders where GBV was now seen as a crime is a major progress in achieving project objectives.³⁴

Further the project made milestones in access to justice where UNYMPDA, through prison visitation, picked a case of 34 years old married woman with five (5) children who had been imprisoned for 14 months after being sentenced on charges of adultery, and successfully mediated for her release with stipulations to pay a fine of 23 heads of cattle, 10 goats and 300,000SSP to the husband.³⁵ The project also supported a woman who had endured domestic violence from her husband claiming to have not fathered the children for over 10 years to successfully secure a divorce after exhausting all the traditional mediation mechanisms. *"...I am free to live in peace. I have been providing for my family and will continue to do so in peace. HDC has given me hope..."*³⁶

A 17-year-old girl reported her father to Special Protection Unit (SPU) for trying to force her into marriage where her father refused to write a commitment never to force her daughter to marriage. The SPU officer had to forward the case to the Public Prosecutor Attorney (PPA) where the father agreed and assigned commitment never to force her daughter into marriage. *"If I had not attended the awareness session, I would still be homeless and my future would also be ruined", said Aluel expressing her gratitude to StewardWomen.*³⁷

³⁴ PBF Final Progress Report, 2021

³⁵ Ibid

³⁶ Supra

³⁷ Supra

Through efforts by StewardWomen, supported by UN Women and partners working to mitigate SGBV, on 11 March 2021, the High Court in sitting in Bor, the capital of Jonglei State, sentenced a 40-year-old prominent businessman for raping a 16-year-old girl. The Jonglei Civil Society network praised the decision of the High Court saying, *"it sends a strong message to men who abuse women"*. One of the challenges in addressing SGBV in South Sudan is the impunity of perpetrators, thus discouraging women and girls to report cases of SGBV to relevant authorities, and cases like these charts a positive precedent.³⁸

Establishment and implementation of mechanisms for dealing with GBV such as the One Stop Centers in Bor and Aweil, Police Special Protection Unit (SPUs), Police Gender/Help Desk, Justice and Confidence Centres, and community volunteers of caseworkers, social workers and groups increase in reporting of incidences and reduced GBV cases. Increased participation of or enhanced voice of women is reported in the project achievement, there are higher chances that that specific gender issues such as GBV and sexual abuse are confidential and confidently discussed and addressed through the One Stop Centers, Peace Huts, Women and Girl Friendly Centers. Establishment of OSC, JCC and Peace Hut provided opportunity for pursuing, reporting and handling of GBV cases. This facilitated increased access to crucial safe spaces for GBV victims and referral mechanism for dealing with GBV cases. They increased awareness; improved the quality of publicly available information on GBV and enabled victims to acquire knowledge on their rights and confidence to report violations. Further, at the community level, women representatives in Akobo and female paralegals in Aweil are positioned in the traditional courts to ensure the fair and just consideration of protection issues.

Significance transformation towards gender equality: The breaking of the culture of gender inequality and strengthening social cohesion is a critical key component to forging peaceful futures free from S/GBV and conflicts as witnessed through the discussion. The community structures are constituted of both women and men. Observable, in the community the women are called upon in the customary courts to listen and give opinions on issues concerning women and girls, *"as trained community paralegal, we are often called upon by the traditional leaders in adjudication of cases involving women in the community"* FGD with HACT trained paralegals in Aweil East. From the recruitment of group participants, joint trainings, participation in the intervention activities, the project distinguished itself with inter-ethnic and gender inclusivity – thus forming integrated groups bringing together members from women, youth, IDPs, returnees and host community. These groups are the actors of change in the communities and form the building blocks for conflict prevention and sustainable peace in the target area. In particular, the increased participation of women in these groups enhances their potential for effectiveness.

Increased knowledge and capacity building on the GBV and peacebuilding: The trainings conducted covering topics such as GBV case management, PSS communication and participation in peace building activities to ensure community women's knowledge and skills improved to participate actively in the community peace process. Evaluation established from beneficiary FGDs that through the PSS activities provided protection training to the vulnerable women and girls in the project intervention *"from the meetings, we are now aware of our rights and where to report in case of an abuse to fellow women and girls"* participant of fgd with women

³⁸ Supra

group in Bor. The training prepared the participants and equipped them with knowledge and skills to prevent, protect and overcome protection risks and challenges.

Strengthened social cohesion: - Social inclusion ensured that the women had a voice in decisions affecting their lives, and that they enjoy equal access to medical, psychosocial support, legal services or assistance, markets, social and physical spaces through the OSC and the WGFS. The project activities found creative ways to bring different groups ³⁹ together through entrepreneurship engagement. These interventions built on women' own capacities and coping mechanisms in such a way that promotes self-reliance and helps them to be able to better manage shocks related to GBV, conflict, and insecurity. Through dialogue, the project brought both diverse groups together *during joint training for GBV, peace, sports, skills training and livelihood initiatives*. The social cohesion approach has strengthened the connecting factors between both women groups with the major connectors being WGFS, Peace Huts, Cultural songs, sports and livelihood initiatives. This approach is very important because it identifies and uses a wide range of interventions to strengthen connectors and weaken dividers thus building cohesion and foundations for sustainable peace within a previously polarized and antagonistic community groups.

Behaviour change: The women, girls and youth have become respected agents of change mediators of conflict prevention and advocates of change on the negative social norms in the community. Women representatives are positioned in the traditional courts e.g in Akobo and Aweil to ensure the consideration of protection issues. Behaviour change has been observed in administration of justice by the traditional leaders as they are referring GBV cases to the Justice and Confidence Centres as opposed to making rulings as had previously been the case. This is attributed to their understanding that GBV is a crime and should be prosecuted in a court of law. The shift in mind set by the communities and traditional leaders where GBV is seen as a crime is seen progress in achieving project objectives.

Improved interventions by the actors in rights awareness creation and uptake on GBVs, creation of gender desks and legal aid through provision of legal consultations and *probono* services by actors in the region access to justice is reported (*by the IPs and beneficiaries who indicated that they had witnessed a conflict in their areas, some of those cases having been resolved and some of cases are in the process of being resolved*). Nonetheless, individual interventions by actors, increased rights awareness, and stronger statutory justice system can serve to slowly improve and strengthen customary laws.

Increased empowerment and improved income at household levels among the women leading to reduced conflicts. Through the business startup kits, those interviewed reporting the kits have improved their businesses and incomes.

The entrepreneurial trainings and the start-up kits received helped them to generate more income or establish a sustainable income. Through their improved economic status and training opportunities, participants said their self-confidence and autonomy had increased. All involved agreed that the project has provided opportunities for women to improve their livelihoods through increased incomes. *"my life is better now than before due to the income from the business."*

³⁹ Women IDPs, Returnees and Host communities and people living with disabilities

We have less fights at home due to our own earnings, chuckles"...female fgd participant for the IGA group in Bor.



Project beneficiary of a sewing machine



Young girl's dresses @ SSP 2,000 made by the women beneficiaries



Eatery in Bor Market by the Women supported with the Start-up kit by UN Women



Bread for Sale made by the IGA skills trained women

The project created a ripple effect by supporting business with a startup kit and (market place expanded) market related activities thus giving opportunities for more women to **create employment in the business sector**. The market expansion is an example of inter-dependency facility that will play economic and social role - bringing **closer interaction and reduce long held stereotypes and prejudices** as traders from the different groups pursue their income generating activities. As a result of the interventions which supported women strategies and programs, there is promotion of women-led initiatives fostering intergenerational dialogue and collaboration through sports, arts, culture and the activities at the women and girls friendly centers that attract children, youth and the elderly too.

The project was **impacted negatively by COVID-19 pandemic⁴⁰ and flooding** that caused displacement of populations in Bor, leading to an increase of cases of gender-based violence, particularly domestic violence against women and girls, teen-age pregnancies and other violations of women's rights.

Unintended Positive Impacts - Response to COVID-19: The project support to the most vulnerable individuals through IPA (hygiene kits among others) and information dissemination with the intent of increasing understanding of COVID-19 symptoms and mitigation measures, and prepare the most vulnerable to reduce mortality and morbidity in an outbreak scenario was unintended. The information dissemination equally impacted the lives of the beneficiaries that due to the COVID-19 information they received, they had changed their behaviors and hygiene practices, including frequent hand washing, which would protect them not only from COVID-19 but cholera as well.

⁴⁰ Due to school closer as a result of lockdowns, restriction of movements, curfew among other containment measures, most girls were less protected against criminal activities such as sexual harassment, sexual physical abuse, child marriages, psychological torture, and general gender based violence.

4.5 Project Sustainability

Ensuring sustainability means making sure that the project's goals continue to be met through activities that are consistent with the current conditions and development needs of the region, including the community needs.

- **Trainings and capacity building of the existing identified community-based protection networks**, where communities have been mobilized to form structures through community networks experienced placed the GBV prevention and response program on the right path to sustainability. There is evidence that this project has established a number of community-based structures and institutions and has conducted a number of trainings to strengthen the capacities of structures. Examples include community action groups, women empowerment centers, community dialogue leaders and champions of change, among others. Sustainability for these groups depends on whether the skills and knowledge they have acquired is adequate to enable them to continue doing the work beyond the project. Secondly, is whether there is possibility that the groups established will continue to operate without expecting any incentives for their efforts. There is strong evidence from the evaluation that a number of groups and individuals involved in the project were working on a voluntary basis. There is high possibility that those with a passion will continue to use the knowledge acquired to support the work started by the project. Groups such as social workers, case managers and community-based paralegals are known to provide probono services. The existing community-based protection networks and human rights activists may to support GBV survivors, where they can.
- The hotline number provided by the OSCs, Women Empowerment Centre (WEC) and ARC for the reporting and management of cases of GBV is also seen as a right move towards establishing sustainable path. The hotline has helped reaching out to girls and women in the remote areas.
- Referral pathways are in place and have the potential to be used long after the end of the project; this is also seen as a positive move towards sustainability of the project achievements.
- The structures and institutions established under the project such as One Stop Center in hospitals, Special Protection Units and Women and Girls Friendly Spaces, among others, could easily be taken over by the government and other implementing partners for up-scaling and continuity once the project ends.
- The presence of the implementing partners and continued resource mobilization to support initiatives started by the project would increase chances for sustainability since the local CSOs would still continue to support the project interventions.

Sustainability hindering factors

The following factors, however, could work against the potential for sustainability of the project interventions:

- Poor infrastructure and limited mobility in some areas would hinder access to services and/or protection centers thus reducing chances of project sustainability.
- Disasters such as floods, covid-19 and conflicts hinder access to services and protection and thus cause increment of cases instead.

- Lack of statutory courts in areas such as Akobo only limits prosecution of GBV cases through customary or traditional courts thus hindering access to justice to the survivors.

4.6 Coherence of the Project

This entails assessment of both internal and external project coherence. The internal coherence looks at the project's maximization of the synergies of its internal staff while the external coherence examines the synergistic complimentary with participating partners. Partnership and collaborations with the relevant MGAs and local community leaders provided an entry point ensuring project acceptability and ownership by the communities. The joint project activities e.g. commemoration of 16 days of activism as One UN in collaboration with the Ministry of Gender, Child and Social Welfare and the government officials participating in message disseminations through radio talk shows increased an uptake of key GBV and peacebuilding messages due to trust on the government institutions by the community.

The collaborations and coordination's in the project were witnessed at Juba levels at inception on joint proposal development, project design, field mission joint assessments, monthly meetings, design of the End of the Project evaluation ToR, workshop organized to plan the future of the project once it comes to an end ensured that the experiences and expertise of a diverse range of partners is drawn on. Meanwhile this was lacking at the project implementation levels with lack of activity harmonization by the IPs not being able to share knowledge and learnings. The UN joint agencies and the local implementing partners (IPs) are in the various technical working groups for the GBV and Protection Clusters as well as rule of law forum.

However, the joint activities at implementation levels were weak, and not engaging as evidenced⁴¹ by reflection on 16 Days' Activism that despite agreement to use only one UN Logo, the UN Joint agencies did not follow this agreement. None involvement of the UNCG in actively engaging in the messaging and designing common visibility actions for the action plans⁴² to have specific community level and policy level messaging as joint messaging across all agencies. The proposed development of synergies⁴³ by identifying areas of convergence, synergies and integration for project implementation (including joint implementation where possible) was not achieved. With each UN Joint agency having to implement an output aligned to its pillar, there was less regard to what partner was implementing, further evidenced by uncoordinated joint monitoring and evaluation of activities. This fact is alluded to by the interview with *UN Joint agency Key Informant*, "each of us was busing focused on the implementation and achievement of activities aligned to the agency".

4.7 Project Coverage

Overall, the project coverage was achieved above the expected populations with spill-over effects to adjacent locations. The UN Joint Programme on GBV was implemented at two levels with the selected locations based on number of existing UN agencies already working in the area with other programmes.

⁴¹ Agenda- TWG meeting on Joint Programme on GBV_14012021

⁴² 16 Days' Activism

⁴³ Revised joint mission concept note PBF-Revised

Through use of radio talk show, cultural and traditional songs, and sports the project reached both the direct and indirect beneficiaries in large numbers. Additionally, through use of radio, wider audience coverage was achieved not only in the implementing counties but beyond.

4.8 Key Strategies of Peace Building

Through design, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation the project used a gendered approach and emphasized the important link between GBV and related harmful social norms/cultural beliefs, on the one hand, and inter-community or national peace building process, on the other hand. This project made a strong case for both immediate response and long-term social transformation of GBV and factors that reinforce it. The twin strategies were complementary and broad enough to address GBV in a sustainable way.

The project strategy was based on the theory of change that there was need to address the structural issues that tend to normalize GBV and create an inclusive, participatory and enabling environment where women, girls, boys and men can effectively contribute in peace building and reconciliation processes. That peace is interconnected and what happens at one level easily affect the other levels. GBV, particularly within a patriarchal context like South Sudan, negatively impacts on women and girls, among other vulnerable groups, in fundamental ways. The national gender policy of the government of South Sudan recognizes women as *central actors* in peace building and reconciliation processes. In fact, the policy recognize that women and girls are supposed to play a central role in the revitalized national peace agreement in South Sudan. Due to their nature and roles in peace building and reconciliation processes, women are one of the pillars of social cohesion and stability within families and communities. The project's main justification is that GBV puts at risk women's *central role* in peace building and other processes where their contribution is important. In South Sudan, an entrenched patriarchal system complicated by many years of civil war has only reinforced unequal gender relations putting women and girls at risk of one form of violence or the other. GBV is one of the most common forms of violence upon which women are discriminated, excluded or abused physically or sexually.

This evaluation observed that, in order to protect women and girls and enable them participate in peace building processes in equitable way, a key strategy of the project was to address GBV from the multi-pronged approach of prevention and response simultaneously. This was captured in the project *aim statement*:

To strengthen the response and prevention mechanisms to GBV and enhance women and girls' participation in local peace processes, contributing to social cohesion and peace in Bor, Aweil and Akobo. Outputs (1 and 3) deal with the response aspect thus they provide services to GBV survivors. (Output 2) deals with both prevention and response aspects. Output 4 focuses on the long-term issue of prevention through community advocacy campaign through awareness creation and public education. The design makes the project to have a holistic approach of responding to the urgent issues of the GBV survivor while at the same time working out strategies for long term preventive initiatives intended to transform the structural and institutional conditions that characterizes GBV and gender inequality. As a strategy, the multi-pronged approach enhances the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, coverage, impact and sustainability.

The evaluation assessment observed that the above strategy ensured that the project remained relevant to the immediate and specific needs and interest of the direct and indirect beneficiaries as well as developing potential to be effective and able to sustain itself against the shocks in the fragile environment in which floods, inter-community conflicts and pandemics. It's important to note that GBV response and prevention mechanisms are two interrelated concepts that are closely related to building and sustaining peace at the household and interpersonal levels.

Find below how the key stakeholders in this project (UNFPA, UN WOMEN, UNDP and UNICEF) and the other implementing partners, under the overall coordination of UN PBF, used this strategy to ensure continued relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project. Find below (in 4.2.1 and 4.2.2). It is important to emphasize at the outset that the immediate GBV response activities are a strategy to build peace at the lowest level of society. On the other hand, the activities or initiatives being undertaken to prevent incidents of GBV are strategies to sustain peace at the same level.

4.8.1 Gender Based Violence Response - As a Strategy for Building Peace

- By supporting the establishment of a mechanism (2 One Stop Centers (OSC) at Bor in Jonglei State and Aweil, respectively, the project, through the support of the United Nation Population Fund (UNPFA), has provided access to integrated support services for 2,126 GBV survivors. The survivors were able to access and use the services including medical support, medical equipment and supplies, anti-rape kit, psycho-social support, legal support and referral pathways, among others. It's important to explain that these services help the survivors to come to terms with the crime committed against them before they can start healing, recovery and re-integration back to society. This is managing intra-personal and/or interpersonal conflict, an essential prerequisite for survivor's full recovery and reintegration into mainstream society.
- The provision of business start-up kits to stimulate income generation and economic growth for women groups is an important aspect of healing and recovery process. For GBV survivor, being involved in gainful employment boosts self-esteem and helps the survivor to stay focused on positive thinking and helps the survivor to heal and recover from the traumatic experience. For the youth opportunities to engage in self-employment helps them to re-direct their energies and predisposition away from being engaged in crime or being recruited by militia groups. This intervention had the potential not only to prevent conflicts but sustain peace as well.

4.8.2 Gender Based Violence Prevention - A Strategy of Sustaining Peace

- Through funding from UNICEF, the project supported a community perception survey in Bor and Aweil counties, in which 85% of participants viewed GBV as less acceptable after participating in the survey, thus the project was able to influence the opinions of participant against GBV. Such efforts are the building blocks the project applied to transform harmful social norms that contribute to GBV to positive norms that promote gender equality. Similarly, through same funding, 200 participants (100 females and 100 males) were trained on how to address negative social norms and increasing women and girls' engagement in peace building and social cohesion. It is important to note that capacity building is a key ingredient for sustainability potential of this project.

- The project was designed and implemented in a dynamic and flexible approach, often getting tailored to specific security situations thus increasing buy-in and ownership of the beneficiaries. The decision to extend the project to Akobo after an appeal was made by State authorities is an example of this strategy. This decision not only provided access to GBV support services for survivors and other beneficiaries in Akobo but strengthened relationship between implementers and GoSS at state level. The gesture helped to build and sustain peace between the various groups participating in the project. Ultimately a shared ownership especially with the GoSS at both national and state levels is important for the sustainability of the project or engagement in similar projects in the future.

4.9 Critical Factors that Influenced Project Performance

The project operational context influenced the achievement of the project targets with the project team either exploiting the enablers to the maximum or countering the hindrances through problem-analysis and solution-based modeling approaches to programming.

a. Enabling Factors

The factor which promoted the successful implementation of program activities amid the challenges includes:

- The experienced and robust project management, technical and operational teams with sectoral expertise at the UN joint agencies at Juba and field levels enabled the effective and timely implementation of the planned activities, thereby achieving targets within the scheduled time despite the COVID-19 global pandemic challenge.
- The strong and deliberate collaborations with the partners, particularly the lead UN agencies, IPs, informal and formal local leaders enable the project to benefit from leveraged synergies and technical expertise, information sharing, combined intervention implementations, and shared costs of implementations.
- The reputation that the UN agencies and the IPs has earned within the target communities in line with its programming ensured ease of acceptance by the target communities and leaders who supported and participated in the programme interventions.
- Remote/online support include weekly activity reports to update on activity progress and gaps continued during the report period.

b. Hindering Factors

Despite the achievement of the program outcomes, this evaluation determined the following gaps;

- The emergence of the COVID-19 global pandemic affected the implementation of some of the programme activities due to restriction in movement and access of project sites, lockdowns, scaling down⁴⁴ of activities and suspicion by the communities that the programme staff could have come into contact with the virus and therefore could infect

⁴⁴ Limited the number of participants in each training setting as well community outreach activities– this led in an adjustment of the traditional training setting of having 15-20 participants to Covid-19 sensitive setting e.g training less (10) participants per training.

them. The effect was a slow reach of the set target number of participants in the project locations.

- The pandemic affected the operations of many institutions such as governments, UN Agencies, local partners, and service providers through the Covid-19 restrictions and lockdown hampered the timely delivery of construction and building materials meant for the establishment of Women empowerment Centre's in Bor and Aweil; hence the delay in finalization and operationalization of these centres.
- Inaccessibility in the project areas due to flooding hindered the survivors accessing service points and curtailed awareness creations within the communities.

4.9 Good Practice

- Joint activities by the UN joint agencies in proposal development, design and assessment reviews leveraging on agencies/partners experience, comparative strengths and expertise ensured learning.
- Implementation of the project interventions based Joint field mission assessment and service mapping. The regular interagency coordination meetings contributed to the success of the project.
- Flexibility of the project funds to cover hitherto uncovered areas such as – Akobo.
- The project replication of the interventions in Akobo under or with the same budget thus creating impact to more than the initial targeted beneficiaries demonstrated a good practice in offering value for money in achieving much with less.
- Use of a hotline number by One Stop Centers (OSC) and Women Empowerment Centre (WEC) for the reporting and management of cases of GBV has helped reaching out to girls and women in the remote areas.
- The innovation and ability to adopt, integrating the COVID19 messaging in the programme.
- The integration of GBV, peacebuilding and aspects of livelihood in the design offers a holistic approach to programming ensuring greater impacts to the targeted beneficiaries.

4.10 Lessons Learnt

- Partnership and collaborations of the relevant MGAs and local community leaders in programming provided an entry point to the community ensuring project acceptability and ownership resulting in achievement of results and desired impacts to the beneficiaries with enhanced sustainability.
- Strengthened positive working relationship with government counterparts, through their dedication by achieving results under trying circumstances. A key lesson learned is the critical importance of maintaining and building upon these relationships, in order to sustain and further improve results for ending GBV, child protection, social cohesion and sustainable peace strengthen the engagement of communities with the government and local authorities.
- Enhanced coordination is crucial and important for a multi-agency programming – despite the success of this project it could have been more organized if there was better coordination between the national and field level.

- Success of the interventions depends largely on the acceptance by the communities. The trust in government by the communities and the Joint agencies' identification of existing community structures, establishment of community-based groups and individual volunteers, together with close government collaboration and Implementing Partners at the field levels offered an entry point to the communities resulting to acceptance and success of the project interventions.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

The PBF project was found to be quite relevant, effective and efficient with great potential for impacts and sustainability. With greater and more structured collaboration and increased investments in time, funds and effort especially in the innovative aspects, this project could lay a strong foundation for a quick and thriving societal transformation in gender relations, sustainable peace building and reconciliation, the rule of law and access to justice leading to recovery, healing and reintegration GBV survivors in many areas of the Republic of South Sudan. There may be need to identify and consolidate the pillars of innovation and sustainability in this project. Considering the great need for transformation in the issues this project set out to address, the exploration and initiatives in Aweil, Bor and Akobo should be considered as a pilot phase especially for inter-agency programming.

The focus should be to study the achievements including lessons made by this project and reasons for the same. Although there was not much variation in the findings from all the three study locations, it was seen clearly that peace building focus should not be the same in Bor, Aweil and Akobo because the issues, experiences and the lessons learnt found in these locations are not similar, for instance, in Aweil the issues of early and forced marriages were imminent, in Bor the imminent issues were cattle raiding and kidnapping or abduction of women and children while in Akobo the imminent issues were youths groups such as the white army who rob and fight vulnerable people in the area. The One Stop Centers (OCS) with its integrated services for the GBV survivors is a major innovation but one that could be conceptualized and made to provide more services at relatively low costs. Despite the achievements and great interests generated by this project, there are certain aspects that could be done differently next time. The project could achieve greater and immediate impacts with more coherence, deliberate collaboration and coverage.

5.2 Recommendations

Based on the findings, good practices and lessons learnt, this evaluation recommends the following:

1. In future joint programming, **at project design, delink the outputs from specific UN agency** but with each participating UN agency having a more defined or distinct role to play. This will ensure a coordinated effort in the implementation other than each trying to achieve its goals.
2. **Continued Capacity Building of Different Community Structures:** The women, girls and youth have become respected mediators of conflict prevention and advocates of change on the negative social norms in the community. Therefore, there is need to continue building capacity of the different community GBV and peace structures⁴⁵ in change advocacy, conflict resolution and leadership skills, and more practical-focused

⁴⁵ Community Discussion Leaders, Community Champions of Change, Community Action Against GBV, Girl Protection Network, Girl Child Right Protection, Community Mobilizers, Dialogue groups, Community Volunteers

areas such as change on negative social norms, mediation and reconciliation, and peace building.

3. For sustainability of the trained community structures of CDLs, Community based paralegals, Champions of Change, Women Group there is need to **establish network of each group** where the skills and knowledge they have acquired can be adequately utilized beyond the project. Further, the networks will ensure continued sharing of knowledge, experiences and synergies in the referral of cases and awareness raising.
4. **Replication of Project Interventions:** For future replication of project interventions, there is need to establish a consortium of all the participating agencies and implementers for harmonized start of activities, enhance networking by local IPs, knowledge sharing and learning, and ensure ease of reporting results.
5. **Transformation of Power Structures:** Longer-term, process-based initiatives are needed to transform power structures, particularly patriarchal moral and social orders and notions of "hyper-masculinity," which in South Sudan are heavily impacted by bride wealth-based local economies, denial of resources, to reduce on the drivers of GBVs and conflicts.
6. In future UN Joint implementations, there should be deliberate efforts in project management by Resident Coordinator Office (RCO) through coordinated collaborations and specific tasks to the agencies. The Country Offices need to ensure a more proactive involvement at the national level, while the field teams and IPs ensures coordinated implementation of interventions at field levels. This will ensure effective development of synergies at different levels by identifying areas of convergence, synergies and integration for project implementation (including joint implementation where possible) was not achieved.
7. **Use of One Stop Centre/Women and Girl Friendly Space:** The impact of the project is great and with the availability of funds, the project should be up scaled and replicated in conflict hot spots in the country with the concept of One Stop Center (OSC) providing a holistic service to the victims and survivors of GBV with Women and Girl Friendly Spaces (WGFS) as a focus to promote integration and social cohesion among the communities. With regards to the gaps and factors that exists, the diversity across the 3 regions of South Sudan (Bor, Akobo and Aweil), as well as across urban and rural areas. This should be coupled with a synthesis research and analysis of women and youth in South Sudan.
8. For sustainability of access to justice services at Justice and Confidential Centers, incorporate the JCC in the services at the OSC for a complete holistic GBV services. Further model the OSC into a mobile facility to reach hard to reach populations.
9. **Funding Period and Consistency:** Longer term consistence funding, and where possible a multi-donor funds is necessary to support peace-building and behavior change initiatives and to provide a space for dialogue, healing and reconciliation, which in the long run lead to cohesion and peaceful co-existence.
10. **More Gender Inclusivity in Hard-to-reach Areas:** There should be more deliberate efforts in targeting the hard-to-reach youths especially boys and young men with the peace messages, behavior change communication and life skill trainings as well as ensuring the creation of awareness on GBV to both parents (husband and wife) focusing the sharing of duties between women and men, boys and girls.
11. **Mentorship and Capacity Building of Participating Women and Girls:** The development actors should embrace continued participatory mentorship, capacity building and strengthened monitoring and evaluation systems for the participating women and girls. The low literacy levels by most of the women demand for regular and

continued skills mentorship and empowerment for peace building impacts and sustainability of the livelihood gains. Coupled with lack of financial support, the women and young girls' peace-building activities often have very limited provision for evaluating the effectiveness and impacts of their work and therefore impeding the visibility and sustainability of their initiatives. But beyond increased financial support, innovative approaches that encourages women active role to evaluate the impact of women engagement in conflict resolution and end of GBV must be used – particularly those that build on qualitative evidence and participative approaches.

12. **Implementation and Administration of Policies:** There should be effective implementation and administration of legal frameworks, policy and strategies e.g. the National GBV Strategy, a National Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for GBV which have been developed to guide the implementation of the prevention and response to GBV.
13. **Integration of GBV and Peacebuilding into IPs Programming:** It is critical for all the project implementing partners to integrate gender-based violence and peacebuilding into their programming in order to enhance effectiveness of the project for better results.
14. **Strengthening of Monitoring and Evaluation System:** There is need for a joint roving M&E officer for the effective and timely monitoring and tracking of results as well as capacity assessment and enhancement of the IPs on project monitoring and management. The basis of strengthening the understanding around the many multilayered factors underlying GBV and especially violence against women, women's experiences with such violence, and the effectiveness of the response at the service provider, community, national and international level lies with monitoring and evaluation. This is critically important because while the global evidence base on the proportion of women having ever experienced various forms of abuse is strong, evidence on what kinds of strategies are effective in preventing such violence and offering adequate support to victims and survivors is still weak and needs to be strengthened.

APPENDICES:

Appendix 1: Performance Achievement

Performance Indicator	Baseline Indicator	End of Project Indicator (Target)	Final Evaluation Indicator	Comments
Outcome Statement: Increased empowerment of women in South Sudan by strengthening prevention mechanisms for GBV by transforming harmful social norms into positive behaviour that promotes gender equality.				
Outcome level Indicators				
Outcome Indicator 1a: % increase of women and girl's participation in local peace and justice processes.	No data	40%	-	There were no community perception reports to verify this outcome indicator both at baseline and end-line. ⁴⁶ This made it difficult to determine the % of women who engage in established local action groups and remain in the Programme to support the overall outcomes related to GBV prevention decision making, and participation in social cohesion, civic life, peacebuilding and justice services
Outcome Indicator 1b: Women's perception of their inclusion and equality in society.	No data	TBD	87%	There were no women's perception surveys in target and non-target areas (control group surveys) for comparison with the end-line result. A baseline survey was supposed to be undertaken at the project inception. ⁴⁷ The target at the end of the project wasn't set.
Outcome Indicator 1c: Proportion of women and girls who feel confident to report GBV and know where to access relevant services in case they become victim of GBV.	No data 37% ⁴⁸	40%	-	The project was supposed to measure this indicator through regular perception surveys and by collecting feedback from women on improvement in access to local justice and peace mechanism and integrated GBV services with an expected 40% improvement of perception. ⁴⁹ The improvement couldn't be determined at the end-line.
Output level Indicators				

⁴⁶ 3. PBF Prodoc_NCE request_16022021

⁴⁷ Ibid

⁴⁸ https://insights.careinternational.org.uk/media/k2/attachments/CARE_The_Girl_Has_No_Rights_GBV_in_South_Sudan.pdf

⁴⁹ Supra

Output 1: Increased access to comprehensive GBV support services in Bor and Aweil				
Output Indicator 1.1: Number of GBV survivors accessing and using the integrated GBV services in One Stop Centre (SADD).	0	1000	2,126 ⁵⁰	Target was surpassed by 1126 GBV survivors
Output Indicator 1.2: Number of GBV One Stop Centers established and operational.	0	2	2	Target achieved
Output Indicator 1.3: Number of service providers (disaggregated by sex and profession) with increased skills and other capacity in providing integrated response services.	0	100	152 duty bears and service providers (68F/84M)	Target surpassed by 52 service providers who were trained on legislations and policies governing GBV investigation, prevention, prosecution and case management, PSS and referrals
Output Indicator 1.4: Number of People (SADD) which are aware of the existence and services of the One Stop Centre in the intervention areas.	0	20,000	54,980	Target surpassed. Community awareness conducted through radio talk shows and road shows through microphone rallies. These new strategies also create an opportunity to sensitize the communities and create awareness on COVID-19 and how best the community could keep their families and friends safe from COVID- 19.
Output 2: Strengthened women's groups participation in local peace processes in Bor and Aweil and increase civic engagement on GBV Prevention and response.				
Output Indicator 2.1: Number of advocacy issues raised by women through peace huts initiatives.	0	5	5	Target achieved through establishment of the peace huts where the following 5 advocacy issues were raised - early marriage, wife inheritance, property ownership, girl-child education and revenge killings
Output indicator 2.2: Number of women's peace huts/ women centers functional.	4	5 (minimum)	5 women's peace huts were established in Aweil and Bor	Target achieved. 3 more women's peace huts/women centres were established in Bor but late in the project.
Output Indicator 2.3: Number of community members reached on GBV response and importance of women participation (SADD).	0	5,000 (60% women and girls)	2,080 (64.1% women and girls)	Target not reached ⁵¹ though the percentage of women and girls surpassed.
Output Indicator 2.4: # of women trained on facilitation skills on women participation in peace process.	0	350	441 Women including 22 girls	Target surpassed

⁵⁰ Including the 4 auxiliary help desks

⁵¹ COVID-19 restrictions such as social distancing and flooding in Bor and Akobo contributed to decreased number of women and girls reached. Despite this, the no cost extension allowed to rectify this.

Output 3: Increased access of GBV survivors in Bor and Aweil to justice mechanisms.				
Output Indicator 3.1: Existence of functional mobile court system to adjudicate GBV cases.	No	Yes	Yes	The mobile court teams continue to be engaged to prioritize adjudication of GBV cases.
Output indicator 3.2: % of cases prosecuted to completion.	0	5%	32.7% (51 cases with 43f /8m)	Target surpassed with sensitization of formal and informal justice actors and communities on SGBV resulting in an increase in the number of SGBV cases reported and subsequently the numbers prosecuted.
Output Indicator 3.1.2: Number of community-based paralegals with skills to support dispensation of justice for survivors (SADD).	0	20 per state ⁵² (min 25% men)	22 trained (100% women)	Target achieved but with non-achievement of gender parity.
Output 4: Communities in Bor- Jonglei and Aweil transform harmful social norms that contribute to GBV into positive norms that promote gender equality.				
Output indicator 4.1: Percentage of target population that views GBV as less acceptable after participating in the Community perception survey.	0	75%	85%	Target achieved
Output indicator 4.2: Number of community action groups addressing GBV, peacebuilding, social cohesion and social norms and negative cultural practices.	8	16	20	Target surpassed
Output Indicator 4.3: Number of trained community action group members with increased knowledge on addressing negative social norms, & increasing women and girls' engagement in peace building and social cohesion (SADD).	0	200 (at least 25% male)	200 (100 women, 100 men)	Target achieved with non-achievement of gender parity
Output indicator 4.4: Number of implemented community action plans addressing peace building, social cohesion and negative social and cultural norms and practices that contribute to GBV.	8	16	16	Target achieved
Output Indicator 4.5: Number of people (women, men, girls and boys) reached through weekly and monthly community dialogues and awareness raising on social norms, peace building, reconciliation, stigma reduction and GBV prevention and response.	7,900	30,000	173,400 (32,750 girls, 23,750 boys, 75,900 women and 41,000 men)	Target is overachieved due to use of multiple forum including radio talk shows, peer to peer discussions, community dialogues, discussions during commemorative days like 16 days of activism, International Women's Day etc.

⁵² Due to budgetary constraints, the Technical Working Group adjusted the target to 10 women per State.

Appendix2: List of KIIs and FGD participants

No	Name	Institution	Title	M	F
	UN Agency				
1	Shruti Upadhyay	UNFPA	Gender Specialist		1
2	Viola Riak	UNFPA	Gender Analyst		1
3	Monalisa Zatjirua	UN WOMEN	Programme Specialist GBV		1
4	Mary Kiratu	UNDP	Reporting, M&E Officer		1
5	Margaret Mathiang	UNDP	Gender Analyst		1
6	Moses Wandera	UNICEF	CC Programme Consultant	1	
7	Athieng Riak	UNICEF	Child Protection Officer		1
8	Evelyn Edroma	UNDP	Programme Manager		1
	Jonglei State (Bor)				
10	Peruth Karungi	UNDP	Security Specialist		1
11	Daniel Pasical	SSNPS- Police	Investigator	1	
12	Dut dau Ghak	SSNPS -Police	Assistant investigator	1	
13	Samuel Majur	MoH	Director General	1	
14	Yuang Kuany Yuang	MoGCSW	A/G Director General	1	
15	Agot Kuol	MoGCSW	Director	1	
16	Joseph Malual Awuol	SSNPS – SPU	Head of SPU	1	
	IPs				
17	Teddy Chandia	IMA	Project Coordinator		1
18	Roda Bol	IMA -OSC	Social Worker		1
	FGD with 5 Youth, 6 GBV School Club, 8 Women Group and 2 Disable Representative				
19	Vitoria	HDC	Project manager		1
20	Garang Ngong Kur	HDC	Protection officer	1	
21	Rachel Achol	HDC	GBV Case Worker		1
22	Mayom Biar	HDC	Area manager	1	
	Anger Uhai Deng	HDC	Community Volunteer		
	Tabitha Akoi Awuol	HDC	Community Volunteer		1
	Monica Yar	HDC	Community Volunteer		1
	Nyamak Magot Mathiang	HDC	Community Volunteer		1
	Apiel Kuot Kuolot	HDC	Community Volunteer		
	Vivian Awel Achiek	HDC	Community Volunteer		1
23	Aleer Buot M	UNYMPDA	Probono Lawyer		1
24	Mary Athieng Alier	AIRD	Champaign for Change		1
25	Bol Malong Deng	AIRD	Champaign for Change	1	
26	Amuor Rebecca Ayii	Care International	Project Manager		1
	FGD with 8 Tailoring group, 10 Bread Making and 8 Bed Sheet design				
27	Tabitha Adut Awon	Steward women	Case worker		1
	Ajah Kuol Aduri		Beneficiary		1
	Mary Abuoi Mach		Beneficiary		1
	Atiek Ayuen Garang		Beneficiary		1
	FGD with Restaurant Group, 3 Female beneficiaries from Steward Women				
	IPs Akobo				
28	Gatluit Chuol	Intersos	Project Assistant	1	
29	Brem Choal	Intersos	Case Work	1	
30	Nyakoang Pur	Intersos	Community Mobilizer		1

	FGD with Restaurant Group 3 female, Elder group 1 female and 3 men				
31	Duol Gatkuoth Dual	Nile Hope	Legal Officer	1	
32	Ruei madding	Nile Hope	Project Manager	1	
	James	Nile Hope-OSC	Doctor	1	
	Kumping Malual		Community action against GBV	1	
	Kher Ruach puok			1	
	Manasa Gai			1	
	John Both Yian			1	
	Yuol Ruach Kok			1	
	Nyaluit Kotda		End child Marriage	1	
	Nyathak Puk				1
	Nyaluak Puk				1
	Nyamal Chuol				1
	Kher Ruot Chuol			1	
	Nyamuon Kolang		Girl protection Network		1
	Nyabuol Kunen				1
	Chuol Biel Hoth				
	Chol Malual				1
	Nyawal Yol				1
	Nyabora Jock		Girl child right protection		1
	Nyawuor Lul				1
	Bol Thok Kier			1	
	Gatthak Kher			1	
	Changkuoth			1	
	FGD, with 5 members of; CAA GBV, 5 ECM, 5 GPN, 5 GCRP(Nile Hope)				
	County Government				
33	Yieni Hoth Deng	County Health	Director	1	
34	James Tang	SSNPS	Assistant Police	1	
35	Tot Tut Koang	SSNPS	Director of Police	1	
	FDG				
	Puoch Yul Thiel		Chief	1	
	Simon Rok Reat		Elder	1	
	Lam Jal Wang		Elder	1	
	Yoal tot Chan		Sub-Chief	1	
	Jock Yoal Yoak		Sub-Chief	1	
	Lual Mut Khan		Chief	1	
	Mai Hoth Garbang		Sub-Chief	1	
	Jesus Wectuor Nhial		Elder	1	
	Chuol Wau Chuol		Sub-chief	1	
	FGD, 9 Chiefs and 2 Elders				

	Aweil				
35	George Kadimba	UNDP	Security Specialist	1	
36	Hon. Deng Majak Deng	MoJ	Head of legal Admin	1	
37	Luac Akor R	Prison Service	Director		
38	Mary Arkanyelo Bak	MoGCSW	Director General		1
39	Akot Angue Akot	MoGCSW	Former Director General	1	
40	Deng Ajiing Dau	NPSS-SPU	GBV Officer/Instigator	1	
41	Major. Ayak Agiu Bol	NPSS-SPU	Head of Spu	1	
	IPs				
42	Elizabeth Ajok	HACT	GBV Officer	1	
43	Mark Kuol Arol	ADAFIN-OSC	Project focal Person		
44	Martin Deng	ADAFIN-OSC	Medical Doctor		
45	Martha Achai Garang	TOCH	GBV project Coordinator		
46	Teresa Nyibol Garang	TOCH	GBV Case Worker		
47	Angelo Ajiing	ACDF	Project Manager		
	Christina Adut	ACDF	Executive Director		
FGD with 3 ACDF women Volunteer, 4 focal point Volunteer and 3 GBV victims					
48	Monica Akon Lual	Women's General Association	Acting Director General		1
49	Lual Deng	Alight	Field coordinator	1	
	Marko Manut Majok		Community Discussion Leader	1	
	Deng Ngor Akoon			1	
	Lilly Anguit Victor				1
	Maria Abuk Dut				1
	FGD with 6 female in skill building and 5 empowerment women(Mill), focal point 3 community volunteer 4 and GBV victims 3				
	FGD				
50	Santino Ajiing Riing	HACT	Paralegal		
51	Margaret Ahiai Francis	HACT	Paralegal		1
52	Monica Kual	HACT	Paralegal		1
52	Nyibol Bak Dut	HACT	Paralegal		1
	Kuan Atak Akot	HACT	Paralegal		

Appendix 3: Terms of Reference (ToR)

Terms of Reference

End of the Project Evaluation for project 'Protecting women and girls in South Sudan: Addressing GBV as catalyst for peace' under the United Nations Joint Programme on Prevention of and Addressing Gender Based Violence in South Sudan

2019-2021

End of the Project Evaluation

March, 2021

1. Introduction

The Peacebuilding fund project, “Protecting women and girls in South Sudan: Addressing gender based violence (GBV) as catalyst for peace”, is implemented by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (UN Women) since September 2018. The project is part of the United Nations Joint Programme (JP) on prevention of and addressing gender-based violence (2017-2020) supported by Peacebuilding fund. . The project runs for the period, September 2018- February 2021. The programme aims to address the alarming situation of GBV gender based violence in South Sudan through an integrated approach to achieve increase empowerment of women in South Sudan by strengthening prevention mechanisms for GBV and transforming harmful social norms into positive behaviour that promotes gender equality in Bor, Aweil and Akobo. This entails, (i) provision of life-saving integrated services through One Stop Centres/ Family Protection Centres in Aweil and Akobo, (ii) strengthening women’s groups participation in local peace processes in Bor, Aweil and Akobo and increase civic engagement on GBV Prevention and response, (iii) increasing access to justice mechanisms for the GBV survivors, and (iv) transforming communities’ harmful social norms that contribute to GBV into positive norms that promote gender equality.

The PBF project contract stipulates to conduct an end of project evaluation towards the end of the project. In this respect, the evaluation will be implemented in line with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards and international good practice for evaluation. It offers step-by-step guidance to prepare methodologically robust evaluations and sets out the roles and responsibilities of key evaluation stakeholders at all stages in the evaluation process.

The main audience and primary users of the evaluation are: (i) The participating UN agencies for the project; (ii) Government of South Sudan (iii) the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) in South Sudan; (iv) the donors operating in South Sudan. The evaluation results will also be of interest to a wider group of stakeholders, including: (i) Implementing partners of the joint project; (ii) UN participating agencies in regional offices and headquarters divisions, branches and offices; (iii) academia; (iv) local civil society organizations and international NGOs; and (v) beneficiaries of UN support (in particular women and adolescents and youth). The evaluation results will be disseminated to these audiences as appropriate, using traditional and new channels of communication and technology.

The evaluation will be managed by the UN lead agency for the project, UNFPA South Sudan, with guidance and support from the Country Office (CO) M&E Manager, Resident Coordinator’s Office as the portfolio manager, and in consultation with the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) throughout the evaluation process. A team of independent external evaluators will conduct the evaluation and prepare an evaluation report in conformity with these terms of reference.

2. Country Context

South Sudan is one of the world’s newest nations, only attaining independence on July 9, 2011. It has a Transitional Government leading the country based on the South Sudan Transitional Constitution with parliamentary and executive system of governance. South Sudan has a population of 12.353 million with 81 per cent living in rural areas and 73.7 per cent aged below 30 years. The protracted conflict in South Sudan has a profound impact on individuals and communities as it has further weakened and destabilized coping mechanisms, GBV prevention and response systems, and peace building initiatives. The conflict has further weakened institutional capacity for provision of basic social services and for justice and reconciliation; has reinforced deep seated grievances that underpin many inter-communal conflicts, perpetuating revenge killings and violence, including GBV.

GBV is a serious human rights violation and a significant global health and security issue. Studies suggest that the rates, perpetrators and types of GBV fluctuate during conflict; evidence shows that sexual violence against both

⁵³2008 Population and Housing Census – Projections

women and men increases during conflict. The global prevalence of sexual violence among refugees and displaced persons is estimated to be 21.4%, suggesting that approximately one in five women who are refugees or displaced by an emergency, experience sexual violence⁵⁴.

In South Sudan many GBV survivors experience multiple forms of GBV during fighting, flight and once in displacement⁵⁵. The 2015 Protection Survey conducted within Protection of Civilian (PoC) sites commissioned by the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) showed GBV prevalence ranging from 23-72%. The special investigation team on human rights abuses in South Sudan described GBV as reaching epidemic proportions in its communique in 2016. GBV in South Sudan including Conflict Related Sexual Violence⁵⁶ (CRSV) is used as a tactical tool and GBV rates therefore takes unprecedented proportions in the country. The hostilities that erupted in Juba in December 2013 and July 2016 marked by political and ethnic undertones⁵⁷, had especially atrocious consequences for targets of GBV. The GBVIMS report shows a significant increase in the number of GBV cases reported in the periods of armed conflict in 2013 and 2016, further emphasising the impact of conflict on the increase of GBV cases.⁵⁸ Impunity stems from a weak judicial system wherein customary practices influence decisions. While the South Sudan Penal Code provides for the criminalisation of several forms of sexual violence, several of such cases are determined by customary courts with unsatisfactory results especially for survivors. This requires strengthening prosecutorial capacities, referral pathways and legal assistance to survivors.

UN joint project 'Protecting women and girls in South Sudan: Addressing GBV as catalyst for peace'

The project brings together UN agencies to deliver on the prevention and response to GBV, recognizing that it is a part of the Revitalized agreement of the Republic of South Sudan, National development strategy of South Sudan, the UNSCR 1325 and its National Action Plan and the UN Nations Peacebuilding plan, all advocating for and promoting the Women, Peace and Security agenda; peacebuilding, Gender equality and respect for, and protection of, human rights and fundamental freedoms is at the core of the resolutions. This project further contributes to progress on the implementation of Agenda 2030 on Sustainable Development, particularly on goals 5 (gender equality and women's empowerment) and 16 (peace, justice and strong institutions) by strengthening women's participation at all levels (target 5.5), addressing violence against women (target 5.2) and strengthening the promotion of the rule of law and access to justice for all (target 16.3).

The project, contributes to the four priority areas of the UN Joint GBV Programme, 1) Increased access to health & psychosocial support services, 2) Protection and security, 3) Justice and Rule of law, 4) Community engagement & social norms; and considers existing GBV interventions coordinated under the GBV sub-cluster mechanism.

At the outcome level, the project's aim is *to strengthen the response and prevention mechanisms to GBV and enhance women and girls' participation in local peace processes, contributing to social cohesion and peace in Bor, Aweil and Akobo*. The programme's Theory of Change is as below.

- **If** survivors of GBV in Bor and Aweil have access to integrated and comprehensive services, including access to justice and healing **and**;
- If women and girls have safe spaces and platforms where they can raise peace and security issues that concern them, including GBV, and where they receive capacity training to mobilize around these concerns **and**;
- **If** perpetrators of GBV are held accountable, are being prosecuted and the culture of impunity ends
- **And if** the whole community, especially men, boys and community leaders, actively promote gender equality and condemn GBV

Then social cohesion in Bor- Jonglei State and Aweil states increases towards stability and sustainable peace

⁵⁴Stark L, Ager A. A systematic review of prevalence studies of gender-based violence in complex emergencies. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*. 2011;12 (127-134)

⁵⁵ IRC, *No Safe Place: A Lifetime of Violence for Conflict-Affected Women and Girls in South Sudan* (2017)

⁵⁶Conflict-related sexual violence refers to incidents or (for SCR 1960 listing purposes) patterns of sexual violence, that is rape, sexual slavery, forced prostitution, forced pregnancy, enforced sterilization, or any other form of sexual violence of comparable gravity, against women, men, girls or boys. Such incidents or patterns occur in conflict or post-conflict settings or other situations of concern, *Stop Rape Now: UN Action Against Sexual Violence in Conflict* (2011).

⁵⁷ Report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council (S/2018/250) issued on 16 April 2018

⁵⁸ South Sudan GBVIMS 2016 report

Because women will participate more actively in local (and national) peace processes in a safe and conducive environment, free from GBV and other harmful acts, reaching their full potential as central actors in society and peacebuilding and herewith ensuring a more inclusive peace process.

The project is designed to achieve the following outcome and the below mentioned outputs:

Overarching Outcome: Increased empowerment of women in South Sudan by strengthening prevention mechanisms for GBV by transforming harmful social norms into positive behavior that promotes gender equality.

Output 1: Increased access comprehensive GBV support services

Establishment of two GBV one stop centres, in Akobo and Aweil to provide survivors with access to critical GBV services (medical, psychosocial, continuous legal advice) and; increase capacities of staff to address survivor needs in a timely and comprehensive manner

Output 2: Strengthened women's groups participation in local peace processes and increase civic engagement on GBV Prevention and response

The output focuses to strengthen capacities of local women's groups at the community level to engage in local peace processes. Women's groups and peace huts/women empowerment centres are established at community level in Aweil and Bor to serve as safe spaces for dialogue on all issues and topics which women would like to raise related to their needs and concerns regarding security, safety, including on GBV prevention and available service.

Output 3: Increased access of GBV survivors to justice mechanisms

Under this output, several initiatives are supported to make local justice processes more accessible for women and ensure that these structures are sensitive to women's justice needs and foster effective legitimacy, engagement and cooperation with women and other vulnerable groups. Through technical support and capacity training on GBV to informal and formal authorities, especially security and justice actors such as law enforcement and prosecutors, access to justice for GBV survivors is expected to increase.

Output 4: Communities in Bor and Aweil transform harmful social norms that contribute to GBV into positive norms that promote gender equality

This output area engages the whole community including local CSOs (both women led and other CSOs), including men and boys, to enable sustainable behavior and social change by transforming gender unequal relationships.

4. Evaluation Purpose, Objectives and Scope

4.1. Purpose

The end of the project evaluation will serve the following three main purposes: (i) demonstrate accountability to stakeholders on performance in achieving development results and on invested resources; (ii) support evidence-based decision making on the progress made against the results outlined; and (iii) contribute key lessons learned to the existing knowledge base on how to carry forward the gains made through the intervention.

4.2. Objectives

The **objectives** of this evaluation are:

1. To provide the project participating agencies, national stakeholders with an independent assessment of the performance of the project and key lessons learned, based on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project towards the expected outputs and outcomes set forth in the results framework.
2. Draw key lessons from past and current cooperation and provide a set of clear and forward-looking options leading to strategic and actionable recommendations for the next project.

4.3. Scope

Geographic Scope

The evaluation will cover interventions at the national level and in locations Bor, Akobo and Aweil.

Thematic Scope

The evaluation will cover the following thematic areas as outlined under the four outcomes envisaged as per the results framework. In addition, under the evaluation criteria noted above, the evaluation will cover cross-cutting issues such as gender equality, human rights and peacebuilding, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), communications, innovation; resource mobilization and strategic partnerships.

5. Evaluation Criteria and Preliminary Evaluation Questions

5.1. Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation will examine the following four OECD/DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and sustainability. The evaluation will also apply Human Rights and Gender Equality as integrated criteria for evaluation.

Relevance	The extent to which the objectives of the project correspond to population needs at country level (in particular, those of vulnerable groups), and were aligned throughout the project period with government priorities and with the project.
Effectiveness	The extent to which outputs have been achieved and the extent to which these outputs have contributed to the achievement of the outcomes.
Efficiency	The extent to which outputs and outcomes have been achieved with the appropriate amount of resources (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.).
Sustainability	The continuation of benefits from intervention after its termination, linked, in particular, to their continued resilience to risks.
Coverage	The extent to which major population groups facing life-threatening suffering were reached.
Coherence	The extent to which the project was complimentary to the actions by the participating agencies and the areas that could be strengthened further.
Gender Equality and Human Rights	The extent to what gender and human rights considerations have been integrated into the project.

5.2. Preliminary Evaluation Questions

The evaluation is expected to provide answers to a number of evaluation questions which are derived from the above criteria. The evaluation questions will delineate the thematic scope of the evaluation and are meant to formulate key areas of inquiry that are of interest to various stakeholders, thereby optimizing the focus and utility. The evaluation questions presented below are indicative and the evaluators are expected to develop a final set of evaluation questions based on these preliminary questions, in consultation with the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG), including the RCO as the overall oversight responsibility.

Relevance

1. To what extent is the project adapted to: i) the needs of diverse populations, including the needs of marginalized and vulnerable groups; ii) national development strategies and policies; iii) the strategic direction and objectives of the joint programme; and iv) priorities articulated in international frameworks and agreements, in particular the UNCF, HRP, SDGs and the New Way of Working.
2. To what extent has the project linked the GBV and peacebuilding and community cohesion in the project planning and implementation?
3. To what extent has the project been able to respond to changes in national needs and priorities, including those of vulnerable or marginalized communities, or to shifts caused by crisis or major political changes?

Effectiveness

4. To what extent have the interventions supported by the project contributed to the achievement of the expected results (outputs and outcomes)?
5. To what extent has the project successfully integrated gender, human rights and conflict analysis in the design, implementation of the project?
6. To what extent has human rights and a gender mainstreamed in the design and implementation of the project?

Efficiency

7. To what extent has the project made good use of its human, financial and administrative resources, and used a set of appropriate policies, procedures and tools to pursue the achievement of the outcomes defined?

Sustainability

8. To what extent has the project been able to support implementing partners and beneficiaries (women and adolescents and youth) in developing capacities and establishing mechanisms to ensure the durability of effects?
9. To what extent do the stakeholders prioritize and pay attention to/integration of gender equality and human rights concerns in their areas of work?

Coherence

10. To what extent was the project coherent in building synergy between each other in the project implementation?

Coverage

11. To what extent have the interventions systematically reached geographic areas in which affected populations reside?

The final evaluation questions and the evaluation matrix will be presented in the design report.

6. Methodology and Approach

6.1. Evaluation Approach

Theory of change-based approach

The evaluation will adopt a theory-based approach that relies on an explicit theory of change, which depicts how the interventions supported by the project are expected to contribute to a series of results (outputs and outcomes) that lead to the overall goal of the project.

The theory of change will play a central role throughout the evaluation process, from the design and data collection to the analysis and identification of findings, as well as the articulation of conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation team will be required to verify the theory of change and use this theory of change to determine whether changes at output and outcome levels occurred (or not) and whether assumptions about change hold true. The analysis of the theory of change will serve as the basis for the evaluators to assess how relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable the support provided by the project.

Participatory approach

The evaluation will be based on an inclusive, transparent and participatory approach, involving a broad range of partners and stakeholders at national and sub-national levels. These stakeholders include: representatives from government, civil society organizations, implementing partners, the private sector, academia, other United Nations organizations, donors and beneficiaries (in particular women and girls, adolescents/youth and men). They can provide insights and information, as well as referrals to data sources that the evaluators should use to assess the contribution of the project.

The Evaluation Manager in the UNFPA South Sudan CO will establish an ERG comprised of key stakeholders including: governmental and non-governmental counterparts at national level, Implementing Partners, staff from the Technical Working Group of UN agencies. The ERG will provide inputs at different stages in the evaluation process.

Mixed-method approach

The evaluation will primarily use qualitative methods for data collection, including document review, interviews, group discussions and observations through field visits, as appropriate. The qualitative data will be complemented with quantitative data to minimize bias.

6.2. Methodology

The evaluation team shall develop the evaluation methodology in line with the evaluation approach and guidance provided in accordance with the *UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation*⁵⁹, *Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation*⁶⁰, *Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System*⁶¹, and *Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations*⁶². When contracted, the evaluators will be requested to sign the *UNEG Code of Conduct* prior to starting their work.

The methodology that the evaluation team will develop builds the foundation for providing valid and evidence-based answers to the evaluation questions and for offering a robust and credible assessment. The methodological design of the evaluation shall include in particular: (i) a theory of change; (ii) a strategy for collecting and analyzing data; (iii) specifically designed tools for data collection and analysis; (iv) an evaluation matrix; and (v) a detailed work plan.

Finalization of the evaluation questions and assumptions

Based on the preliminary evaluation questions presented in the present terms of reference (see section 5.2), the evaluators are required to finalize the set of questions that will guide the evaluation. The final set of evaluation questions will need to clearly reflect the evaluation criteria and key areas of inquiry (highlighted in the preliminary evaluation questions). The evaluation questions should also draw from the theory of change. The final evaluation questions will structure the evaluation matrix and shall be presented in the design report.

Sampling strategy

The participating agencies of the project (UNDP, UNFPA, UN Women, UNICEF) will provide an initial overview of the interventions, the locations where these interventions have taken place, and the stakeholders involved in these interventions.

Based on information gathered through desk review and discussions with the participating agencies, the evaluators will refine the initial stakeholders map and develop a comprehensive stakeholders map. From this stakeholders map, the evaluation team will select a sample of stakeholders at national and sub-national levels who will be consulted through interviews and/or group discussions during the data collection phase. These stakeholders must be selected through clearly defined criteria and the sampling approach outlined in the design report. In the design report, the evaluators should also make explicit what groups of stakeholders were not included and why. The evaluators should aim to select a sample of stakeholders that is as representative as possible.

The evaluation team comprising of two members (One International Team Lead, One national Team member) shall also select a sample of sites that will be visited for data collection, and provide the rationale for the selection of the sites in the design report.

Data collection

The evaluation will consider primary and secondary sources of information. Primary data will be collected through semi-structured interviews with key informants at national and sub-national levels (government officials, representatives of implementing partners, civil society organizations, other United Nations organizations, donors, and other stakeholders), as well as group discussions with service providers and beneficiaries (women and adolescents and youth) and direct observation during visits to programme sites.

The evaluation team is expected to dedicate a total of approximately twelve days (12 days) for data collection in the field. The data collection tools that the evaluation team will develop, which may include protocols for semi-structured interviews and group discussions, a checklist for direct observation at sites visited or a protocol for document review, shall be presented in the design report.

⁵⁹<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

⁶⁰<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>

⁶¹<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

⁶²<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/980>

Validation mechanisms

All findings of the evaluation need to be firmly grounded in evidence. The evaluation team will use a variety of mechanisms to ensure the validity of collected data through systematic triangulation of data sources and data collection methods, regular exchange with the Technical Working Group of the project; internal evaluation team meetings to share and discuss hypotheses, preliminary findings and conclusions; and the debriefing meeting with the UNCT and the ERG at the end of the field phase where the evaluation team present the preliminary findings and emerging conclusions.

Additional validation mechanisms may be established, as appropriate.

7. Evaluation Process

The evaluation can be broken down into five different phases that include different stages and lead to different deliverables: preparatory phase; design phase; field phase; reporting phase; and facilitation of use and dissemination phase.

7.1. Preparatory Phase

The preparatory phase includes:

- Establishment of the ERG.
- Drafting the terms of reference (ToR), and approval of the draft ToR by the Participating UN agencies
- Selection of two consultants (one International, one national),
- Compilation of background information and documents for desk review by the evaluation team.
- Preparation of a first stakeholders map.

7.2. Design Phase

The evaluation team will conduct the design phase in consultation with the Evaluation Manager and the ERG. This phase includes:

- Desk review of initial background information as well as other relevant documentation.
- Review and refinement of the theory of change
- Formulation of a final set of evaluation questions based on the preliminary evaluation questions provided in the ToR.
- Development of a comprehensive stakeholders map and sampling strategy to select sites to be visited and stakeholders to be consulted in South Sudan through interviews and group discussions.
- Development of a data collection and analysis strategy, as well as a concrete work plan for the field and reporting phases
- Development of data collection methods and tools, assessment of limitations to data collection and development of mitigation measures.
- Development of the evaluation matrix (evaluation criteria, evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data collection methods and sources of information).

At the end of the design phase, the evaluation team will develop a **design report** that includes the results of the above-listed steps and tasks.

7.3. Field Phase

The evaluation team will undertake a field mission to project sites to collect the data required to answer the evaluation questions. Towards the end of the field phase, the evaluation team will also conduct a preliminary analysis of the data to identify emerging findings and conclusions to be validated with the ERG. The field phase should allow the evaluators sufficient time to collect valid and reliable data. While a period of 12 days is

recommended, the Evaluation Manager will determine the optimal duration of the field mission in consultation with the evaluation team during the design phase. The field phase includes:

- Meeting with the participating agencies to launch the data collection.
- Meeting of evaluation team members with relevant programme officers
- Data collection at national and sub-national levels.

At the end of the field phase, the evaluation team will hold a **debriefing meeting with the ERG** to present the preliminary findings and emerging conclusions from the data collection. The meeting will serve as an important validation mechanism and will enable the evaluation team to develop credible and relevant findings, conclusions and recommendations.

7.4. Reporting Phase

In the reporting phase, the evaluation team will continue the analytical work (initiated during the field phase) and prepare a **draft evaluation report**, taking into account the comments and feedback provided by the ERG at the debriefing meeting at the end of the field phase.

This draft evaluation report will be submitted to the ERG for quality assurance purposes. Prior to the submission of the draft report, the evaluation team must ensure that it underwent an internal quality control against the criteria outlined in the Evaluation Quality Assessment (EQA). The M&E Advisors/ focal points of each participating agency will play a role in quality assurance.

The Evaluation Manager will collect and consolidate the written comments and feedback provided by the members of the ERG. On the basis of the comments, the evaluation team should make appropriate amendments, prepare the **final evaluation report** and submit it to the ERG. The final report should clearly account for the strength of evidence on which findings rest to support the reliability and validity of the evaluation. Conclusions and recommendations need to clearly build on the findings of the evaluation. Conclusions need to clearly reference the specific evaluation questions from which they have been derived, while recommendations need to reference the conclusions from which they stem.

The evaluation report is considered final once it is formally approved by all the four participating agencies.

7.5. Facilitation of Use and Dissemination Phase

In the facilitation of use and dissemination phase, the evaluation team will develop a **PowerPoint presentation and evaluation brief for the dissemination of the evaluation results** that conveys the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation in an easily understandable and user-friendly way.

8. Expected Deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to produce the following deliverables:

- **Design report.** The design report should translate the requirements of the ToR into a practical and feasible evaluation approach, methodology and work plan. It should include (at a minimum): (i) a stakeholders map; (ii) an evaluation matrix (incl. the final set of evaluation questions, indicators, data sources and data collection methods); (iii) the evaluation approach and methodology, with a detailed description of the agenda/timeline for the field phase; (iv) and data collection tools and techniques (incl. interview and group discussion protocols).
- **PowerPoint presentation of the design report.** The presentation will be delivered at an ERG meeting to present the contents of the design report and the agenda for the field phase. Based on the comments and feedback of the ERG, the Evaluation Manager and the Regional M&E Adviser, the evaluation team will develop the final version of the design report.
- **An evaluation brief** outlining the methodology, findings and recommendations of the evaluation

- **PowerPoint presentation for debriefing meeting with the ERG, M&E Working Group of UNCT, PMT and UNCT.** The presentation provides an overview of key preliminary findings and emerging conclusions of the evaluation. It will be delivered at the end of the field phase to present and discuss the preliminary evaluation results with UNCT and the members of the ERG.
- **Draft and final evaluation reports.** The final evaluation report (*maximum 70 pages plus annexes*) will include evidence-based findings and conclusions, as well as a full set of practical and actionable recommendations to inform the next project cycle. A draft report precedes the final evaluation report and provide the basis for the review of the participating agencies, ERG members, the Evaluation Managers of participating agencies. The final evaluation report will address the comments and feedback provided by the stakeholders.
- **PowerPoint presentation of the evaluation results.** The presentation will provide an overview of the findings, conclusions and recommendations to be used for dissemination purposes.

All the deliverables will be developed in English language.

9. Quality Assurance and Assessment

The ERG is responsible to ensure the quality assurance and quality assessment. While quality assurance occurs throughout the evaluation process and covers all deliverables, quality assessment takes place following the completion of the evaluation process and is limited to the final evaluation report only.

The evaluation team leader also plays an important role in undertaking quality assurance. The evaluation team leader must ensure that the evaluation team member provides high-quality contributions and that the deliverables submitted comply with the quality assessment criteria outlined below. The evaluation quality assessment checklist (see below), is used as an element of the proposed quality assurance system for the draft and final versions of the evaluation report.

1. Structure and Clarity of the Report
To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.
2. Executive Summary
To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section including key elements of the evaluation, such as objectives, methodology and conclusions and recommendations.
3. Design and Methodology
To provide a clear explanation of the methods and tools used, including the rationale for the methodological approach. To ensure constraints and limitations are made explicit (including limitations applying to interpretations and extrapolations; robustness of data sources, etc.)
4. Reliability of Data
To ensure sources of data are clearly stated for both primary and secondary data. To provide explanation on the credibility of primary (e.g. interviews and group discussions) and secondary (e.g. reports) data established and limitations made explicit.
5. Findings and Analysis
To ensure sound analysis and credible evidence-based findings. To ensure interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions; contextual factors are identified; cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained.
6. Validity of Conclusions
To ensure conclusions are based on credible findings and convey evaluators' unbiased judgment of the intervention. Ensure conclusions are prioritized and clustered and include: summary, origin (which evaluation question(s) the conclusion is based on), and detailed conclusions.
7. Usefulness and Clarity of Recommendations
To ensure recommendations flow logically from conclusions, are targeted, realistic and operationally feasible, and are presented in order of priority. Recommendations include: summary, priority level (very high/high/medium),

target (administrative unit(s) to which the recommendation is addressed), origin (which conclusion(s) the recommendation is based on), and operational implications.

8. SWAP - Gender

To ensure the evaluation approach is aligned with SWAP (guidance on the SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator and its application to evaluation can be found at <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1452> - UNEG guidance on integrating gender and human rights more broadly can be found here: <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/980>).

10. Indicative Timeframe and Work Plan

The table below indicates the specific activities and deliverables and their timelines at all stages of the evaluation.

Nota Bene: Column "Deliverables": Deliverables in *italic* are the responsibility of the Evaluation Manager/ TWG, while the deliverables in **bold** are the responsibility of the Evaluation team.

Evaluation Phases and Activities	Deliverables	Timelines
Preparatory phase		
Development of the terms of reference (ToR) in consultation with the Regional M&E Adviser and approval by the Evaluation Office	<i>Final ToR</i>	March 2021
Preparation of letter for government and other key stakeholders to inform them about the evaluation	<i>Letter from the UNFPA Country Representative</i>	June 2021
Selection, pre-qualification and recruitment of consultants to constitute the evaluation team		May-June 2021
Establishment of the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)	RCO may take lead in establishing. Include M&E wg and possibly 1-2 separate un agencies not involved in the project. And Keep pbso informed	June 2021
Development of a first stakeholder map	<i>Stakeholder map</i>	May 2021
Compilation of background information and documentation for desk review by the evaluation team	<i>Creation of a Google Drive folder containing all relevant documents on country context and CP</i> <i>List of Atlas projects</i>	April-June 2021
Design phase		
Evaluation kick-off meeting between Evaluation Manager and evaluation team (virtual)		June 2021
Desk review of initial background information and documents (incl. bibliography and resources in the ToR) and drafting of the design report (incl. articulation of evaluation methodology, refinement of theory of change, finalization of evaluation questions, development of evaluation matrix, methods and tools and indicators, development of comprehensive stakeholder map and sampling	Draft design report	June 2021

strategy, and drafting the agenda for the field phase)		
Presentation of the draft design report to the ERG for comments and feedback (virtual)	PowerPoint presentation of the design report	July 2021
Review of the draft design report by the Evaluation Manager, ERG and the Regional M&E Adviser	<i>Consolidated feedback provided by Evaluation Manager to evaluation team leader</i>	July 2021
Revision of the draft design report and submission to the Evaluation Manager for approval	Final design report	July 2021
Field Phase		
Meeting of the evaluation team with Joint programme staff to launch data collection	<i>Meeting between evaluation team and project staff of participating UN agencies, RCO</i>	July 2021
Individual meetings with relevant programme officers of participating UN agencies	<i>Meeting of evaluators and project staff of participating UN agencies, RCO</i>	July 2021
Data collection (incl. interviews with key informants, site visits, direct observation, group discussions, desk review etc.)	Entering data/information into the evaluation matrix	July-August 2021
Debriefing meeting with the ERG to present preliminary findings and emerging conclusions from data collection	PowerPoint presentation for debriefing with the ERG	July 2021
Reporting Phase		
Preparation of the draft evaluation report and submission to the Evaluation Manager	Draft evaluation report	July-August 2021
Review of the draft evaluation report by the Evaluation Manager, the ERG and the M&E Managers of each agency Joint development of the EQA of the draft evaluation report by the M&E Managers of all participating agencies	<i>EQA of the draft evaluation report</i>	August 2021
Drafting of the final evaluation report (including annexes) and submission to the Evaluation Manager	Final evaluation report (including annexes)	August 2021
Preparation of the management response by joint programme agencies	<i>Management response</i>	September 2021
Facilitation of Use and Dissemination Phase		
Development of the presentation for the dissemination of the evaluation results by evaluation team	PowerPoint presentation of the evaluation results	August 2021
Development of the evaluation brief by the Evaluation Manager, with support from the communications officer at CO	<i>Evaluation brief</i>	August 2021
Publication of the final evaluation report		September-October 2021
Dissemination of the evaluation report and the evaluation brief to stakeholders	<i>Including (but not limited to): Communication via email; stakeholders meeting;</i>	October 2021

	<i>workshops with implementing partners etc.</i>	
--	--	--

Once the evaluation team leader has been recruited, she/he will develop a detailed work plan in close consultation with the Evaluation Manager.

11 Management of the Evaluation

The Evaluation Manager at the UNFPA South Sudan CO will be responsible for the management of the evaluation and supervision of the evaluation team. The Evaluation Reference Group comprising of the participating agencies' focal points will oversee the entire process of the evaluation, from the preparation to the dissemination and facilitation of the use of the evaluation results. The Evaluation Manager will coordinate the exchanges between the evaluation team and the ERG. The major task of the ERG is to ensure the quality, independence and impartiality of the evaluation in line with the UNEG norms and standards and ethical guidelines for evaluation. The Evaluation Manager has the following roles and responsibilities:

- Compile a preliminary list of background information and documentation on both the country context and the participating agencies and share with the evaluation team upon recruitment.
- Collate the stakeholders map and share them with the evaluation team.
- Prepare the ToR for the evaluation and submit it to RCO for approval.
- Establish the ERG.
- Chair the ERG, convene meetings with the evaluation team and manage the interaction between the evaluation team and the ERG.
- Launch and lead the selection process for the team of evaluators in consultation with the ERG members
- Identify potential candidates to conduct the evaluation, complete the consultant assessment matrix to assess their qualifications, and coordinate the recruitment
- Inform the ERG members about with logistical support in making arrangements for data collection (site visits, interviews, group discussions etc.).
- Prevent any attempts to compromise the independence of the evaluation team throughout the evaluation process.
- Coordinate the quality assurance of the deliverables submitted by the evaluators throughout the evaluation process (notably the design report: focusing on the final evaluation questions, the theory of change, sample of stakeholders to be consulted and sites to be visited, the evaluation matrix, and the methods, tools and plans for data collection, as well as the draft and final evaluation reports) and approve final versions.
- Coordinate feedback and comments on the deliverables produced by the evaluation team throughout the evaluation process.
- Lead and participate in the preparation of the management response.
- Submit the final evaluation report to RCO and PBSO

At all stages of the evaluation process, the Evaluation Manager will require support from staff of the participating agencies. Specifically, the roles and responsibilities of the **participating agencies** are:

- Contribute to the preparation of the ToR, specifically: the stakeholder mapping and the compilation of initial background information and documentation, and provide input to the evaluation questions.
- Be available for meetings with/interviews by the evaluation team.
- Provide support to the Evaluation Manager in making logistical arrangements for site visits and setting up interviews and group discussions with stakeholders at national and sub-national levels.
- Be available for the quality assurance, recruitment of the evaluation team, keeping an overview of the evaluation process.
- Provide input to the management response.
- Prepare the agency specific dissemination of the evaluation results.

The progress of the evaluation will be followed closely by the **Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)** which is composed of relevant UN participating agencies' staff from RCO, UNDP, UNFPA, UN Women and UNICEF, M&E

working group, representatives of the national Government of South Sudan, non-governmental implementing partners, separate UN entities may be invited to participate in the reference group. The ERG will serve as an entity to ensure the relevance, quality and credibility of the evaluation. It will provide inputs on key milestones in the evaluation process, facilitate the evaluation team's access to sources of information and undertake quality assurance from a technical perspective.

The ERG has the following roles and responsibilities:

- Provide input to the drafting of the ToR, including the selection of preliminary evaluation questions.
- Provide feedback and comments on the design report.
- Provide comments and substantive feedback from a technical perspective on the draft and final evaluation reports.
- Act as the interface between the evaluators and key stakeholders of the evaluation, and facilitate access to key informants and documentation.
- Assist in identifying key stakeholders to be consulted during the evaluation process.
- Participate in review meetings with the evaluation team as required.
- Contribute to learning, knowledge sharing and dissemination of evaluation results, as well as the completion and follow-up on the management response.

12. Composition of the Evaluation Team

The evaluation will be conducted by a team of independent, external evaluators, consisting of: (i) an evaluation team leader (international) with overall responsibility for carrying out the evaluation exercise, and (ii) 1 member (national) who will provide technical expertise in thematic areas of the project priority.

Emphasis will be placed on recruiting evaluation team members that have adequate peacebuilding, regional and subject matter expertise and experience and knowledge of the country context. The evaluation team leader must have solid knowledge and experience in conducting evaluations of development interventions and humanitarian action. In addition, the evaluation team should have the requisite level of knowledge to conduct human rights- and gender-responsive evaluations and be able to work in a multidisciplinary team in a multicultural environment.

12.1. Roles and Responsibilities of the Evaluation Team

Evaluation team leader

The evaluation team leader will hold the overall responsibility for the design and implementation of the evaluation. She/he will be responsible for the production and timely submission of all expected deliverables in line with the ToR. She/he will lead and coordinate the work of the evaluation team and ensure the quality of all deliverables at all stages of the evaluation process. The Evaluation Manager will provide methodological guidance to the evaluation team in developing the design report, in particular, but not limited to, the evaluation approach, methodology, work plan and agenda for the field phase, the draft and final evaluation reports, and the PowerPoint presentation of the evaluation results. She/he will lead the presentation of the design report and the debriefing meeting with the ERG at the end of the field phase. The Team leader will also be responsible for liaising with the Evaluation Manager and participating agencies and RCO.

Evaluation team member:

The evaluation team member will provide expertise on the evaluation. She/he will contribute to the methodological design of the evaluation and take part in the data collection and analysis work, with overall responsibility of contributions to the expected deliverables. She/he will provide substantive inputs throughout the evaluation process by contributing to the development of the evaluation methodology, evaluation work plan and agenda for the field phase, participating in meetings with the Evaluation Manager and the ERG. She/he will hold interviews and group discussions with stakeholders, and undertake desk review, as advised by the evaluation team leader.

The modality and participation of the evaluation team members in the evaluation process, including data collection analysis, provision of technical inputs to the drafting of the design and draft and final evaluation reports will be agreed with the evaluation team leader and these tasks performed under her/his supervision and guidance.

12.2. Qualifications and Experience of the Evaluation Team

Team leader

The competencies, skills and experience of the evaluation team leader should include:

- Master's degree in Social Sciences, International Studies, Gender studies, Peace building and conflict resolution, Development Studies or a related field.
- 7 years of experience in conducting or managing evaluations in the field of international development and peace building.
- Experience in leading evaluations commissioned by United Nations organizations and/or other international organizations and NGOs.
- Demonstrated expertise in one of the thematic areas of programming covered by the project, especially peacebuilding programming
- In-depth knowledge of theory-based evaluation approaches and ability to apply both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods and to uphold standards for quality evaluation as defined by UNEG.
- Good knowledge of peacebuilding and GBV strategies, policies, frameworks and principles as well as the international humanitarian architecture and coordination mechanisms.
- Ability to ensure ethics and integrity of the evaluation process, including confidentiality and prevention of harm to evaluation subjects.
- Ability to consistently integrate human rights, peace building and gender perspectives in all phases of the evaluation process.
- Excellent management and leadership skills to coordinate and supervise the work of the evaluation team.
- Excellent analytical skills and demonstrated ability to formulate evidence-based conclusions and realistic and actionable recommendations.
- Excellent communication (written and spoken), facilitation and knowledge-sharing skills.
- Good knowledge of the national development context of South Sudan
- Fluent in written and spoken English, knowledge of Arabic will be an asset.

Team member

The competencies, skills and experience of the team member should include:

- Master's degree in Social Sciences, International Studies, Gender studies, Peace building and conflict resolution, Development Studies or a related field.
- 5-7 years of experience in conducting evaluations, reviews, assessments, research studies or M&E work in the field of international development and/or humanitarian action.
- Substantive knowledge of GBV, peace building, human rights and conflict resolution.
- Good knowledge of GBV and peacebuilding strategies, policies, frameworks and principles applicable in South Sudan as well as the stakeholders in GBV and peacebuilding.
- Ability to ensure ethics and integrity of the evaluation process, including confidentiality and prevention of harm to evaluation subjects.
- Ability to consistently integrate peacebuilding, human rights and gender perspectives in all phases of the evaluation process.
- Solid knowledge of evaluation approaches and methodology and demonstrated ability to apply both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods.
- Excellent analytical and problem-solving skills.
- Experience working with a multidisciplinary team of experts.
- Excellent communication (written and spoken), facilitation and knowledge-sharing skills.
- Excellent knowledge of the national development context of South Sudan
- Familiarity with United Nations organizations' mandates and operations will be an advantage.
- Fluent in written and spoken English and Arabic.

13. Budget and Payment Modalities

The evaluators will receive a daily fee according to the UN consultancy scale based on qualifications and experience.

The payment of fees will be based on the submission of deliverables, as follows:

Upon approval of the design report	20%
Upon satisfactory completion of the draft final evaluation report	40%
Upon approval of the final evaluation report and PowerPoint for dissemination of evaluation results	40%

In addition to the daily fees, the evaluators will receive a daily subsistence allowance (DSA) in accordance with the UN Duty Travel Policy, using applicable United Nations DSA rates for the place of mission. Travel costs will be settled separately from the consultancy fees.

The provisional allocation of workdays among the evaluation team will be the following:

	Team Leader	Team Member
Design phase	10	10
Field phase	20	20
Reporting phase	15	15
Facilitation of use and dissemination phase	4	2
TOTAL (days)	49	47

The exact number of workdays and distribution of the workload will be proposed by the evaluation team in the design report, subject to approval by UN ERG.

14. Bibliography and Resources

The following documents will be made available to the evaluation team upon recruitment:

South Sudan national strategies, policies and action plans

1. South Sudan Vision 2040
2. National Development Strategy (2018/19-2020/21)
3. National Health Policy (2016-2026)
4. Strategic National Action Plan for Ending Child Marriage (2017-2027)
5. The South Sudan Humanitarian Response Plans (2019, 2020)
6. SSPDF, SPLA-IO, NPSS National Action Plans for ending conflict related sexual violence

UN Project documents

7. United Nations Cooperation Framework (UNCF) (2019-2021)
8. UN System Wide Peacebuilding plan 2018-2021
9. UNCT Core Contribution 2019-202
10. Community mechanisms for peacebuilding in South Sudan
11. UNCF Joint Workplans
12. UNFPA, UNW, UNDP, UNICEF annual work plans
13. PBF Project/Donor Proposal Documents
14. Joint programme documents (JP GBV)
15. Project progress reports Donor reports.
16. Field mission reports
17. Communication materials generated under the project
18. Audit reports and spot check reports
19. Meeting agendas and minutes of joint United Nations working groups

Appendix 2: PBF End of Project Evaluation Work Plan and Timelines

The evaluation assignment will take a total of 50 consultancy days and implemented from 21st August to 29th September, 2021 as presented in the table below;

Phase	Date	Location	Activity
Inception/Design Phase	Wed 1 st Sept, 2021	Juba/Nairobi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation kick-off meeting between Evaluation Manager and evaluation team (virtual).
	Thursday 2 nd – Friday 3 rd Sept, 2021	Juba/Nairobi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation of letter for government and other key stakeholders to inform them about the evaluation. Sharing of Project Documents by UN Agencies with the Consultants. Development of a first stakeholder map by the UN Agencies and share with the Consultant.
	Friday 3 rd - Thursday 9 th Sept, 2021	Nairobi/Juba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review of initial background information and documents (incl. bibliography and resources in the ToR) and drafting of the design report (incl. articulation of evaluation methodology, refinement of theory of change, finalization of evaluation questions, development of evaluation matrix, methods and tools and indicators, development of comprehensive stakeholder map and sampling strategy, and drafting the agenda for the field phase) Development of Inception Report including data collection tools, evaluation matrix, stakeholder list and work plan. Review meeting with Evaluation Manager and evaluation team – Wednesday 8th Sept. (virtual).
	Fri 10 th – Mon 13 th Sept, 2021	Nairobi/Juba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission of the Inception Report including data collection tools, evaluation matrix, stakeholder list and work plan for review and comments by the Evaluation Manager and the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) and the Regional M&E Adviser. Share consolidated feedback and comments with the Evaluation team.
	Tue 14 th Sept, 2021	Nairobi/Juba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revision of the draft design report and submission to the Evaluation Manager for approval.
	Wed 15 th Sept, 2021	Nairobi/Juba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultant travels to Juba
Field Phase/ Data Collection	Thu 16 th – Mon 20 th Sept, 2021	Juba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting of the evaluation team with Joint programme staff to launch data collection.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual meetings with relevant programme officers of participating UN agencies for KII.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual meetings with relevant GOSS Ministries of Justice and Gender for KII.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual meetings with relevant stakeholders including but not limited to Judiciary, Police and Implementing CSOs for KII.

	Tue 21 st Sept, 2021	Akobo, Bor, Aweil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultant travels to Field Sites
	Wed 22 nd Sept, - Sun 3 rd Oct 2021	All project locations including	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct Survey, KIs and FGDs Data editing and submitting
	Monday 4 th Oct, 2021	Juba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultants return to Juba
Report Writing/Validation	Tuesday 5 th Oct, 2021	Juba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Debrief on the Preliminary findings to the ERG by the Evaluation Team
	Wed 6 th Oct, 2021	Juba/Nairobi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultants return to Nairobi
	Thur 7 th Oct – Thur 14 th Oct, 2021	Nairobi/Juba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Collation and Analysis Draft Report development
	Friday 15 th Oct, 2021	Nairobi/Juba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission of Zero Draft to the Evaluation Manager and ERG
	Sat 16 th – Wed 20 th Oct, 2021	Juba/Nairobi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review, comments and Inputs by ERG Share consolidated comments.
	Thursday 21 st – 29 th	Nairobi/Juba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporation of comments and inputs Submission of Final Evaluation Report Presentation of the Evaluation Findings

Appendix 3: Qualitative Study Tools – KIIs and FGD Guides

1. Key Informant Interviews (KII) Guides

Introduction:

This Key Informant Interview guide is intended for data collection during the End of Project Evaluation of the Peacebuilding fund project, "Protecting women and girls in South Sudan: Addressing gender based violence (GBV) as catalyst for peace".

Target Respondents: The interviews will be administered to the staff of the lead implementing agencies: - UNFPA, UN WOMEN, UNDP, UNICEF; collaborating implementing partners - MoGCSW, MoH, IRC, Grand debaters, SWEN, MoJCA, SSNPS, JSS, SPIDO, HACT and CIDO,ADAFIN, ARC, CARE, Nile Hope, SAADO; the donor agency, change actors, GoSS representatives and community leaders in Aweil, Bor and Akobo

Confidentiality and consent: This interview is intended for the purpose of generating information for the End of Project Evaluation of PBF Project in South Sudan. Information obtained in this evaluation will be strictly used for planning, monitoring and evaluation purposes of the project. No reference will be made to the identity of individuals engaged in this evaluation during and after the survey. Your participation in this will not positively or negatively affect your access to assistance. This interview is voluntary and you are able to withdraw from the interview, or refuse to answer a question, at any time. We kindly request your consent to proceed with this survey.

Full name of the informant:

Organization:

Position of the informant in the organization:

Time started: Time ended:

Implementing Agencies (Lead and collaborating Partners)

1. May you provide an overview of PBF project activities in this project location?
2. In your opinion, how appropriate/relevant were the inputs and activities to the local socio-cultural, political and economic context?
3. How was the programme targeting (beneficiary selection) done?
4. How is vulnerability defined in the context of the project location (South Sudan)? Who are the most vulnerable in the project locations?
5. Would you say the programme reached the most vulnerable households/beneficiaries?
6. In your opinion, what are the highest priority needs of the communities in the project locations?
7. Would you say the project addressed the highest priority needs of the communities in the target locations? How far was this done (give examples)?
8. In your opinion, would you say the project has made any change in the lives of the beneficiaries/households and community as a whole? Which changes/effects are these? Were they intended or unintended (*explain how*)?
9. In your opinion, would you say the project design was appropriate? How appropriate was the design of assistance modality? Was the voucher vs unconditional used the most appropriate to the target beneficiaries (*explain how*)?
10. Would you say the implementation of the actions lead to the achievement of the expected results (*explain how*)?
11. In your opinion and based on the project documents, would you say the project outcomes were achieved? Which ones were achieved and which ones were not achieved? What were the enabling and hindering factors?
12. Were the quality and quantity of the produced outputs and outcomes in accordance with the proposed project plans?
13. In your opinion, to what extent would you say the project achieved its purpose?
14. Was the project sufficiently adaptable to a fluid and insecure context especially during COVID-19 to deliver outputs in a timely manner and sufficiently achieve targets? Which project elements were mostly affected by Covid-19?

15. Would you say that monitoring mechanisms were effective in providing timely data to inform programming decisions? Were there challenges in achieving this?
16. Does the project have an exit strategy? What does that exit strategy entail?
17. Which sustainability mechanisms or options did the project put in place to ensure the beneficiaries continue enjoying their rights regardless of the cessation of the project?
18. To what extent was the community involved in the project from design to implementation? What would you say about community participation during the project lifecycle?
19. Which community structures would you say the project established that would support sustainability of the project impacts? Is the community leadership willing to continue supporting the beneficiaries?
20. What are the possible factors that you can say enhance or inhibit sustainability, including ownership/commitment, economic/financial, institutional, technical, socio-cultural and environmental sustainability aspects?

Note: Specific reference will be made to available documentation with regard to the discussion questions.

Thank you for taking time to respond to my question. Do you have any question?

End

Donor agency – PBF - and) Government Related Departments/Agencies

Donor Agency – PBF- and Government Related Departments/Agencies	
No.	Reference Area
1	Areas of collaborations/Networking (Connectedness)
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In which ways have you been collaborating with PBF project? How did the project relate with other partners of stakeholders? What were the challenges in working with other partner or stakeholder? How did the project try to address these challenges? 2. What have been the main activities? 3. In your view how effective have PBF been in forging the relations with collaborators and partners? 4. How will the knowledge and skills gained through this project be used? 5. How did beneficiaries perceive the value of the project compared with other alternatives? 6. Have there been any un-intended benefits or negative consequences? How did the project mitigate these consequences? 7. How successful was the project activities integrated with other sectors (complimentary activities e.g livelihood etc)?
2	Strengths and Gaps in PBF Project Management
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What have been the areas of PBF project success? 2. How has PBF Management been responding to your request? 3. How has been the quality of PBF Project services? 4. What is your opinion on the PBF project management? 5. What is your opinion on the competence of the PBF project staff? 6. Has the PBF project been providing value for money? If so in what ways, if not in what ways? 7. What do you feel are the strengths of the PBF project with regard to project management? 8. What are the weaknesses of PBF project?
3	Community Participation and Targeting
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Would you consider PBF as targeting the right communities in its programs and how? 2. How do you perceive PBF involvement in the communities? 3. What are the positive and negative effects of the program? 4. How has the program contributed to the fulfillment of the mission of the Joint UN agencies? 5. How has the program affected the environment? 6. To what extent has the program been gender sensitive?
4	Efficiency: (Doing it the right way – Sound management and value for money)
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Were the outputs commensurate to the inputs? 2. Did the project adopt the most efficient approach in implementation?

	3. How well did the management structure support/facilitate program implementation? 4. Was project management responsive to changing conditions on the ground? 5. How did the project team respond to COVID-19 pandemic? 5. Was the project implementation in line with the planned objectives? 6. Did the project adhere to the security protocol?
5	Relevance/appropriateness of the Programs
	1. Was the program in line with local needs and priorities, targeting the right areas, people with the right interventions? 2. Was the project sensitive to the culture and practices of the beneficiaries? 3. Was the selection criteria appropriate for identifying and reaching target communities and households? 4. Did the process of designing the prevention of GBV project adequately enlist the participation of all key stakeholder groups besides the lead implementing agencies and their partners? 5. What measures were put in place to ensure that the project stakeholders were adequately informed of the project interventions and their roles in it? 6. To what extent did the key stakeholder groups (desegregated by age/sex and other level of vulnerability) participate in the management and implementation of the project? 7. Did the activities contribute to the outcome and the objective of the project? Were there gaps in the sector? If yes, what are they and what more or different could the project Stakeholders do to address the problem?
6.	Effectiveness: (Doing the right thing – achievement of purpose)
	1. Were project activities implemented effectively to achieve maximum benefits within the context? 2. What are the factors that hindered/assisted the effectiveness of the program? 3. Did project put in place adequate effective systems for ensuring accountability and transparency in the management and implementation? Were these systems adhered to? Why or why not? 4. What level of technical support did you as a donor give the implementing agencies at state, regional and county as well as regional technical teams towards improving the quality of project implementation? Was this adequate? 5. Were security issues effectively handled and resolved at all levels (County level, Project level and National Office level? How effective was project management in providing feedback in relation to security matters?
7	Sustainability of the Programs
	1. What aspects of sustainability are in place to ensure that the implementing agencies are not over-dependent on your support? 2. What community structures have been put in place to ensure continuity of the program beyond the donor funding? 3. Which exit/phase out strategies have the key stakeholders put in place for program continuity when the donor funding ends?
8	Recommendations
	1. In which areas would you be interested in working with the Joint Mission in future? 2. What other suggestion do you have for future Joint Mission project design?

2. Focus/Small Group Discussions Guides

Introduction:

This Focus Group Discussions guide is intended for data collection during the End-of project Evaluation of the Peacebuilding fund project, "Protecting women and girls in South Sudan: Addressing gender based violence (GBV) as catalyst for peace".

Target Respondents: The FGD Participants will be selected among the project participants/beneficiaries including women and girls, survivors of GBV, men, boys and duty bearers and other special groups. Other participant will include women and girls who benefited from group PSS activities in WGFSS, men and boys, Community Leaders,

youth group members and members of the community taking into account gender and age of the groups for ease of sharing in the discussion and to capture diverse opinions

Confidentiality and consent: This discussion is intended for the purpose of generating information for the PBF end of project evaluation. Information obtained from this discussion will be strictly be used for purposes of the evaluating the current project and future programming. No reference will be made to the identity of individuals engaged in this process during and after the survey. Your participation in this discussion will not positively or negatively affect your access to assistance. This interview is voluntary and you are able to withdraw from the interview, or refuse to answer a question, at any time. We kindly request your consent to proceed with this survey.

Focus Group Discussions Participants Details

Target group[s]						
State:						
County:						
Venue:						
Date:						
Time started:		Time ended:				
Facilitator		Name:			Sign:.....	
Note taker		Name:			Sign:	
No.	Participant's Name	Age (Years)	Gender		Education	Status in the community
			Male	Female		
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						
7.						
8.						

FGD Participants Categories Compositions

A: Women and Girls' Groups - Women and Girls who benefited from group PSS activities in WGFSS

A. Background

1. Since when did you started coming to this Friendly Space and how many times have you visited it in the past month? (Note taker can do the head count and fill out the information in the heading)
2. How and when did you first hear about this place?
 - When do you normally come here? (*Specific time of day; when a specific/preferred activity is scheduled; etc.*)
3. Why did you decide to come to the Space?
 - Did the Space meet your expectations and helped you fulfill the objective of your visit?
4. Have you ever invited others to come? If yes, who did you invite?

B. About the Space

5. How easy is it to get here? Which obstacles may prevent you/others from coming here?
 - Do you think that the Space is accessible to all those in the community who may benefit from the activities implemented here? If not, who is being "excluded"?
 - Are there any specific groups of people that you think come to the center more often? (e.g. adolescents, IDPs, older women, etc.)
 - Are there any groups of women and girls who you think are unable to access the services provided at the center?

- For those, why do you think this is the case?
- 6. What types of activities are implemented here?
 - How do you think these activities are selected? (e.g. based on suggestions from beneficiaries, based on the NGO/donor priorities, etc.)
 - Which of these activities have you participated in?
 - Among these, which ones have you liked the most and the least? Why?
 - What do you think could be improved?
 - Overall, do you think that these activities address the needs of vulnerable women and girls?
- 7. Have you or any relative or a friend been trained in protection? Who provided the training? Would you say that the training has increased your ability to cope with protection challenges?
- 8. Which types of information can you access here?
 - How is this information useful for you?
 - How might this information be useful for other groups in the community? Who are they?
 - Are there any topics that you would like to learn more about? Please explain.
- 9. What are the Space's opening times? Are these times appropriate for you? Why?
- 10. In a scale from 1 to 4; with 1 being weak, 2 average, 3 good and 4 excellent; how do you rate the quality of the staff here? Why?
 - Any recommendations for improvement?
- 11. In a scale from 1 to 4; with 1 being weak, 2 average, 3 good and 4 excellent; how do you rate the quality of the infrastructure here? Why?
 - Any recommendations for improvement?
- 12. What do you like most and least about the Space?
 - Do you have any recommendations for improvement?

C. Evidence of Change

- 13. How do you think the community perceives the Space?
- 14. What do "empowering women and girls in the society" mean to you? Please provide examples.
 - Has the Space contributed to empower women and girls in any way? Please explain. (e.g. increased psychological wellbeing, helped to solidify/build networks, women and girls learned about their rights, etc.)
- 15. Would you say that you or other women you know in this community would be reporting improvements in feeling of well-being after participating in the activities at the Space?
- 16. Would you say that you have the ability to cope with protection challenges? Why do you say so and how?
- 17. Has this Space affected your life in any way, positively or negatively? How? Please explain.
 - If any, what were some of the key outcomes and learnings that you took away by visiting this space?
- 18. In your opinion, what do you think UN through PBF project should do better in future programming?

D. Ending the Discussion

This conversation has been really helpful for us and we appreciate your time. Before we end, are there any other important questions that you think we should have asked you but have not done so? If yes, please share with us now. Do you have any questions for us?

Thank you again for sharing your time and information by participating in the discussion, we value your views as they will be critical in improving, designing and implementing future programmes on PSS and Protection in this community and South Sudan at large to bring positive changes to community. Do you have any question to ask?

End

B: Men and Boys who benefited from project activities

Guiding Questions

- 1. What would you say about UN project in this location?
- 2. What support has the UN project given to the youth, men and women?

3. Were you involved in the project design and implementation? Which components of project design and implementation were you involved?
4. Would you say the UN project is equally accessible for both women and men? If so, how? If not, why not?
5. Would you say the project achievements would be sustained once the project comes to an end? Why do you think so?
6. Does the UN project treat both genders (men and women) equally? If so how? If not, why not?
7. What would you say about effectiveness of the implemented project activities?
8. Do you feel the activities were priority of the youths? Why?
9. Did the project address your needs as youths and women in this community?
10. What do you think was left out that should be considered in the future programming?

Thank you for participating in the discussion, we value your views as they will be critical in designing and implementing programmes for community empowerment and support to promote development and positive change. Do you have any question to ask?

End

C: Community Leaders Groups - who interacted/benefited from the project activities

1. What is your take on the PBF project in this community? What was it all about?
2. Would you say that PBF is addressing the priority needs of this community? Why do you say so?
3. Would you tell me about GBV in this community? How do community members perceive GBV?
4. Would you say that women you know in this community would be reporting improvements in feeling of well-being after their participating in activities?
5. Have you been trained in protection issues? Who provided the training? Would you say that the training has increased your ability to handle protection challenges in the community?
6. In your opinion, what do you think UN should do better in future programming?

Thank you for participating in the discussion, we value your views as they will be critical in designing and implementing future programmes on PSS and Protection in this community and South Sudan at large to bring positive changes to community. Do you have any question to ask?

End