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1. BACKGROUND

After the cessation of hostilities in 2002, the Government of Sierra Leone and Development Partners held a Consultative Group meeting in Paris where it was agreed that the aid landscape in Sierra Leone needs to be rationalised in order to ensure that that large influx of international partners is properly coordinated to ensure that duplication and wastage of resources is minimised and that some sectors and regions are not oversubscribed at the expense of others. This started the process of putting together an efficient and effective mechanism for aid coordination and a framework for improved aid coordination and management.

Consequently, in 2003 the Government with support from Development Partners established the Development Assistance Coordination Office (DACO) as the central hub for the new aid coordination mechanism under the authority of the Vice President. In 2006, UNDP, DFID and the European Commission (EC) jointly agreed to provide financial and technical support to the DACO under the UNDP project ‘Support to the Development Assistance Coordination Office’, with the aim of achieving the following objectives:

- Coordinate the activities of the Inter-Ministerial Committee (IMC) and the National Technical Committee (NTC) for steering the implementation of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP).
- Set up and coordinate a system for monitoring and evaluation of programmes identified in the PRSP.
- Support capacity building for the implementation of the PRSP.
- Coordinate and analyse development assistance into Sierra Leone and facilitate Government/Donor dialogue through the Development Partnership Committee (DEPAC), the CG and other appropriate structures or mechanisms.
- Develop a communication strategy to facilitate greater dissemination of development assistance as well as the activities of the PRSP to the public.

Since its establishment, the DACO has made significant contributions to the development of the first, second and third generation Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP I, II and III1), and to the coordination of donor assistance, through introducing Development Assistance Database (DAD), producing annual donor assistance report, convening the regular donor coordination meetings. The DACO was also instrumental in the implementation of the Paris Declaration in Sierra Leone, and successfully completed the Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey, which was presented at the Accra High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in September 2008.

In addition, UNDP in collaboration with DFID and EC commissioned a first round evaluation of DACO in 2009 with the primary objective of undertaking a final evaluation of the multi donor funded project “Support for the Development Assistance Coordination Office (DACO), which commenced in January 2006 and ended in December 2008. The

1 This is also the Agenda for Prosperity (2013-2018).
second objective of the assignment was to examine current arrangements for aid coordination and management in Sierra Leone and to make proposals for their improvement. The key finding is that the project was overambitious, not well designed and not well managed. The evaluation also provided some lessons, notably (i) effective co-funding agreements require harmonization of project implementation procedures including financial reporting, among the agencies involved and (ii) a focus on short-term results tend to impede achievement of sustainable development results in the long term.

It is now three years since the previous evaluation and is therefore opportune to conduct a second round project evaluation in order to evaluate the achievements, document the challenges in the evolving aid management environment, codify lessons learnt and make specific recommendations for the future aid architecture.

2. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this evaluation are:

- To evaluate and assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project with regards to achievement of its planned objectives and outputs as set in the project document and annual work plans since 2010 when the “Support to Aid Policy Implementation” commenced. This will also include the evaluation of expenditure against the planned and actual budget.
- To assess the relevance and adequacy of the project in light of the changes that have taken place and the identified and emerging challenges
- To codify challenges in project implementation and make recommendations to address them, given the lessons learned
- To review the emerging and evolving aid management environment, and make recommendations on the best modalities to enhance the effectiveness of the aid management in Sierra Leone
- Assess whether lessons an recommendations of the evaluation in 2009 were taken on board in informing DACO operations. If not what are the challenges?
- Recommend the programme framework for the future support to the rationalised aid coordination body

3 SCOPe AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation will cover a number of key areas in line with the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria. Below are indicative questions for each criterion:

**Relevance of the Institution/Project: the extent to which the project support to DACO and the DACO activities are suited to the priorities and policies of the country**

- Did the project design properly address the issues eminent in 2010?
- Did the project objective remain relevant throughout the project implementation phase?
- Is the project still relevant to current situation?

**Effectiveness: the extent to which project activities attain its objectives**
• How many and which of the projects outputs were delivered as planned?
• To what extent has the project contributed towards overall aid effectiveness of Sierra Leone?
• Where the funds utilized as planned?

**Efficiency:** measurement of the outputs in relation to the inputs.
• Was the project management structure appropriate to the objective and activities of the project?
• Were the resource mobilisation processes smooth and in synch with the project requirement?
• Could a different type of intervention lead to similar results at a lower cost?

**Impact:** the positive and negative changes produced by the DACO project and activities, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended
• To what extent has the project contributed towards the poverty reduction, national capacity development, and sustained inflow of the donor resources?
• What positive and negative effects are resulting from anticipated outputs?
• What are the unintended effects on the project, if any?

**Sustainability:** the benefits of the DACO related activities that are likely to continue after the project fund has been exhausted
• Will the outputs delivered through the projects be sustained by national capacities, after the end of the project duration?
• Have the follow up support after the project duration been discussed and formalised?
• To what extent did the progress had catalytic effects on the national actors to engage in further aid effectiveness activities and donor support?

**Partnerships:** the extent to which the project brings together the relevant stakeholders to achieve the project objectives
• Which partners did the project bring together to promote the aid effectiveness agenda in the country?
• How effective was UNDP’s interaction with the donors and the government?

It is expected that the evaluation results will be used in future planning by the government of Sierra Leone and will also help donors effectively support Government interventions in aid effectiveness and harmonization.

4 METHODOLOGY

Generally, the exercise will be wide-ranging and participatory, entailing a combination of comprehensive desk reviews, field visits and interviews, and document analysis.

Based on the objectives and scope mentioned above, the consultants identified will further elaborate on the methodology and plan for this assignment, which will be approved by UNDP Senior Management.
It is intended that the methodology will take into account the following, namely:

- Project document and work plans for a description of the intended results, the baseline for the results and the indicators and benchmarks used. Obtain information from the UNDP country office gathered through monitoring and reporting on the outputs; this will help inform the evaluation with regards to achievements and potential impacts.
- Desk review of existing documents and materials such as support documents, previous evaluation in 2009, assessments, and a variety of temporal and focused reports. In particular it will review the annual reports, the 2009 evaluation, interviews with key informants and gather information on what the projects have achieved with regard to the output and strategies used.
- Interviews with beneficiaries, participating ministries, departments and agencies, donors and UNDP, as well as the gathering of information on achievements versus objectives.
- Visits to selected institutions and briefing and debriefing sessions with the Government and UNDP, as well as donors and partners.
- Validation of information on the status of the results culled from contextual sources such as work plans or monitoring reports. To do this, the consultants may use key informant interviews or focus group discussions during the evaluation that seek key respondents’ perceptions on a number of issues, including their perception of whether an outcome has been realised.

5 TEAM COMPOSITION AND COMPETENCIES

Team will comprise of 2 consultants as follows:

- International Consultant identified by the supporting donors (DFID)
- International or a national Consultant identified by UNDP

The Consultants should have a Post-graduate Degree specializing in economic development, management, political science or an equivalent field or discipline. The consultants should also have extensive experience in conducting high-level evaluations, preferably relating to reorganization of operational processes and restructuring. Finally, they should have a thorough knowledge of aid coordination, effectiveness and harmonisation issues, preferably in the post crisis countries.

6 KEY DELIVERABLES

6.1 Format of the Evaluation Report

At the end of the assignment, the consultants will deliver the evaluation report (in line with the UNDP evaluation report format and quality control checklist for its content) containing:

- Executive Summary
6.2 Deliverables and Milestones
The key deliverables/milestones are:

(i) Evaluation Inception Report
(ii) Presentation of the preliminary findings (Exit Meeting)
(iii) Draft Evaluation Report prepared using the UNDP evaluation report format; and
(iv) Final Evaluation Report prepared using the UNDP evaluation report format

7 DURATION
The total duration of the Final Evaluation will be 3 weeks in December, 2013.

8 TENTATIVE ACTIVITIES AND TIMEFRAME:
The tentative activities of the evaluation will involve:

- Week 1: Desk review for the evaluations and relevant documents; Meetings with key government actors and donors.
- Week 2: Write up of draft report and a briefing session with Government and donors to discuss findings.
- Week 3: Finalisation and submission of the report (following the stated evaluation period).

9 REFERENCE GROUP
The reference group that will serve as unit for quality assurance and oversight for this evaluation will constitute key development partners drawn from UNDP, DFID, and the Government preferably from the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development

10 MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS
DACO will provide an office space for the consultants for the entire period of the evaluation. The Evaluation team will report to UNDP Senior management at the end of each week. At the end of the evaluation period, the team will provide a briefing session to the representatives of the DACO, the MoFED, UNDP and DFID.

11 LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED (NOT EXHAUSTIVE) OR REFERENCED

For the desk review, the following documents will need to be reviewed:

- DACO Project document and annual work plans.
- Signed agreements between UNDP and the donors.
- DACO annual reports.
- Annual progress report on PRSP Implementation.
- Minutes of Pillar working group meetings.
- UNDP annual reports to the donors.
- 2009 Evaluation Report of DACO
- UNDP Handbook for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results (for UNDP Consultant)
- UNDP Outcome Level Evaluation Guide (for UNDP consultant)