



FINAL EVALUATION OF The Social Rehabilitation and Payment to EVD Survivors project

Final Report

Prepared by:

Fatimah Bisola Ahmed

Email: fabis1961@yahoo.co.uk

Tel: +2348034513854

July 2017



Table of Contents

Table of contents	2
Acknowledgement	4
List of Acronyms and Abbreviation	5
Executive Summary	6
1. Introduction	7
1.1. Background to the Project.....	7
1.2. Objective of the Evaluation.....	8
2. Evaluation Approach, Scope and Limitations	10
2.1. Limitations of the Methodology.....	10
3. Evaluation Methods, Data Analysis and Guiding Principle	11
3.1. In depth interview with Key Informant.....	11
3.2. Focus Group Discussions.....	12
4. Findings	12
4.1. Relevance.....	13
4.2. Efficiency.....	13
4.3. Effectiveness.....	14
4.4. Sustainability.....	15
4.5. Impact.....	15
4.6. Coordination and Partnership.....	16
4.7. Coverage.....	17
4.8. Crosscutting issues – Gender & Human right.....	18
5. Conclusions	19
5.1. Lessons Learned.....	19
5.2. Challenges.....	20
5.3. Recommendations.....	21
Tables	
• Table 1: Evaluation Work plan & Timeline.....	10
• Table 2: List of Individuals/Organisations Interviewed.....	12
• UNDP’s theory of change.....	18
• Output/Outcome Analysis.....	22

Annexes.....	23
a. References	
b. List of People contacted/Interviewed	
c. Evaluation Terms of Reference	
d. Evaluation Matrix	
e. Evaluation checklist	
f. Pictures	

Acknowledgement

The Consultant will like to express her sincere gratitude to everyone who contributed, in one way or the other, towards making this final evaluation of ‘The Social Rehabilitation and Payment to Ebola Survivors project’ a success. I wish to acknowledge the Country Director, Dr. Samuel Doe, the Deputy Country Director, Ms. Carine Yengayenge for their immense support. I acknowledge Mr. Ghulam Sherani and Mr. Samuel Palmer for their guidance and contributions. Special appreciation goes to Tuzlyn Bayoh and Brian Davies for coordinating the field trips and for their valuable feedbacks! Special appreciation goes to Mr. Marbey Sartie and Ms. Baindu Massaquoi for their contributions. I cannot forget our Driver and guide (Saliu), for his patience. My appreciation is also extended to all the partners particularly MSWGCA, WHI, PHI, MoPADA, DIP and AFRICELL for their useful inputs that helped make the content of this report, meaningful.

Thank you all!

Consultants Address: -

Fatimah Bisola Ahmed

Tel: +234 8034513854 & +234 9080961558

Email: fabis1961@yahoo.co.uk

Acronyms

AWP	Annual Work Plan
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
DIP	Development Initiative Programme
EVD	EBOLA Virus Disease
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
IPs	Implementing Partners
JP	Joint Project
KII	Key Informant Interview
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MSWGCA	Ministry of Social Welfare gender & Children's Affairs
MoPADA	Movement towards Peace and Development Agency
MOVE	Movement Opposed to Violence And Exclusion
MPTF	Multi Partner Trust Fund
OECD/DAC	Organization of Economic Cooperation for Development /Development Assistance Cooperation
PIH	Partners In Health
RBM	Result Based Management
SLAES	Sierra Leone Association for Ebola Survivors
SRPES	Social Rehabilitation and Payment to Ebola Survivors
TOR	Terms Of Reference
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Guidelines
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UN WOMEN	United Nations Entity For Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
WHI	World Hope International
WHO	World Health Organisation

Executive Summary

This is a report of the Final evaluation of the Social Rehabilitation and Payment to EVD Survivors project implemented by UNDP and UN Women along with the Government of Sierra Leone represented by the Ministry of Social Welfare gender & Children's Affairs (MSWGCA).

The evaluation was carried out from June to July 2017 with the purpose of assessing the outcome and impact of the intervention on the lives of project beneficiaries, their families and communities and also identifying the intended and unintended project outcome(s), best practices as well as challenges arising from its execution, and deduce conclusions and recommendation for learning and future interventions pertaining to emergency responses.

The evaluation used Primary and Secondary data gathering methodologies and made efforts to triangulate data from different sources, interviewing over a variety of stakeholders in different districts of Sierra Leone including Kailahun, Kenema, Port Loko and Bombali.

a. Major findings and recommendations

The evaluation report comes in several chapters, the first three chapters gives a description of the project, its aims and purpose, it further on relates the project to the National response in Sierra Leone, the chapters also include a description of the methodology used and scope of the evaluation. The rest of the chapters are analysis of the project, including results, challenges lessons learnt and recommendations. Below is a summary of the key findings and recommendations based on the OECD/DAC criteria.

b. Relevance

The project was found to be highly relevant to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) 1, 2, 5, 8 and 10, and the Global Ebola Response, it also supports the President's recovery priorities of the government of Sierra Leone.

c. Efficiency and Effectiveness

The evaluation also found out that the project was highly effective in laying good grounds for poverty reduction and empowerment of vulnerable groups in an emergency, however its efficiency was compromised by duplication of support given and slow response systems and processes which delayed project implementation.

d. Impact

The project has in no doubt impacted positively on the Beneficiaries (EVD survivors and Caregivers), but the positive impact may not be long lasting because of their increasing needs and demands.

e. Sustainability

The sustainability of the Project is mixed, while some systems and structures supported by the project can be sustained, it may be difficult to sustain others, particularly those concerned with the use of financial resources to generate impact.

f. Partnerships and Coordination

With a wide range of partners cutting across the country, the project has succeeded in fostering relationship. The coordination too has been successful except with issues of delay in government's response and the need for more joint initiatives.

g. Conclusion

The evaluation revealed that the Social Rehabilitation and Payment to EVD Survivors project has been very successful as it went a long way in satisfying the physiological (basic) needs of the beneficiary at the period and it is highly appreciated for its accomplishments as enumerated by stakeholders and beneficiaries. There are however few areas that subsequent projects can improve upon.

1. Introduction

1.1. Background to the Project

Following the Operational conference for scaling up the UN-System approach to the Ebola Response (Accra, 15-18 October 2014), a UN commitment framework was adopted with clear distribution of tasks among UN agencies involved in the Ebola Response. UNDP was mandated with the responsibility of leading the Cash payment and Livelihood aspect. The increased number of deaths meant more children were orphaned and more women widowed and this gave rise to an increase in number of female-headed households. By May 2015, the Ebola virus has affected a total of 9,524 children. One of the crucial measures that had to be taken to contain the virus was to empty the residences of all suspects and patients, destroying all their belongings, leaving them with no essential possession except the clothes they are wearing. Thus orphans, widows and many female survivors were left without access to basic social services and livelihoods opportunities. Most female survivors were rejected by their family and husbands and also found it difficult re-integrating in the communities. Survivors and destitute families faced stigma and social exclusion.

The Social Rehabilitation and Payment to EVD Survivors project is a joint project implemented by UNDP and UN Women along with the Government of Sierra Leone

represented by the Ministry of Social Welfare gender & Children's Affairs (MSWGCA) and some Civil Society Organizations including Movement towards Peace and Development Agency Sierra Leone (MoPADA-SL), World Hope International, Action Aid, Green Africa, Development Initiative Programme (DIP) MOVE and Partners In Health (PIH), under the Ebola Response Multi-Partner Trust Fund, targeting 2,500 vulnerable EVD survivors and EVD related destitute families in 8 designated districts in Sierra Leone namely: Kailahun, Kenema, Moyamba, Port Loko, Bombali, Tonkolili, Koinadugu and Kambia.

This unique UNDP, UN Women, the government of Sierra Leone and other partner's joint initiative of Cash Transfer/Income Generating Activities project is supported through a mix of financial and technical aid. This is in order to better provide support at the Federal, District and Community levels, to those who survived the Ebola Virus Disease as well as their Caregivers.

Project Objectives

The objectives of the project is to help prevent conflict and commence building resilience by addressing vulnerabilities and social marginalization affecting Ebola Virus Disease (EVD) survivors and EVD related destitute families. It was hoped that these objectives would be achieved through two outputs:

1. Discharged packages to EVD survivors and destitute families
 - 1.1 One-off basic commodity package
 - 1.2 Short term safety net scheme
2. Socio-economic support to enhance self-reliance

Specialized partners were engaged in the area of cash transfers and livelihood skills trainings to ensure the project achieves its overall aim successfully. Project beneficiaries that formed part of this process and have benefitted from the services offered by the project are expected to have either established improved sustainable income generating activities or selected and enrolled in long-term personal skills development project all geared towards enhancing self-reliance of vulnerable beneficiaries.

Due to a no-cost extension granted, the project which started in 2015, is due to end on the 31st of July, 2017 and hence before its closure, an end of project evaluation and a documented lessons learnt workshop was required.

1.2. Objective of the Evaluation

The main objective of this evaluation is to assess the progress made towards the achievement of the project objectives. Specifically, the evaluation assessed: -

- The outcome and the impact of the intervention on the lives of project beneficiaries, their families and communities.

- Identified the intended and unintended project outcome(s), best practices as well as challenges arising from project execution.
- The evaluation deduced conclusions and recommendation for learning and future interventions pertaining to emergency responses.

Expected Result/Deliverables

Under the supervision of the UNDP Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development Team Leader and in close collaboration with the UNDP project focal person(s), the consultant was expected to perform the following key functions:

- Develop an evaluation plan based on the following project thematic areas; relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, assessment of outcomes and impact, sustainability and lessons learnt/recommendations.
- Conduct a based desk review of similar projects on livelihood recovery in post emergency context, both nationally and internationally.
- Review the achievement of outputs and impact of the project, as well as the modalities of implementation and execution. Also, the consultant is to provide an overall judgment on to what extent the project has been successful in its activities, building the capacity of and supporting target groups.
- Review the project indicators and measure to what extent the expected results of the project have been achieved in a timely manner.
- Conduct comprehensive evaluation of the project entailing the adoption of various methods to collect and analyse data including but not limited to; literature review of all project documentation, field observations of project team members, interviews with key project staff (UN Women/UNDP), government stakeholders, implementing partners and focus group discussions involving primary project participants.
- Compile a report containing the presentation and analysis of the data.
- Document the lesson learned and provide recommendation (s)
- Present findings in visual presentation for UNDP/UN Women feedback.
- Finalize the report in a publishable format

The deliverables on the evaluation include:

1. Inception Report, detailing evaluation scope and methodology, including data collection methods, as well as, approach for the evaluation. The Inception Report should also contain a detailed work plan with timelines for agreed milestones;
2. The Draft Evaluation Report which will be shared with UNDP, UN Women and partners for comments and input; and
3. The Final Evaluation Report, incorporating comments from stakeholders

2. Evaluation Approach, Scope and Limitations

The evaluation covers project interventions from its inception in 2015 to 2017. The evaluation and its deliverables were accomplished within a period of thirty working days, between 6th of June and 6th Of July 2017. Schedule and work plan for the evaluation is presented below.

Table 1 – Evaluation Work plan & Timeline

Activities	Dates	No of work days
*Initial preparations and familiarization with the project documents, Outcomes, Results Matrix, and Monitoring & Evaluation Framework and Development of Inception report- remote	6 th to 11 th June	5
*Communications & Meetings with stakeholders and field visits to project sites in Sierra Leone * Development of draft report – on field	12 th to 23 rd June	12
*Submission of Draft evaluation report for comments and Presentation of Findings and recommendations to stakeholders (Validation workshop-on field)	28th June	5
*Feedback, finalization and submission of final report –remote	6 th July	8
Total		30

2.2. Limitations of the Methodology

A major limitation on this Project was the inability to reach all the Implementing Partners on this project because part of the project had been carried out and closed almost two years ago, some of the staff who worked on the project had also left the organization (IP), Therefore up to date information and data on the database including the characteristics of the beneficiaries (EVD survivors and caregivers) could not be accessed. Also, beneficiaries are scattered in remote communities, which was hard to reach at this rainy season. The Consultant therefore used a non - probability sampling

method - Convenience sampling including Chain (Snow-ball) method, making sure that available options like document reviews, telephone interviews etc. were fully employed and key stakeholders and beneficiaries were reached.

The evaluation is limited to the Social Rehabilitation and Payment to EVD Survivors project, jointly implemented by UNDP and UN Women along with the Government of Sierra Leone represented by the Ministry of Social Welfare Gender and Children's Affairs (MSWGCA) and Implementing Partners, from 2015 to 2017.

3. Evaluation Methods, Data Collection, Analysis and Guiding Principle

To achieve the evaluation objectives, the Consultant used both Primary and Secondary data sources to gather information, Primary data was generated from the use of Convenience sampling using the Snowball method and rapid appraisal techniques such as key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and general observation. While secondary data was generated from desk review of documents.

The evaluation approach was adopted with due consideration of the following factors:

- A theory of change approach, which was adopted to determine direct link between supported interventions and progress among Beneficiaries.
- The project is multidimensional in terms of intervention areas with a variety of stakeholders and target beneficiaries (Men, Women, Adolescent Youths and Children) EVD survivors.

The data collected during the evaluation process demonstrated how the project has performed in relation to its goals and strategic directions. It provides several insights into what is working and what is not working, whether there are lessons learned, benefits and challenges associated with project implementation and outcomes. Because of these multiple assessments, selected sample of institutions and individuals were used. The evaluation mapped the entire project outputs and the various activities to the expected outcomes.

3.1. In depth interviews with Key Informants

Semi - structured Questionnaires and checklists were developed for Survey and interviews to gather primary data. Interviews were also held with key stakeholders including Government, IPs and Beneficiaries within and outside Freetown metropolis.

3.2. Focus Group Discussions

Another method that was used to generate primary data is Focus Group Discussions. FGDs were held with key stakeholders and Beneficiaries in Kailahun, Kenema, Bombali (Makeni) and Port Loco districts. This was to fully explore stakeholders and beneficiaries' experiences and perceptions of the project.

The whole evaluation followed OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of assessing the Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Sustainability and Impact of a project. It was also carried out according to UNEG guidelines on evaluation as well as other guidelines and Core Humanitarian Standards. The following are the findings: -

Table 2: - List of Individuals/Organizations interviewed

S/N	List of Individuals/Organizations interviewed	Interview channel
1.	UNDP	In-depth interviews
2.	UN Women	In-depth interview
3.	Ministry of Social Welfare gender & Children's Affairs	In-depth interview
4.	Beneficiary EVD Survivors & Caregivers	FGD
5.	Movement towards Peace and Development Agency (MoPADA) Sierra Leone	FGD
6.	Green Africa	In-depth interviews
7.	World Hope International,	FGD
8.	Development Initiative Programme	FGD
9.	Partners In Health	KII
10.	Sierra Leone Association for Ebola Survivors	KII & FGD
11.	AFRICELL	KII

4. Findings

This chapter is an assessment of the project outputs and outcomes against the evaluation criteria. These criteria are: -

1. The relevance or appropriateness of the project or the extent to which the objectives of the intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the Districts and the Country as a whole.
2. The Efficiency or the extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results

3. The Effectiveness or the extent to which objectives of the intervention have been achieved, the extent to which the project contributed to the attainment of development.
4. Sustainability or buying in of the progress made by government and other stakeholders
5. The impact of the project among beneficiaries including host communities.
6. Coordination, Coverage, Crosscutting issues, and key lessons learnt.

4.1. Relevance

The relevance of a project focuses on the appropriateness of the project's outputs and outcomes in achieving National goals.

This refers to the design and focus of the SRPES project, whether it meets National and State's development priorities and the value of the intervention in relation to international policies and global references like the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Gender Equality? The project relates well to the SDG, particularly goals 1, 2, 5, 8 and 10, and these are:

- To end poverty in all its forms everywhere
- To end hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture
- To achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls
- To promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all
- Reduce inequality within and among countries

Furthermore, the design and implementation of the project was observed to have observed Strategic Objective 3 (SO3) of the Global Ebola Response that is: - Ensure Essential Services MCA8: Recovery and Economy. Also, the project supports the President's recovery priorities of the government of Sierra Leone.

According to all the beneficiaries interviewed, the project was timely and very relevant as it came when they lost every of their belongings, were stigmatized and by their family, friends and community entirely, with very little hope left for them. All stakeholders therefore unanimously agreed that the project was appropriate, relevant and timely, it was a response to the challenges of the EVD survivors as the discharged packages to and the socio-economic support pushed them towards early recovery.

4.2. Efficiency

Efficiency criterion is a measure of how economically resources and inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results. It includes issues like capacity utilization, disbursement rate and the timeliness of implementation of a project.

Moreover, the fact that the IPs are community based makes the project more cost efficient and timely in training, monitoring and mentoring. However, there were

reports where some beneficiaries benefitted from the support given by both UNDP and UN Women, making it a duplicated effort and hampering the efficiency of the project. Furthermore, the project experienced a lot of delays in its implementation due to continuous staff attrition and change in project leadership, and government policy.

4.3. Effectiveness

The effectiveness of a project is the extent to which objectives of the intervention have been achieved, it is the extent to which the project contributed to the attainment of development or progress.

The project was found to be highly effective in laying good grounds for poverty reduction and empowerment of vulnerable groups in an emergency.

For a country coming out of an epidemic with many challenges and desperately in need of humanitarian assistance, effective strategy of interventions must include financial support and capacity development in several areas including psycho-social, socio-economic, Financial literacy and entrepreneurship. The interventions on this project were: -

1. Training in Entrepreneurship (Financial literacy - Setting up Businesses, Banking etc.)
2. Food and agriculture for self reliance
3. Conditional and unconditional Cash Transfer
4. Group Peer support (Psychosocial and economic support through savings similar to the 'Osusu') The purpose for this was to provide them with socio-economic support for resilience building.

Through the above interventions and with resilience and determination, the beneficiaries were able to overcome their challenges, change family, friends and communities perception about them and regain their dignity and self-worth in the society. Most of them have moved on to become 'change agents' with income generating activities and leadership qualities that is used for Peer support.

By engaging the services of a telephone network provider like Africell that has the widest coverage in the country to carry out the cash transfer, the project proved its effectiveness and transparency.

However, for a target group, majority of who cannot read or write, a longer workshop of about five days or more of Financial Literacy training would have been more effective, a refresher course would have also been needed to make more impact.

Furthermore, the fact that a few people became determined enough to make a success story of their poultry business despite the stigma around them shows the kind of ordeal the beneficiaries went through, more mentoring and monitoring would have been needed to follow up on those who may not have been strong enough.

Perhaps a more effective and more lasting Livelihood scheme would have been a more innovate skills acquisition, such that will keep them under coaching or mentoring for some months while they learn to be creative or manipulative, most

survivor youths among the beneficiaries expressed their intentions in learning such vocational skills.

4.4. Sustainability

Sustainability is the likelihood that the achievements recorded so far will be sustained beyond the project's life and it is also the resilience of the achievements to financial, political, systemic and other risks.

It deals with questions such as the likelihood of the sustenance of the achievements after the withdrawal of external support, the extent to which counterparts are able to continue erstwhile with supported activities, and the extent to which the project has built human and institutional capacities, the continued commitment of stakeholders, including government and civil society to the project in terms of sustaining the momentum that has been generated.

The project has obtained mixed results in sustainability, a lot has been achieved in the area of capacity development among the beneficiaries. The Beneficiaries have been given start off packages and unconditional payment, thus giving them relief from their crises and emergency situation. They have also been provided with conditional cash payments and psychosocial support along with entrepreneurial skills for resilience building. The fact that some of the IPs reside in the communities with the beneficiaries is also a right step at sustaining the project. Most of them are familiar with the beneficiaries as they are already programming in the area of EVD relief and may continue mentoring them after the expiration of the project.

Furthermore, the project has gained a lot of support from government. It tried to carry government along in its planning and implementation, though government response was initially slow.

However, the beneficiaries explained that as they are still grappling with a lot of health issues and lack the strength to embark on vigorous and stressful income generating activities, they would prefer to be taken through a vocational training or apprenticeship for a period of time before starting their own business, moreover, a lot of them are uneducated and will therefore need a longer period of skills acquisition to enable them fully acquire the necessary skills needed for business and entrepreneurship. They will also need to be closely monitored for a longer period of time.

4.5. Impact

Impact - is the extent to which the project is contributing to a long-term positive and negative effect, this involves the following:

The project has in no doubt impacted positively on the beneficiaries, it is said to be very timely and innovative, and they have been able to rebuild their lives through the support they received. Most of them are also engaged in small-scale income

generating activities and have little time to reflect on their past. Furthermore, they are gradually being accepted back in their communities, as they have been able to contribute to its growth. The consultant interviewed some survivors who explained that through the conditional cash transfer, there have been remarkable changes in their lives, some have been able to cultivate large farmlands and have harvested large proceed from the farm, there are also examples of survivors and caregivers who have increased their Poultry and other Businesses like Trading, and are doing very well. Furthermore, the project has also helped to strengthen and encouraged community integration and harmony.

However, the positive impact of the project may not be long lasting for some reasons listed below.

- a) Some of the beneficiaries were driven from their former homes after they contacted the virus and had to get new accommodation with some of the fund given to them
- b) Some of them are not as strong as they used to be (health wise), they often feel unwell and therefore may be unable to carry out any vigorous income generating activities for now despite the fact that they have specific livelihood schemes that they would love.
- c) Some of them are Caregivers for three (3) or more under aged orphans who are still in school and have to pay for their schooling and other needs, the little they get from their business proceed, cannot take care of all the needs
- d) Some of the group businesses are not working and there are accusations and counter accusations, they would prefer family or sole business, besides, some of the businesses like poultry products are failing because of either the chickens dying or being stolen.
- e) There are increasing monetary demand from them from family and friends who see them receiving financial assistance from the project
- f) A livelihood training of such a short time may not make a lasting impact, It would need 6 months or more to make better impact, considering the level of education of the Beneficiaries (At least 80% of whom are said to be illiterates)

4.6. Coordination and Partnership

Coordination - Effects of coordination or lack of coordination among partners.
UNDP, UN Women and the government of Sierra Leone partnered with Civil Society Organisations to implement the project. The implementing partners include: -

1. Green Africa
2. Action Aid
3. Development Initiative Programme (DIP)
4. MOVE
5. MOPADA
6. Partners In Health (PIH)
7. World Hope International (WHI)

Other partners who supported the project include Africell, Pink Cross and Sierra Leone Ebola Survivors (SLES).

A feature unique to joint projects is that it is seen as a platform for knowledge sharing¹, it should decrease duplicative activities. Joint needs assessment, joint monitoring and evaluation, collaborative decision-making, streamlined government dialogue and or enhanced government participation in decision-making was not fully utilized. The MPTF partners (UN Women & UNDP) perhaps except for the initial stage of the project, almost worked alone without sharing notes, ideas and strategies. This led to duplication of support and resources. The project was designed for a timeframe and within a limited budget, which may be attributed in part to limited funding, but due to continuous delay, continuous change in leadership and none adherence to initial plan, there was lack of coordination and no synergy in implementation. If the project had followed the initial plan made, more sustainable development impact would have been realized through collective efforts, taking in recognizant the comparative advantage UN wielded. The project unrealistically expect implementing partners (IPs) to 'take over' project tasks without providing adequately for monitoring and supervision for a period of time, while project extensions were requested, this approach increases transactions costs, which may not be convenient for growing IPs.

4.7. Coverage

Coverage - Which Groups did the project reach e.g. Adolescent girls, Women, Orphans and vulnerable children etc.? What differential impacts did these groups make?

The different groups supported through the Multi Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) include, Women (including Adolescent girls and Female Survivors heading households), Men and Children. All of who are either Survivors or Caregivers including Female Destitute (Those who are affected by the virus) in their coverage.

The project covered eight (8) designated districts in Sierra Leone namely: Kailahun, Kenema, Moyamba, Port Loko, Bombali, Tonkolili, Koinadugu and Kambia. The reasons for choosing these districts are because they are the most affected by the EBOLA virus, and also because there is more concentration of other Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) servicing the other districts.

4.8. Cross-cutting Issues: - Gender & Human Rights

As part of its mandate and its objective to promote an inclusive, resilient and sustainable development, the project worked to strengthen the empowerment of the beneficiaries by supporting their entrepreneurship training and giving them cash transfer to start small scale enterprises. While UNDP and its implementing partners

¹ Enhancing the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Joint Programmes - Lessons Learned from a United Nations Development Group Review

supported both men and women, the UN Women specifically serviced women, based on its mandate. The people mostly hit by the EVD are poor indigenous women who though survived the disease but had to do away with the little they had (every of their personal belongings were burned to curtail the spread of the disease). Among the survivors interviewed were orphans and widows heading households who were unemployed, stigmatized and humiliated and therefore suffered a lot of trauma before the project was implemented, they all expressed their gratitude to the project implementers for the opportunities given to them to live what they termed ‘a meaningful life again’.

4.9. Livelihood Support Project theory of change

The evaluation also reviewed the extent to which the project has followed the theory of change, as illustrated through the diagram below.

Table 3: UNDP’s Theory of change chain

Strategy	
UNDP & UN Women form partnership with the Government of Sierra Leone and Civil Society Organisations to implement a Social Rehabilitation project for EVD Survivors	
By giving psychosocial support and building their capacity in entrepreneurship management	By giving unconditional cash transfer in 3 tranches and a conditioner cash transfer, also by giving discharge packages as one off basic commodity package
So that	
Capacity of Men, Women and youths who are EVD survivors and caregivers are built to effectively manage a livelihood.	Ebola Survivors and Destitute families (Beneficiaries) would have the socio-economic support they need to recover fully and to re-integrate them in the communities
So that the EVD Survivors	
Are transformed emotionally through social re-integration, counseling and mentoring	Are provided with income generating activities and entrepreneurship skills
So that they will	
Function well in the emerging society	Be able to have enhanced self - reliance and access potential livelihood skills
So that EVD Survivors will be able to address their vulnerability and social marginalization	

5. Conclusions

The evaluation has observed and subsequently concludes that the Social Rehabilitation and Payment to EVD Survivors project has performed reasonably well in relation to its objective to help prevent conflict and commence building resilience by addressing vulnerabilities and social marginalization. The project constituted a relevant and an effective intervention considering that it also helped to strengthen and encouraged community integration and harmony. The value of the project has been more in laying good grounds for poverty reduction and empowerment of vulnerable groups in an emergency. However, the impact of the project may be short lived, due to increasing needs of the beneficiaries without a corresponding increase in their livelihood activities. Perhaps, a longer time strategy may be needed to yield lasting result.

5.1. Lessons Learned

1. **Health Condition of a Survivor:** A major lesson that was learnt on this project is that the average Ebola Survivor may still be ‘sickly’. Most of the Beneficiaries explained that they frequently feel unwell with aches and pains. This contributed to most of them not being able to engage in vigorous livelihood opportunities, as they would have wished. This should be noted when planning future livelihood programmes.
2. **UN’s comparative advantage:** The Joint Project has deepened and widened the UN’s influence and reach, it has showcased its unique expertise and strength in promptly responding to emergency situation by building resilience and promoting sustainable human development to reduce poverty in all its dimensions including economic empowerment of rural communities in emergency and humanitarian situations.
3. **The right resources does do wonders:** When given the right resources (skills development, trauma counseling etc.) after a needs assessment and situation analysis, people who have been traumatized can lead a normal and dignifying lifestyle, and also earn decent living for themselves. It is also good to continue empowering and sustaining old/previous skills instead of introducing new ones. The psychosocial support and then business training given to the beneficiaries prior to the Livelihood skill was commended. Most of the beneficiaries were previously traumatized and in pathetic situations without hope, the support given to them was crucial and well needed to regain their confidence and dignity.

4. **Partnering with Community based IPs:** This is a good initiative for sustainability of the project. The IPs were already integrated in the community and are familiar with most of the beneficiaries, there is therefore likelihood that they will continue mentoring them after the expiration of the project.
5. **Banking and Other Saving Scheme:** Introducing the Banking system by assisting the Beneficiaries to open a savings account, as been a good step in the right direction. Some of them said it would help them in being thrifty and may reduce the pressure put on them by family, friends and even Landlords, as they become less aware of when have money
6. **Engagement of a communication network:** Engaging a communication network with wide coverage like Africell was laudable for Efficiency, Effectiveness and Transparency.

5.2. Challenges

1. **Sustainability of the Project:** Sustainability of the project may be a challenge. Presently, the beneficiaries are still expecting further support from the project, the Government and the IPs (unless they get funding from other sources) do not seem to have the fund to continue.
2. **Joint/Coordinated programming:** The fact that the project was loosely coordinated was a big challenge. Partners carrying out their activities at different times without informing the others or sharing notes, ideas or lesson's learnt. Unfortunately, while government partner (MSWGCA) was 100% in support of UNDP's activities, the same could not be said for UN Women.
3. **More variety of vocation & Longer training time needed:** Future project should include more innovative vocational skills that may need longer training duration to make a more permanent impact. It could be an apprenticeship scheme or training and mentoring scheme.
4. **Short training period:** The project's focus was mainly in rural communities with a large percentage of uneducated (illiterate) beneficiaries. Research revealed that it was quite challenging taking them through a supposedly 5-day training programme in 2 days and expects them to make meaning out of it.

5.3. Recommendations

1. **Coordinate activities in harmony:** Partners should harmonize their strategies for joint project arrangements, particularly UN agencies. They should identify opportunities for better coordination, effectiveness and efficiency where activities could be jointly implemented and managed. An 'Integrated Work Plan' that clearly indicates each agency's and partner's responsibilities creates a clear division of labour between partners and has proven to eliminate unnecessary duplication.² Plan together and work together to avoid duplication and wastage.
2. **Exit strategy and M & E Framework:** - When designing a project, exit strategy that all partners will agree to, should be topmost on the list of all. This is to ensure that projects are sustained and continues, even after funding has ended. The design of the project should be more encompassing and explicit. The existence of a clear and well-structured design and implementation framework (durations, resources, beneficiaries and partners) including Monitoring and Evaluation framework at the outset of the project is a key factor for successful implementation.
3. **Innovative Approaches and Missed Opportunity:** Innovative approaches such as consistent advocacy and dialogue with government is a veritable tool in getting commitment and support from government, ensure government is carried along 100%. Furthermore, consequent project should consider educational support for EVD teeming school going Orphans and Destitute families.
4. **Good Communication:** Partner agencies should communicate more between each other especially on a joint programme such as this. This opportunity could be used to promote UN's comparative advantage over other international donor agencies.
5. **Future Projects:** It is almost difficult to implement a Livelihood project within a one (1) year period of time especially amongst uneducated people. Successful Livelihood projects are usually implemented for at least a period of 3 years, giving enough time for skills acquisition, mentoring and supervision. Livelihood scheme that could be looked into under such settings and condition

²: Through the integrated work plan in Eritrea, overlapping coverage of same (sub-) zobas in the Supplementary feeding activities carried out by both UNICEF and WFP was avoided.

include vocational skills and IGAs such as Tailoring, Hairdressing, Catering, Basket weaving, Knitting, Mobile Phone Repairs, Motorcycle repair, Shoe making and Agro based including – Rice, Cassava farming, and Animal husbandry including Poultry Farming, Fish Farming. A lot of coaching and mentoring would also be needed.

Table 4: Output/Outcome Analysis

Outcome: Early recovery and rapid return to sustainable development pathways are achieved in post-conflict and post disaster situation		
Output 1: Discharge package for Survivors and Destitute families are provided	1.1: Provide one off basic commodity package	Completed
	1.2: Provide monthly stipends	Completed with cash transfer of 350,000 Leones made to beneficiaries (EVD survivors & caregivers) in 3 tranches
	1.3: Provide discharge package for specifically female beneficiaries	Completed
Achievements/Results: A total of about 2,500 beneficiaries where reached with basic needs		
Output 2: Survivors and destitute families receive livelihood rehabilitation support	2.1: Conduct livelihood recovery assessment & planning	Completed
	2.2: Implement individual livelihood plans (gendered mixed group)	Completed with Cash transfer through mobile money
	2.3: Specifically female beneficiaries	Pending
Achievement/Result: A total of about 2500 beneficiaries were reached through this activity with most of them successfully carrying out income generating activities.		

ANNEXES

References:

1. SRPES Project Document
2. Tranche 1, 2 and 3 Breakdowns
3. MoPADA-SL, UNDP – SIERRA LEONE – January – March 2017 Project Progress Report
4. Annual Work plans 2015 & 2016
5. UN Women Mission Report
6. WHI – UNDP Monthly Report
7. Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory: www.simplypsychology.org
8. sustainabledevelopment.un.org
9. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP): Comparative Advantage
10. National Ebola Recovery Strategy for Sierra Leone (2015 – 2017)
11. Draft eligibility Criteria for the selection of Survivors and Destitute Families
12. Enhancing the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Joint Programmes - Lessons Learned from a United Nations Development Group Review
13. New UNEG Ethical guidelines (2016)
14. OECD/DAC guidelines for evaluating development assistance
15. Terminal Evaluation Of UN Joint Programme 3 - Support to Tanzania National Response Against HIV and AIDS by Fatimah Bisola Ahmed
16. UN joint Programme on Strengthened Approach for the Integration of Sustainable Environmental & Livelihood Management in Afghanistan (SAISEM) by Fatimah Bisola Ahmed
17. Final Evaluation Of UNDP Livelihood Skills Scheme – Operation Rainbow (2013 -2015), Report prepared by Fatimah Bisola Ahmed

Table

LIST OF PEOPLE CONTACTED/INTERVIEWED ON SRPES EVALUATION

S/N	Name	Position	Address/Chiefdom	Tel. No.
1.	Tuzlyn Bayoh	Project Team Member	UNDP Sierra Leone	
2.	Brian Davies	Project Team Member	UNDP Sierra Leone	
3.	Ghulam Sherani	Team Leader, Inclusive Growth cluster	UNDP Sierra Leone	
4.	Samuel Palmer	Deputy Team Leader, Inclusive	UNDP Sierra Leone	0732124153

SRPES FINAL EVALUATION 2017

		Growth		
5.	Baindu Massaquoi	Programme Specialist	UN Women	076602214
6.	Marbey Sartie	Programme Specialist	UN Women	078822311
7.	Dehunge Shiaka	Initiative Owner	MOSWG Initiative	076656065
8.	Richard Ghoussoub	Ecommerce Specialist	AFRICELL	077928021
9.	Samuel B. Vande	Programme Manager	MOPADA	079190944
10.	Edward Baina	Admin Finance Officer	MOPADA	076657222
11.	Tamba Morray	Supervisor	MOPADA	076651446
12.	Mamie Massaquoi	Field Supervisor	MOPADA	078927307
13.	Mohammed Sam	Supervisor	MOPADA	078761220
14.	Bobor Sakira	Office Assistant	MOPADA	088681333
15.	Momoh Ensah	Survivor	Kailahun Town	030316272
16.	Jebbeh Koroma	Survivor	Kailahun Town	
17.	Brima Kamara	Caregiver	“	088675009
18.	Morie Vand	Survivor	“	030708080
19.	Evon Hemoh	Survivor	“	099961930
20.	Ensah Feika	Survivor	“	088470704
21.	Amie Lamsana	Caregiver		088143738
22.	Fatmata Swaray	Survivor		076571743
23.	Princess Lakoi	“		099090165
24.	Mustapha Feika	“		088224264
25.	Hauwa Kamara	“		030046949
26.	Finda Hemoh	“		088185035
27.	Baindu Morie	“		
28.	Momoh Saffa	“		077767925
29.	Philip James Kamanda	Field Officer	Development Initiative Programme	076145050
30.	David M. Gbetuwa	District Supervisor	“	079721616
31.	Amie Mansaray	Survivor		
32.	Fatu Bangura	Survivor		
33.	Watta Samai	“		
34.	Sao Samai	“		
35.	Zainab Konneh	“		
36.	Jattu Lahai			
37.	Jusu Samah			
38.	Lahai Kallou			
39.	Mamudu Samba			
40.	Mohamed Kanneh			
41.	Alhaji Brima			
42.	Bockarie Fofanah			
43.	Junisa Banya			
44.	Mustapha Alhaji	“		
45.	Alhaji Sheku	“		

SRPES FINAL EVALUATION 2017

46.	Ousman Konneh			
47.	Moses Zombo	Director	Green Africa, S/L	030384201
48.	Alimamy Sesay	Finance Manager	Green Africa, S/L	076651422
49.	Fatmata Sesay	Survivor		076282150
50.	Ahmed Turay	Social Service Officer	MOSWG	078 443096
51.	Lsherry Bangura	National Social Protection Manager	Partners In Health	077882499
52.	Ramatu Mansaray	Survivor/Caregiver	Port Loco	
53.	Ngouia Eisa	Caregiver	Sittaiwei	
54.	Jenneh Mohammed	Survivor	“	
55.	Aroyo Mambo	Survivor	“	
56.	Martin Kandeh	Survivor	“	
57.	Amie Bayoh	Survivor	“	
58.	Kadie Mambo	Survivor	“	
59.	Mohammed Kammeh	Survivor	“	
60.	Yusuf Gbla	Survivor	M/Gbanti	088754618
61.	Abdul Thullah	Survivor	M/Gbanti	025354814
62.	Ammata Korom	Survivor	“	088003543
63.	Mohammed Santhol	Survivor	“	099382033
64.	Abubakar Hamera	Caregiver	“	088709187
65.	Isatu Korom	Survivor	“	030240018
66.	Saidu Kamar	Survivor	B/Shebora	088791684
67.	Zamaba Fofornal	Survivor	B/Shebora	077832193
68.	Ummi Conteh	Survivor /Caregiver	B/Shebora	077420024
69.	Ularrah Koroma	Survivor	“	077306596
70.	Kadiatu Koroma	Caregiver	“	077306596
71.	Aminatu Conteh	Survivor	“	077420024
72.	Siatta Kameni	Survivor	“	088868979
73.	Esther Manasary	Caregiver	“	088868979
74.	Ummi Koroma	Survivor	“	076856111
75.	Zainab Kamar	Survivor	“	076856111
76.	Alfred P. Kau	Survivor	“	076499202
77.	Marriatu Kangbo	Chair/Sales	B/Shebora	088040448
78.	Bernadette Udo	Team Leader	World Hope International	076947269
79.	Momah Z. Koyauday	Project Officer	“	
80.	Wusu Conteh	Survivor Advocate	“	076371262
81.	Samuel Banguru	Director of Programs	“	

UNITED NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
Terms of Reference



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

I. Position Information

Post Title: International Consultant
Duty Station: Freetown (with field visits as applicable)
Contract type: Consultancy
Duration: 30 working days
Application deadline:
Contract Start Date: Immediately

II. Background

The Social Rehabilitation and Payment to EVD Survivors project is a joint project implemented by UNDP and UNWomen, targeting 2,500 vulnerable EVD survivors and EVD related destitute families in 8 designated districts Kailahun, Kenema, Moyamba, Port Loko, Bombali, Tonkolili, Koinadugu and Kambia.

The project is designed to help prevent conflict and commence building resilience by addressing vulnerabilities and social marginalization affecting EVD survivors and EVD related destitute families. The project is to achieve this objective through two outputs:

3. Discharged packages to EVD survivors and destitute families
 - 3.1 One-off basic commodity package
 - 3.2 Short term safety net scheme
4. Socio-economic support to enhance self-reliance

To achieve the above output, the project teams engaged the services of specialized partners in the area of cash transfers and livelihood skills trainings to ensure the project achieves its overall aim successfully. Project beneficiaries that formed part of this process and have benefitted from the services offered by the project should have either established improved sustainable income generating activities or selected and enrolled in long-term personal skills development programmes all geared towards enhancing self-reliance of vulnerable beneficiaries.

The project is due to end on the 31st July, 2017 and hence before its closure, an end of project evaluation and a documented lesson learnt workshop is highly required. The purpose of the evaluation will be to assess the progress made towards the achievement of the specific objectives of the project, its outcome and the impact of the intervention on the lives of project beneficiaries, their families and communities. Identifying the intended and unintended project outcome(s), best practices as well as challenges arising from project execution. In addition, the evaluation will deduce conclusions and recommendation for learning and future interventions pertaining to emergency responses.

III. Functions/Key Results Expected

Under the supervision of the UNDP Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development Team Leader and in close collaboration with the UNDP project focal person(s), the consultant will be expected to perform the following key functions:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an evaluation plan based on the following project thematic areas; relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, assessment of outcomes and impact, sustainability and lessons learnt/recommendations. • Conduct a based desk review of similar projects on livelihood recovery in post emergency context, both nationally and internationally. • Review the achievement of outputs and impact of the project, as well as the modalities of implementation and execution. Also, the consultant is to provide an overall judgment on to what extent the project has been successful in its activities, building the capacity of and supporting target groups. • Review the project indicators and measure to what extent the expected results of the project have been achieved in a timely manner. • Conduct comprehensive evaluation of the project entailing the adoption of various methods to collect and analyse data including but not limited to; literature review of all project documentation, field observations of project team members, interviews with key project staff (UNWomen/UNDP), government stakeholders, implementing partners and focus group discussions involving primary project participants. • Compile a report containing the presentation and analysis of the data. • Document the lesson learned and provide recommendation (s) • Present findings in visual presentation for UNDP/UNWomen feedback. • Finalize the report in a publishable format
<p>IV. Impact of Results</p> <p>Based on the scope of work outlined above, the consultant will be expected to deliver the following outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inception report with detailed evaluation plan with coinciding work schedule. • First draft report • Final evaluation report in publishable format. • Final process documentation report in publishable format • Submission of hard and electronic copies of materials/data collected and analysed. • A summary PowerPoint presentation, highlighting main findings and recommendations.
<p>V. Skills and Competencies</p> <p>Job Knowledge/Technical Expertise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-depth knowledge of livelihood and job creation, and community development. • Knowledge of EVD response and coordination. • Prior experience with qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis as well as good interview skills. • Experience in carrying out project reviews. • Experience and knowledge in the socio-political context of Sierra Leone would be an asset, especially in relation to EVD response. • Knowledge of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise development. • Experience in capacity building of vulnerable mixed groups. • Strong report writing and documentation skills <p>Functional Competencies:</p>

Professionalism

- Demonstrated problem-solving skills and judgment in applying technical expertise to resolve a wide range of complex issues/problems.
- Knowledge of region or country of assignment, including the political, economic and social dimensions.
- Demonstrated ability to complete in-depth studies and to formulate conclusions/recommendations.
- Demonstrates professional competence and mastery of subject matter.
- Is conscientious and efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results.

Results Orientation

- Displays initiative, sets challenging outputs for him/herself and willingly accepts new work assignments.
- Ability to take responsibility for achieving agreed outputs within set deadlines and strives until successful outputs are achieved.
- Identifies opportunities to bring forward and disseminate materials for advocacy work.

Team Work and Communication skills

- Excellent time management, monitoring and evaluation skills.
- Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback.
- Creating and promoting enabling environment for open communication.
- Demonstrates initiative and self-motivation to work independently, as well as, cooperative and collaborative spirit to work in a team.
- Excellent interpersonal and communication skills.
- Listens to others, correctly interprets messages from others and responds appropriately.

Planning and Organizing

- Develops clear goals that are consistent with agreed strategies.
- Identifies priority activities and assignments.
- Allocates appropriate amount of time and resources for completing work.
- Foresees risks and allows for contingencies when planning.
- Monitors and adjusts plans and actions as necessary.

Innovation and Marketing New Approaches

- Consistently looks at experience critically, drawing lessons, and building them into the design of new approaches.
- Identifies new approaches and promotes their use in other situations.
- Documents successes and uses them to project a positive image.
- Creates an environment that fosters innovation and innovative thinking.
- Capacity to make fair and transparent decisions, and take calculated risks.

Organizational Learning and Knowledge Sharing

- Advocates for innovative ideas documenting successes and building them into the design of new approaches.
- Identifies new approaches and strategies that promote the use of tools and mechanisms.
- Shares knowledge across the organization and building a culture of knowledge sharing and learning.
- Knowledge of inter-disciplinary development issues.

Corporate Competencies

- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards.
- Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP.
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.
- Treats all people fairly.

SRPES FINAL EVALUATION 2017

VI. Recruitment Qualifications	
Education:	The qualifications require a strong educational background (A Master's degree) in Community Development, Economics, and or related areas.
Experience:	<p>Advanced knowledge and work experience in development programme or project development and implementation, conducting research, including project evaluation and monitoring, developing interview and focus group discussion tools and conducting interviews, as well as desk research</p> <p>Minimum of 4 years professional experience in research and development project and programme (emergency response is a comparative advantage); and Familiarity with the UN system and UNDP.</p>
Language Requirements:	Fluency in oral and written English required.
VII. Submission of Application	
<p>Qualified candidates are hereby requested to apply. The application must contain the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Brief letter of application. 2. Personal CV or P11, indicating relevant professional experience, as well as the contact details (email address and phone number) of at least three professional references. 3. Brief description of the proposed methodology for completing this assignment with evidence of successfully completion of similar tasks with contact details to access the document. 4. Financial proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price supported by a breakdown of costs including local travel costs related to the assignment. <p>Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The information in the breakdown of the offered lump sum amount provided by the offeror will be used as the basis for determining best value for money, and as reference for any amendments of the contract. • The agreed contract amount will remain fixed regardless of any factors causing an increase in the cost of any of the components in the breakdown that are not directly attributable to UNDP. <p>Applications will only be considered if they include ALL of the items listed above. Also note that this website only allows for one document to be uploaded, so please combine all of the above mentioned items into one single Word or PDF document before uploading</p> <p>Evaluation of Criteria and Weight</p> <p>Offers received will be evaluated using a Combined Scoring method, where the qualifications and proposed methodology will be weighted 70%, and combined with the price offer, which will be weighted 30%. Only consultants obtaining a minimum of 49 points in the Technical Evaluation will be considered for the Financial Evaluation. Criteria to be used for rating the qualifications and methodology:</p> <p>Technical evaluation criteria (total 70 points):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional qualifications and experience with respect to the TOR including evidence of completed similar task with accepted quality: 25 points. 2. Methodology of approach in accomplishing the consultancy: 30 points. 3. Detailed work plan for the completion of the assignment: 15 <p>Financial evaluation (total 30 points):</p> <p>All technically qualified proposals will be scored out 30 based on the formula provided below. The maximum points (30) will be assigned to the lowest financial proposal. All other proposals receive points according to the following formula: $p = y (\mu/z)$ where: p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated; y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal; μ = price of the lowest priced proposal; z = price</p>	

of the proposal being evaluated.

Evaluation Matrix

<u>Evaluation Criterion 1: Relevance/appropriateness of the programme</u> The extent to which Objectives of the intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the State and the Country as a whole.		
Evaluation questions	Indicators	Data sources and collection methods
1. Was the initial design of the project adequate to properly address the issues envisaged in formulation of the project and provide the best possible support to the Government of Sierra Leone? 2. Has the project remained relevant?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outputs and outcomes addressing priorities identified in National development plans • Government and other stakeholders supporting project • No of People/organisations whose capacity were developed • Amount of fund given per person & criteria for benefitting • Types and No of socio-economic activities created and on-going 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inception & Planning documents • Development plans & other document Minutes of meetings KII with stakeholders
3. How relevant was the project to National priorities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project outputs and outcomes address priorities identified in regional and district development plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports KII with Stakeholders
4. What evidence is there for evidence-based programming (i.e. information generated from situation analysis translated into a response in an appropriate manner)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents were prepared and are available • Situation analysis was conducted prior to design of the project • M&E plan was prepared and is being implemented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and situation analysis report • Regional and district development plans M&E plan and monitoring reports
5. To what extent were partners involved in the development and implementation of the Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of meetings held during implementation with stakeholders and communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of meetings with Government officials and community representatives • Interviews with Stakeholders
<u>Evaluation Criterion 2: Efficiency</u> Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results		
Evaluation questions	Indicators	Data sources and collection methods
1. Were UNDP and UN Women's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial and technical 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report

SRPES FINAL EVALUATION 2017

supports to the project appropriate to achieving the desired objectives and intended results? If not, what were the key weaknesses?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> resources available throughout duration of the project Information flows easily and decision making channels flows without hindrance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KII & FGD
2. Has there been an economical use of financial and human resources?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of UN staff deployed in the project region % of planned activities carried out % of planned budget actually spent on activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial reports Progress reports M & E Report KII
3. Were the results delivered in a reasonable proportion to the operational and other costs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proportion of programme cost, compared to operational costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial report Interview with UNDP focal person Monitoring reports
4. Could a different type of intervention lead to similar results at a lower cost and how could this be incorporated in future programme designs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost of similar Livelihood programme in the Country 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literature review
5. Did the monitoring and evaluation systems that UN have in place help ensure that the project was managed efficiently and effectively?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> M & E indicators are SMART 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project document, M & E report Progress reports
6. How were the funding modalities used by UN appropriate, including use of state systems for disbursement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time taken to transfer funds from UN to Beneficiaries Appropriateness of disbursement method. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with Beneficiaries and Stakeholders Progress & Financial reports

Evaluation Criterion 3: Effectiveness

Extent to which objectives of the intervention have been achieved, the extent to which the project contributed to the attainment of development.

Evaluation questions	Indicators	Data sources and collection methods
1. Are the project outputs appropriate, sufficient, effective and sustainable for the desired outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outputs aligned with desired outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project report, document review
2. What evidence is there that UN support has contributed towards improvement in the State government's capacity, including institutional strengthening?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of beneficiaries reporting improvement in their livelihood Stakeholders (including Govt, CSO and Communities reporting improved capacity and progress. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress report, KII with Community Leaders KII with Govt focal person and CSO
3. Has UNDP & UN Women worked effectively with other UN Agencies and other international and national	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of joint planning with National partners and other UN agencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning reports Joint meeting reports

SRPES FINAL EVALUATION 2017

partners to deliver the project objectives?		• KII with Stakeholders
4. How effective has UN been in partnering with civil society and the private sector to promote and implement the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSOs and other partners reporting participation in the promoting and implementation of the project • Coordination meetings at national and field levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII with Stakeholders • Project Reports
5. Has UN utilized innovative techniques and best practices in its implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders and Beneficiaries perception of the project • Project compared with other international livelihood projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature review • KII with Stakeholders & Beneficiaries
6. Are UN perceived by stakeholders as a strong advocate for supporting victims of violent conflicts - particularly women, widows and youths in the communities and Sierra Leone at large?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No of stakeholders and beneficiaries – particularly women, children and destitute expressing satisfaction or improved quality of life 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII with CSOs, Women, Widows and Youths
7. Taking into account the technical capacity and institutional arrangements of the UNDP Country Office, is it well suited to provide and implement the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of Stakeholders dissatisfaction about UNDP's management of the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KII with Stakeholders (Govt, CSO & Community Leaders) • FGD with beneficiaries
8. To what extent were the key results achieved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of planned monitoring activities performed jointly • Assessments or mid-term evaluation conducted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports of monitoring activities • Progress reports from 2015 - 2017 • Interviews with Stakeholders
9. What contributing factors and impediments have enhanced or impeded UNDP performance in this area?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of Human & material resources • Trend in Social arena 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M&E reports • Interviews with UN's' focal persons • Interviews with Stakeholders

Evaluation Criterion 4: Project Output, Outcome & Impact Analysis
Positive and Negative results generated by the Project

Evaluation questions	Indicators	Data sources and collection methods
1. Are the project outputs relevant to the outcome?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outputs aligned and in harmony with outcome 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document review, • Reports review
2. Has the project made a difference to the lives of host communities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of communities reporting improved relationship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress reports • Focus group discussions and KII with

SRPES FINAL EVALUATION 2017

		Community Leaders, Stakeholders & Beneficiaries
3. What are the quantities and qualities of the outputs, and their timeliness? What factors impeded or facilitated the delivery of the outputs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outputs and Outcomes proportional to the objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress reports KII Interviews & Focus Group Discussions
4. Have the outputs been delivered as planned?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of the results achieved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KII & FGD Progress reports
5. Which aspects of the project have been most effective so far and which ones are least effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of positive and negative results achieved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress reports KII & FGD
6. What key challenges have hampered the delivery of intended outputs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of challenges, lessons learnt & best practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents review & KII
7. How can the effectiveness of the project be strengthened for future interventions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of challenges, lessons learnt and best practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents review KII & FGD

Evaluation Criterion 5: Sustainability

Evaluation questions	Indicators	Data sources and collection methods
1. Will the outputs delivered through the project be sustained by Government's capacity after the end of the project duration? If not, why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of District, Community & Institutional support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surveys and interviews with stakeholders
2. Will there be adequate funding available to sustain the functionality over the short, medium and longer term?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of short, medium and long term financial support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project development plans Interviews with stakeholders Progress reports
3. Has the project generated the buy-in and credibility needed for sustained impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Types of systems strengthening and capacity development approaches provided % of project budget spent on training and capacity development Number of persons trained 	Progress report

Evaluation Criterion 6: Resources, Partnerships and Management Analysis

Evaluation questions	Indicators	Data sources and collection methods
1. Were project partners, stakeholders and/or beneficiaries involved in the design of the intervention?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidences of project design, planning and review meetings held 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report of meetings KII & FGD
2. If yes, what was the nature and extent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project document

SRPES FINAL EVALUATION 2017

of their participation? If not, why not?	and/or beneficiaries involvement in project intervention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports • KII
3. Was the structure and management of the project appropriate to achieving the desired objectives and intended results of the project? If not, what were the key weaknesses?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of reporting participation in coordination meetings at national and field levels • Monitoring and progress reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents review • KII
4. Has the intervention developed the necessary State capacities (both human and institutional) for sustainability?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical staff turnover within the • staff turnover 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with
Evaluation Criterion 7: Cross-cutting Issues: - Gender & Human Rights		
Evaluation questions	Indicators	Data sources and collection methods
1. Was cross-cutting considerations mainstreamed in the implementation of activities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of cross-cutting issues mainstreamed in project activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress reports • Monitoring reports • Project plans
2. To what extents have poor, indigenous and tribal peoples, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from UN's work in support of livelihoods promotion and conflict prevention?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of capacity needs assessments conducted at the different levels • Number of planning and progress review meetings held with communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports of capacity needs assessments undertaken
3. To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of Local context recognition and mainstreamed in project design documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project design documents

CHECKLIST TO DEVELOP SURVEY TOOLS FOR THE SOCIAL REHABILITATION AND PAYMENT TO EVD SURVIVORS PROJECT

1. How many CSO's are involved? List out
2. How many Beneficiaries? List by Gender, Age & LGA/Districts have been reached.
3. How many Discharged Packages were distributed?? Was an assessment conducted before distribution?
4. What percentages of the Beneficiaries have established improved sustainable income generating activities/Livelihood scheme?
5. How many Districts involved on the Project?
 - b. How many were affected
 - c. What were the criteria for choosing the Districts?

6. How were beneficiaries chosen?
7. Where District government, CSOs, Women groups, community leaders/Opinion leaders involved in the project?
 - b. How?
 - c. How has the scheme contributed to peace, resilience building and self-reliance?
8. What are the opinions of Government, Women/community leaders, CSOs, Family/Guardian and Beneficiaries on the project?
 - b. What do they see as challenges and best practices?
9. Probe on appropriateness and relevance of the project
10. Probe further on effectiveness and efficiency (Financial & Time) of the project
11. Probe on effective supervision, coordination and leadership
12. What were the challenges encountered by the beneficiaries?
13. What were the challenges encountered by the CSOs on the project?
14. What were the challenges encountered by Government on the project?
15. To what extent has gender equality and human rights been addressed on the project
16. Do you think that a particular strategy should have been used to tackle the issue of Gender? YES / NO
17. If yes, Please explain
18. Should gender aspects be strengthened through women specific component/sub-components/activities? YES / NO
19. Please explain.
20. What is your personal opinion on the project in terms of the following? -
 - a. How it was Managed
 - b. Selection of Beneficiaries
 - c. The trainings (probe on the different trainings)
 - d. Supervision
 - e. Funding
21. How should the project be similar project be carried out
22. Suggest who should be involved for the project to be more effective
23. Has the project achieved its objectives?
24. Has the project observed the 'Do no harm protocol'?
25. If so how, If not why?
26. Is the project self – sustainable? If not, how can sustainability be achieved?
27. Check minutes/reports of meetings with CSO, Government and Beneficiaries
28. Check supervisory/monitoring reports etc.

Further pertinent questions may arise during or after a pre – test of the tools.

