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**Terms of Reference for the UNDAF Evaluation (2015-2018) in Sierra Leone**

**National Consultant**

**Assignment: UNDAF Evaluation (2015-2018) in Sierra Leone**

**Expert: Evaluator**

**Category: Senior National Consultant**

**Start Date: September 2019**

**Amount of Working Days: 20 Working Days**

**Location: Freetown, with field missions**

1. **Background**

The 2030 Agenda calls for a strong United Nations development system that addresses the challenge of doing business differently and delivers joined-up support to advance sustainable development. Consequently, Sierra Leone adopted the Delivering As One (DAO) approach in 2009 and is currently implementing the five UN pillars: One Leader; One Programme, Common Budgetary Framework (One Fund); Communicating as One; and Operating as One.

In Sierra Leone the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) is comprised of the following resident agencies: UNFPA, FAO, IOM, UNAIDS, UNCDF, UNDP, UNICEF, UNIDO, UNODC, UNOPS, UNWOMEN, WFP, WHO, OHCHR; financial institutions: African Development Bank, IMF, World Bank; and non-resident agencies: ILO, UNESCO, UNHCR.

The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) (2015-2018) in Sierra Leone was prepared to support the implementation of the Government’s Agenda for Prosperity (2013-2018) as well as other internationally agreed goals and treaties. Two key factors interrupted the consistency of the implementation of the UNDAF, the Ebola outbreak and the extension of presidential term due to a delay on the electoral cycle, resulting in the extension of the UNDAF for one more year (until end of 2019)

In line with global UN procedures there were four sequential stages that led to the completion of the UNDAF, which were as follows:

1. Road Map April (May 2013)
2. Country Analysis (June – July 2013)
3. Strategic Prioritization (August – November 2013)
4. Finalization (December 2013 – February 2014)

The UNDAF Road Map was jointly written by the UNCT and the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development. The Road Map was also endorsed by the Development Partners Group and the UN’s Regional Directors’ Team.

The Country Analysis concluded that there were multiple root and underlying causes that accounted for under-achievement in many developmental targets. According to the Country Analysis the root causes in Sierra Leone were: a tendency for short term focus; unequal distribution of national wealth, notably revenue generated from resource exploitation that does not adequately flow back to local communities; frequently weak accountability and oversight; insufficient child protection, and inequalities in gender that were rooted in the social norms and harmful traditional practices.

‘Underlying Causes’ identified in the Country Analysis included; lack of capacity and insufficient access to information and services provided by the health sector; food insecurity and malnutrition; high levels of youth unemployment, and unsustainable management of natural resources.

When the ‘Root Causes’ and the ‘Underlying Causes’ were combined and converted into programmatic sectors, where the UN had expertise, then Food Security, Land Reform, Sustainable Environmental Management, Education, Health, particularly sexual and reproductive health, child protection, Employment, Youth Employment, Nutrition, Public Sector Reform, Governance, Gender and Women’s Empowerment emerged as the UN’s contribution to the Agenda for Prosperity. These UN priority areas were subsequently mapped onto the architecture of the Government’s Agenda for Prosperity to form the backbone of the UNDAF.

The following table indicates the areas of UNDAF intervention in accordance to the Government pillars:

|  |
| --- |
| **Pillars** |
| Pillar 1: Economic Diversification to Promote Inclusive Growth |
| Pillar 2: Managing Natural Resources |
| Pillar 3: Accelerating Human Development |
| Pillar 5: Labour & Employment |
| Pillar 6: Strengthen Social Protection Systems |
| Pillar 7: Governance and Public-Sector Reform |
| Pillar 8: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment |

To enable effective monitoring and evaluation, outcome statements were added and aligned directly with the pillars of the Agenda for Prosperity to form a results table. The results table is to be found in the UNDAF Action Plan.

Pillar 4, referent to International competitiveness was not part of the UNDAF as the UN in Sierra Leone deemed that other stakeholders were in better position to support the Government.

The UN Development Group (UNDG) requires all UN country offices to undertake an evaluation of their Programme of Cooperation (UNDAF) in the penultimate year of the programming cycle. To this end, the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) in collaboration with UN Development Operations Coordination Office (DOCO) has issued guidance on the required Management Structure and Terms of Reference to ensure quality standards are maintained[[1]](#footnote-1). The planned UNDAF evaluation must observe the parameters of the UNEG/DOCO guidance.

1. **Purpose, Objectives and Scope**
	1. **Purpose**

The UNDAF Evaluation is a joint UN review of the progress made on the results of the UNDAF during the Programme Cycle initiated in 2015 through 2018. The **purpose** of the evaluation is twofold;

TO:

1. Support greater accountability of the UN to stakeholders – by objectively verifying results achieved within the framework of the UNDAF and assessing the effectiveness of the strategies and interventions used, the evaluation will enable the various stakeholders in the UNDAF process, including national counterparts and donors, to hold the UNCT and other parties accountable for fulfilling their roles and commitments.
2. Support learning –the evaluation must provide clear recommendations for strengthening programming and results at the country level, specifically informing the planning and decision-making for the next UNDAF programme cycle and for improving United Nations coordination at the country level. The UN, the Government of Sierra Leone and UNDAF stakeholders should be able to learn from the process of documenting good practices and lessons learned which can then be shared with UNDOCO and used for the benefit of other countries.

**2.2 Objectives**

The **objectives** of the UNDAF evaluation are to:

1. Assess the contribution made by the UNCT in the framework of the UNDAF to national development results through making judgements using evaluation criteria based on evidence (accountability).
2. Identify the factors that have affected the UNCT's contribution, answering the question of why the performance is as it is and explaining the enabling factors and bottlenecks (learning).
3. Draw conclusions from the analysis concerning the UN’s contribution across the scope being examined.
4. Provide actionable recommendations for improving the UNCT's contribution, especially for incorporation into the new UNDAF. These recommendations should be logically linked to the conclusions and draw upon lessons learned identified through the evaluation.
	1. **Scope**

The evaluation will cover the period of January 2015 until December 2018. The evaluation includes examining UNDAF programming principles (human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management, capacity development), overall strategies and outcome/output specific strategies included in the UNDAF itself. Priority will be given to evaluating the impact of strategic partnerships with the Government of Sierra Leone and other relevant stakeholders. The UNDAF will be evaluated against the strategic intent laid out in the UNDAF document and specifically its contribution to the national development results included in the UNDAF results framework, taking into account the two interruptions mentioned in the background.

1. **Methodology**

**Overall approach**: The UNDAF evaluation is a programmatic evaluation which will assess the performance against a given programme framework that specifies its strategic intent and objectives. As such it is a country-level evaluation carried out jointly with the UNCT and the overall approach is participatory and orientated towards learning how to jointly enhance development results at the national level. The evaluators will examine the stated UNDAF outcomes; identify the change over the period being evaluated on the basis of available baseline information; and observe the national strategy and actions in support of that change. Second, they will examine the implementation of UNDAF strategy and actions in support of national efforts.

The standard set of evaluation criteria across all UNDAF evaluations is to be used, namely:

**i) Relevance** - The extent to which the objectives of UNDAF are consistent with country needs, national priorities, the country’s international and regional commitments, including on human rights and the recommendations of Human Rights mechanisms, sustainable development, environment, and the needs of women and men of all ages, young people, boys and girls and most vulnerable groups in the country. To what extent was the UNDAF informed by substantive human rights and gender analyses that identified underlying causes and barriers to Human Rights and Gender Equality?

**ii) Effectiveness -** The extent to which the UN contributed to, or is likely to contribute to, the outcomes defined in the UNDAF and to the degree to which were the results were equitably distributed among the targeted groups. To what extent was a human rights-based approach and a gender mainstreaming strategy incorporated in the design and implementation of the UNDAF? Did the intervention contribute to empowerment of rights holders, especially women and young people, to claim and duty bearers to fulfil Human Rights and Gender Equality standards? The evaluation should also note how the unintended results, if any, have affected national development positively or negatively and to what extent have they been foreseen and managed.

**iii) Efficiency -** The extent to which outcomes were achieved with the appropriate amount of resources and maintenance of minimum transaction cost (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.). The extent to which resource allocation took into account or prioritised most marginalised groups including women and girls. To what extent were adequate resources provided for integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in the UNDAF?

**iv) Sustainability -** The extent to which the benefits from a development intervention have continued, or are likely to continue, after it has been completed. In particular, if the transition from developing individual capacity in the short-term to creating institutional capacity in the long-term has been made. The range of requirements should be considered, including creation of technical expertise, financial independence and mechanisms through which rights-holders may participate in and assert the fulfilment of their rights. To what extent did the UNDAF contribute to developing an enabling environment (including capacities of rights holders and duty bearers) and institutional changes to advance Human Rights and Gender Equality issues?

**v) Impact –** Assess the changes in the well-being of individuals, households and communities attributed to the UNDAF. Identify the changes that have occurred and provide accountability of the UN system. It will also provide feedback to help improve the design of the next UNDAF.

During assessment, using the above criteria, the evaluator(s) should identify the various factors that can explain performance. Where these factors have been identified as UNDAF outcomes in their own right, they should be considered as both results and enabling factors. The evaluator(s) must include reference to:

**UN Coordination and Value Addition of Delivering as One** – Assess the extent to which UN Coordination and DaO created or encouraged synergies among agencies, optimal results and avoidance of duplication. The extent to which harmonisation measures at the operational level contribute to improved efficiency and results. Factors that facilitated or adversely impacted upon implementation and commitment to the DaO approach.

**UN Programming Principles** – Assess to what extent were the UNDAF programming principles (human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management, capacity development) considered and mainstreamed in the chain of results. Assess if there were any shortcomings due to a failure to take account of programming principles during implementation. If there were adequate resources (both agency specific and One UN Fund) allocated to enable the application and implementation of UNDAF programming principles and related results.

Assess how well the **UN carried out partnerships** (with civil society / private sector / local government / parliament / national human rights institutions / gender equality advocates / international development partners) to improve performance. Assess to what extent was the “active, free, and meaningful” participation of all stakeholders (in particular vulnerable groups including women and girls) ensured in the UNDAF process.

Assess whether or not the **UN undertook appropriate risk analysis** and took appropriate actions to ensure that results to which it contributed are not lost.

**Responsiveness –** Assess how adequately the UN, during planning and implementation of the UNDAF, responded to changes in national priorities and to additional requests from national counterparts, as well as to shifts caused by major external factors and evolving country context (e.g. natural disaster, elections).

* 1. **Data collection and analysis**

The UNDAF evaluation should draw on a variety of data collection methods, including but not limited to: document review; semi-structured key stakeholder interviews; survey and assessment reports; focus groups; outcome mapping; and, observational visits.

Data should be systematically disaggregated by sex, age, geographical region, and to the extent possible, other contextually-relevant markers of equity.

The inception report shall include a description with the methodology and tools for the evaluation and an evaluation matrix linking the data collection methods to the evaluation criteria and questions. Analysis should combine qualitative and quantitative tools, triangulating information sources and findings where possible for validation purposes.

**Evaluation Process Map**

* Desk Review Report
1. **Deliverables**

The consultants will be expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Phases** | **Task**  | **Deliverables** |  **Time frame**  | **WD Senior Int. Evaluator/ TL** | **WD Local Evaluator** | **Location** | **Payment division**  |
| **Inception Phase** | Designing the steps for the evaluation to ensure a good grasp of the expectations and a clear plan for conducting it. | * **Inception Report**

Include a stakeholder map, evaluation questions and matrix, the overall design and methodology of the evaluation* **Power point presentation**

PPT to highlight the main components of the final inception report and present via conference to the EMG/UNCT | Week 1 | 4 | 0 | Home-based |  |
| **Desk Phase** | Conduct Desk Review of available documents; Participate in virtual meetings with the EMG/UNCT | * **Desk Review report**

Including a detailed field visit plan | Week 2-3 | 10 | 0 | Home-based |  |
| **Field Phase** | Undertake planned visits and interactions with relevant stakeholders, including UNCT, reporting, presenting and validating the findings  | * **Field visit report**

**C**ontaining data and findings from the field mission and stakeholder’s interaction* **Data validation exercise**
 | Week 4-7 | 15 | 15 | Freetown, Sierra Leone and field missions |  |
| **Reporting Phase** | Data Compilation and Analysis. The evaluation team will analyze the data collected during the desk review and the field work, conduct additional consultations with stakeholders, draft the evaluation report | * **Draft Evaluation Report**

(annex I indicates the report outline) | Week 8-10 | 9 | 4 | Home-based | 50% |
| * **Revised draft report**
 | Week 11 | 3 | 1 | Home-based |  |
| Validation of report by the Evaluation Steering Committee | * **Validated final report**
 |  | 1 | 0 | Home-based | 50% |
|  |  | Total WDs per consultant | 42 | 20 |  |  |

1. **Consultant Qualification and Role[[2]](#footnote-2)**

**5.1. National Evaluator Qualification and Role**

* University Degree in the Social Sciences (sociology, anthropology, and development studies), economic development, research methods, political science, international development, governance and public policy, or related fields relevant for the assignment.
* Minimum 5 years of experience in undertaking evaluations in developing countries.
* Demonstrates a solid understanding on the use of evaluation methodologies and proven experience in leading and managing outcome, thematic and/or impact evaluations.
* Experience with UN evaluations is an asset
* Substantive knowledge of development issues, especially related to Economic Diversification, Natural Resources Management, Human development, Labour and Employment, Social protection, Governance and Public Sector Reform, Gender equality.
* Demonstrated ability to work in multicultural environment.
* Demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking, problem solving and policy advice.
* Strong inter-personal, teamwork and organizational skills.
* Excellent presentation and writing skills, and familiarity with information technology, including proficiency in word processing, spreadsheets, and presentation software.
* Fluency in written and spoken English and Krio are essential.

The Team leader is responsible to draft and lead the evaluation process providing clear guidance to the national evaluator. S/he is responsible to provide the deliverables in a timely manner and with high level quality, respecting the reporting procedure in place. The Team leader will oversee the work of the National evaluator.

The National Evaluator will be responsible to support the team leader in conducting focus groups, meetings, interviews, collect data, analyze data and support the team leader in drafting findings. Extensive filed mission is foreseen under this assignment. S/he might be requested to translate documents and meetings to English. The national evaluator shall comply with the deadlines stipulated by the team leader.

1. **Evaluation Management Structure**

The evaluation will be managed by the UN Resident Coordinator in Sierra Leone – UNCT. The UNCT has established the Evaluation Management Group (EMG) to provide logistics and technical support.

**The United Nations Country Team (UNCT)** will commission and oversee the work of the Evaluation Management Group (EMG) to: ensure decisions are made on time, endorse the recruitment panel to choose the consultant(s), pre-approve the final report, ensure the corporation of all agencies, and clarify questions raised during the evaluation, and provide a management response to the evaluation.

**The National consultant will report** to the international consultant and will be responsible for the following:

* Develop data collection instruments including questionnaires, pretesting and planning visits;
* Compilation of data and analyzing data;
* Participate in field visits to the project sites identified and collect information;
* Recommend the most appropriate ways to adopt a culturally sensitive and ethical approach to the task;
* Co-responsible for the quality of the report;
* Provide substantive inputs to the draft and final reports;
* Works with RCO to organize data collection schedule of the evaluation team;
* Facilitates access to information from key informants and institutions;
* Liaises with national partners and follows - up in country on requests from consultant team during design and report drafting phases;
* Assists lead consultant in the planning and facilitation of debriefing and presentation meetings as well as the UNCT capacity assessment workshop.

**The Team Leader** will report to the Chair/Co-chair of the Evaluation Management Group. The lead consultant will provide all necessary information, updates and reports to the EMG chair that will coordinate dissemination of information between UN agencies and the RC**.** S/he will provide information on additional issues that can affect the evaluation process and consult the EMG Chair about all circumstances that can eventually impact on the original and agreed final evaluation plan. The lead consultant will also be responsible for the following tasks and outputs:

* Lead the implementation process in a timely manner;
* Supervise and work closely with the other members of the team (if any);
* Review documents;
* Clarify research methods;
* Produce the meta-analysis and the overall assessment of the relevance criteria;
* Conduct field visits to the project sites identified and collect data,
* Assume main research responsibility with support of the team members (if any);
* Present key findings and facilitate candid discussion on the preliminary findings with stakeholders and on the final reports and recommendations to the full UN Country Team;
* Facilitate a validation workshop;
* Produce and submit all deliverables in a timely manner and with high quality; and
* Responsible for the first quality assurance of the deliverables.

To ensure the independence and neutrality of the evaluation the Team leader may report directly to the UN Resident Coordinator in Sierra Leone.

The **Evaluation Management Group EMG** is composed by members of the UNCT, RCO and a technical team. The EMG will manage the evaluation process through all phases; ensure quality assurance mechanisms are operational consolidates and share comments on inception and evaluation reports with the evaluation team; ensures that the team has access to all documentation and information necessary to the evaluation; and the dissemination of the final evaluation report.

**The Resident Coordinator’s Office (RCO)** will support the EMG in the day-to-day management of the task, ensure close communication with the consultant(s) during the process, and facilitate communication between the consultant(s) and the EMG/UNCT/ESC.

The **Evaluation Steering Committee (ESC)**, is composed by members of the UNCT and Government counterparts, it will be responsible to oversee and approve the main deliverables of the evaluation.

1. **Security Considerations**

Security clearance where required is to be obtained from SL UNDSS. Consultants hired independently are covered by the UN Department of Safety & Security (UNDSS) system for UN personnel which cover UN staff and consultants contracted directly by UNCT. Independent consultants must obtain UNDSS security clearance for travelling to be obtained from designated duty station. The team members are registered with the UNDSS on arrival and undergo a security briefing. The team members observe applicable UN security rules and regulations.

1. **Logistics**

The EMG will provide relevant documentation for the Evaluation team. The Evaluation team will be provided with a working office during the assignment, for the evaluation purposes only. The consultants are expected to use their personal IT equipment. Support to book meetings with stakeholders will be provided by the pillar leads. Transportation will be provided and managed by the EMG.

**Annex I**

**Final Report Structure**

The Final UNDAF Evaluation report should include the following chapters:

Chapter 1: Introduction (objectives, scope and methodology, limitations)

Chapter 2: National development context

Chapter 3: Evaluation Findings (corresponding to the UNDAF outcomes with each analysed by evaluation criteria)

Chapter 4: Conclusions and Recommendations

The final report will include an Index, a List of Abbreviations and Acronyms and an Executive Summary and must be kept short (maximum 15-20 pages report excluding annexes). More detailed information on the context, the programme or the comprehensive aspects of the methodology and of the analysis will be placed in the annexes.

A detailed outline of the evaluation report should be included in the inception report.

The report will be prepared in accordance with UNEG guidance (Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports).

1. http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1211 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The evaluators will not have been involved in the design or implementation of the subject of evaluation or have any other conflicts of interest. Further, they will act impartially and respect the [code of conduct of the evaluation profession.](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)