**CONSULTANTS’ TERMS OF REFERENCE (ToR)**

**FOR**

**THE MID TERM EVALUATION OF THE ECOWAS EU SMALL ARMS PROJECT**

1. **Background**

The ECOWAS-EU Small Arms Project is an intervention under the Programme "EU support to ECOWAS Regional Peace, Security and Stability Mandate" (ECOWAS-EU PSS) for the implementation of the "Pilot Weapons Collection Programmes "related to the ECOWAS Conflict Prevention Framework (ECPF) component "Practical disarmament" in Member States. The project aims at sensitizing border communities, strengthening operational and institutional capacities of relevant stakeholders such as: National Commissions, Security Forces and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) on the dangers of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW proliferation), as well as encourage voluntary weapons surrender/collection in return for community based development projects.

It is an ECOWAS project, funded by European Union (EU) and implemented by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Nigeria Country Office in close collaboration with National Commissions on Small Arms and Light Weapons (NATCOM), CSOs and other relevant stakeholders. It covers a duration of 3 years (2015-2017) with a budget of EUR 5,560,000. The project is implemented in two clusters covering seven countries, namely Sahel (Northern Niger, Mali, and Northern Nigeria) and Mano River Union (West of Cote d’Ivoire; Guinee Forestiere; East of Liberia; North-East of Sierra Leone).

1. **Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation**

The broader aim of the mid-term evaluation as is to generate a usable evaluation report that would aid in the implementation of the second half of the project in a timely and most effective manner, provide relevant information and strategic recommendations that would guide the Project steering Committee The recommendations will aim to improve the strategies, implementation mechanisms, management efficiency, and also to inform the design of the follow up interventions of the phase of the project. The Evaluation exercise will cover the six countries that the project covers from 2015 to 2017, it will holistically review and systematically analyze recorded achievements and the accompanied strategies and how all these aided the project in delivering on its mandate.

The mid-term evaluation will:

* Assess the progress or lack thereof, towards the expected outputs envisaged in the project document. It will particularly refer to the approved work plans by the PSC which reflects the intended outputs in real time. Where appropriate, the evaluation will also highlight unexpected results (positive or negative) and missed opportunities;
* Provide an analysis of how the project has delivered and added value to the work of the national commissions in response to the issue of SALW;
* Present key findings, draw key lessons, and provide a set of clear and forward-looking options leading to strategic and actionable recommendations for the next project implementation by the partners.

1. **Evaluation Questions and Evaluation Criteria**

The mid-e valuation will have 3 components, (i) the analysis of the focus output areas, and (ii) the analysis of the extent to which the issue of SALW has been brought to the fore through this project within the respective NATCOMS in the six (6) countries (iii) the extent to which the management arrangements and implementation modalities have impacted on the project objectives. To define the broad aspects of the project that will be assessed within the 3 components, a series of evaluation criteria would constitute the framework used to formulate the evaluation questions.

***Component 1: Analysis of the Focus Output Areas***

1. *Relevance of the ECOWAS/EU SALW project:*

* Assess the degree to which the intended output for the project addresses the challenges of the respective countries;
* To what extent is the project aligned with and is responding to the ECOWAS convention?
* Is the implementation strategy appropriate for the needs as expressed?
* To what extent is the output areas (i) adapted to the needs of the Beneficiaries (ii) and in line with the priorities set by national commissions?
* A realistic analysis of the respective country situations; to what extent were the external risks (i.e. political, governance, conflict and fiduciary) and the internal threats to the project implementation identified?
* Assess to what extent the project incorporated gender-sensitive and inclusive approaches in implementation?

1. *Effectiveness of the ECOWAS/EU SALW Project:*

* To what extent were the expected outputs of the results matrix achieved or are likely to be achieved through the events and activities implemented in the project?
* Was there sufficient synergy among the various pilot countries? Did other pilot countries contribute to and reinforce achievement of project results?
* To what extent were the monitoring, evaluation, reporting and accountability systems adequate to enable the UN demonstrate project results?
* How well has the UNDP communicated its results/lessons learnt/good practices?

1. *Efficiency of the ECOWAS/EU SALW Project:*

* Was the project actual expenditure in line with expectations and plans? Were there any significant changes or delays?
* Was the skill mix and continuity of key staff appropriate to the country context and strategy?
* To what extent was the geographic project coverage cost-effective?
* To what extent were the results of monitoring missions, periodic Project boards reviews used to reconsider design/direction of the project?
* How has the UNDP been effectively working together with the key partners, and other development partners in the Implementation of the project?

1. *Sustainability of the ECOWAS/EU SALW Project:*

* Did the project incorporate adequate exit strategies and capacity development measures to ensure sustainability of the output results over time?
* Are conditions and mechanisms in place so that the benefits of the project interventions are sustained and owned by commissions, institutions and stakeholders at the national and sub-national levels after the interventions are completed?
* What could have been done within the timeframe of the project so far to improve the likelihood of positive long-term effects and reduce the likelihood of negative long-term effects?
* Which areas of the project did not receive attention (either in Scope or output) which should be considered in future phases of the project?

***Component 2: The analysis of the extent to which the issue of SALW has been brought to the fore through this project within the respective NATCOMS in the six (6) countries***

The mid-term evaluation will analyze a core set of criteria related to the focus of the National institutions on the issue of SALW as follows.

1. Strategic Alignment:

* To what extent is the ECOWAS/EU SALW project aligned with the provisions of the ECOWAS Convention in the pilot countries?
* How effectively has the NATCOM’s been working together with other key security sector and non-state actors in the respective countries?

1. Responsiveness:

* To what extent did the project anticipate and respond to significant changes in the national response to implementing the provisions of the ECOWAS convention? What were the missed opportunities in the project implementation if any?

c. Added Value:

* To what extent did the ECOWAS/EU project add value to national efforts in increasing the awareness of the issue of SALW in the country?
* To what extent did the project increase the possibility of social cohesion at the community level in the pilot countries?

***Component 3 The extent to which the management arrangements and implementation modalities have impacted on the project objectives.***

The mid-term evaluation will analyze a core set of criteria related to the extent of the management/ implementation arrangements of the project.

1. Strategic Alignment:

* To what extent did the management arrangements set up for the implementation of the project realistic achievable?
* To what extent did the project make use of the management arrangement stipulated in the contribution agreement between UNDP and EU?
* To what extent was the implementation aligned to the UNDP internal control frameworks?

1. Synergistic opportunities

* To what extent did the management of the project draw on the synergy available within the scope of the project to achieve results in the output areas?
* To what extent did the management of the project leverage on existing processes to maximize cost efficiency

1. Ownership and partnerships

* To what extent did the project manage the interests of the different partners in line with the agreed arrangements?
* To what extent did the communication of development results attribute achievements to the partners in the project?
* To what extent were the different stakeholders provided the opportunity to be involved with implementation?

1. **Evaluation Methodology and Approach**

The Evaluation shall benefit from existing or newly commissioned studies, research or evaluations conducted by individual or collaborating Agencies including the UN Agencies.

Based on the documented innovations, lessons learnt and findings from the research, studies and evaluations, the Consultants will work with the UNDP and partners to conduct in-depth analysis of progress towards results, identify lessons learnt and propose corrective actions. The consultants will work with six Pilot countries to draw on lessons to feed into the draft mid- term evaluation report.

*Data Collection*

In terms of data collection, the mid- evaluation will use a multiple method approach that will include document reviews, group and individual interviews and field visits as appropriate.

Final methods to be selected must match the above stated objectives and specific questions. It is expected that the technical proposal will:

a) Identify methodology and sample (address sampling limitations)

b) Level of stakeholders’ participation amongst other issues

*Information Sources*

The following minimum documents will be used for obtaining detailed background information on the ECOWAS/EU SALW project: The project contribution agreement document; The results matrix; The project document; approved Annual Work Plans by PSC; Relevant SALW Reports.

*Validation*

The Evaluation Team will use a variety of methods to ensure that the data is valid, including triangulation.

*Stakeholders’ Involvement*

An inclusive approach, involving a broad range of partners and stakeholders, will be taken. The mid- evaluation will have a process of stakeholders mapping to identify both project direct partners as well as stakeholders who do not work directly with the UNDP, yet play a key role in a relevant outcome of the project. These stakeholders may include representatives from the security apparatus and institutions, Governments at all levels, civil-society organizations, other multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, and most importantly, the beneficiaries of the project. The Inception report will describe consultants’ understanding of the assignment, with detailed methodology as well as chronogram and the different report to be submitted.

1. **The Evaluation Process**

The process of the evaluation will be divided into four phases, each including several steps.

**Phase 1: Preparation and Desk Phase:** i**.** Desk review ii. Stakeholder mapping; iii. Development of an operational/logistical plan. The Output of this phase is the Inception Report.

**Phase 2: Data Collection Phase:** At the end of this phase, the evaluation team will provide a debriefing of the preliminary findings to the National Technical/project implementation team, take initial comments and validate the preliminary findings.

**Phase 3: Drafting the Evaluation Report:**i.*A draft mid-term evaluation report* will be prepared by the evaluation team after the data collection exercise. The draft report will be submitted by the Lead Consultant to the mid-term evaluation Committee. ii. *Review and Quality Assurance –* The Lead consultant will be directly responsible for addressing any comments or observations towards eventual finalization of the report iii. *Presentation of findings, Validation and submission of report- The Evaluation team* shall present the final draft for validation to stakeholders in designated meetings while the *final report* shall be submitted to the PSC via the UNDP project coordination office (Word and PDF version).

1. **Deliverables**

* Inception report describing consultants’ understanding of the assignment and his/her plan to execute it (4 to 6-page document) one week after the start of the assignment.
* Progress report/briefing to the mid-term evaluation Committee Project Coordination office/ECOWAS/EU (the briefing periods to be determined in the Inception Report)
* Comprehensive Final mid-term evaluation Report (*25 pages content including not more that 4-page Executive Summary)*
* *A Power Point presentation* containing the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation for dissemination and debriefing purposes.
* *Final mid-term evaluation report will be translated into both English and French (Cost of translation to be borne separately by the project).*

1. **Management and Process**

The consultants will be expected to work independently on the evaluation although organizational support will be available from the coordination office in Abuja, MRU Cluster coordination as well as from project coordinators in all the pilot countries. Under the overall supervision of the PSC the mid-term evaluation consultant will be primarily responsible for managing the evaluation process with the day-to-day technical management support by the Project Coordination Office (PCO). The PCO will facilitate (where necessary) access of the consultants to key informants, including heads and staff of the respective security agencies, development partners, government and other partners; prepare the necessary documentations for the consultants. A detailed work plan will be prepared by the consultants and submitted to the PCO for approval to guide the monitoring of the assignment. The 2 selected consultants will be jointly accountable for the deliverables within deadlines agreed upon with PCO in Nigeria. The team will ensure sufficient division of labor and coordination among themselves

1. **Time Frame and Remuneration**

The consultancy is expected to last six weeks from the first week in March 2018. Remuneration will be in accordance with the UN Rules and Regulations and will be commensurate with the complexity of the assignment. The UN will in addition to the agreed fee meet the costs for official travel of the consultants and pay the appropriate Daily Subsistence Allowance which should be included in the financial proposal. The Consultancy fee will be paid in line with the following schedule and upon acceptance of key deliverables:

* At the end of the Desk Phase: *20%*
* At the submission of the Final Draft Reports: *50%*
* At the end of the mid-term evaluation exercise: *30%*

1. **Composition of the Evaluation Team**

There will be a team of two (2) consultants with the responsibility of undertaking the assignment in 4 of the pilot countries, the two consultants will cover Cote D’Ivoire and Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone respectively., The team of consultants will be responsible for producing the mid-term evaluation report document to be validated by the project technical team in Abuja before finalization. Each of the consultants should possess relevant qualifications and experience in at least one of project countries. As much as possible, the composition of the team will be gender sensitive. The selected consultants are expected to be independent and should not have been involved in the implementation of project of its NATCOMS in any of the pilot countries.

1. **Tasks of the Consultants**

* Thoroughly review and familiarize self with the project documents including the contribution agreement, Standard Operating Procedures, ECOWAS Convention, the project Results Matrix, ECOWAS conflict prevention Frameworks;
* In close consultation with the PCO, manage the day-to-day coordination of the detailed tasks of the mid-term evaluation including communication with the focal points in the respective National Agencies, sending, receiving and proper archiving of documents; organizing and facilitating consultative/coordination meetings etc.;
* Convene coordination meetings with and provide technical guidance to the other consultants and ensure their full understanding and application of the Evaluation principles and guidelines to both the processes and outputs.
* Review and analyze inputs from all agencies and stakeholders, ensure that the reports answer the Evaluation Questions (see above) and collate into the draft mid-term evaluation Report;
* Draft the text of the report including the executive summary; and synthesis of the Situation Analysis update, the constraints, the lessons learnt, summary of proposed changes and recommendations for the ECOWAS/EU SALW Project;
* Plan, organize, facilitate and summarize outputs from a participatory comprehensive SWOT analysis of the implementation arrangements and operationalization process;
* Present the draft mid- term evaluation Report to the PCO and incorporate any comments or changes and produce the final draft of the report;
* In collaboration with the PCO in Abuja, lead the planning for, and organization of, the mid- term Evaluation meeting including preparation of the report document, the accompanying presentations and the meeting logistics;
* Attend Evaluation meetings and incorporate any comments or changes and produce the final Evaluation report;
* Ensure final report is translated into both English and French.

1. **Competencies of Consultants**

**11.1. Consultants**

The Consultant Reduction of Risk of Crisis, Conflict and Insecurity should have the following qualifications and competencies:

* Advanced University degree in one or more of the following areas: Political Science, Economics, Social Sciences, Law or related fields;
* At least 10 years’ experience in programming in conflict prevention and management, internal security, management and responses to SALW related issues, design and implementation of community based responses;
* Expert knowledge of and working familiarity with results-based management, human rights based and gender mainstreaming approaches;
* Demonstrated experience in quantitative and qualitative evaluation methodology;
* Understanding of the UN’s mandate and *modus operandi* preferred;
* Excellent communication and writing skills in French, Knowledge of English is an advantage;
* Ability to work in a team and deliver results.

**Ethical Code of Conduct for UNEG Evaluations**

*For details on the ethics and independence in evaluation, please see UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Norms for Evaluation in the UN System*

*http://www.unevaluation.org/search/index.jsp?q=UNEG+Ethical+Guidelines*

*http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc\_id=21*