



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

SDG-Fund Project on Enabling Sustainable Livelihoods through Improved Natural Resource Governance and Economic Diversification in Kono District

Final Evaluation

By

Alexandre Diouf, International consultant, alexdiouf@hotmail.com
Pious Abubakar Sesay, National consultant, piousabsesay@yahoo.co.uk
Independent Evaluation consultants

May 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS	II
PROJECT STATUS INFORMATION	III
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1. INTRODUCTION	8
2. THE PROGRAMME	8
2.1 TECHNICAL AND VOCATIONAL SKILLS TRAINING FOR YOUTHS PROGRAMME.....	8
2.2 BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP SKILLS TRAINING AND BUSINESS START-UP AND SUPPORT SERVICES.....	9
2.3 INCREASING PRODUCTION AND PRODUCTIVITY OF CROPS, LIVESTOCK, AND FISHERIES AND SUPPORT TO MARKET ACCESS AND SANITARY MEASURES FOR BETTER TRADE.....	10
2.4 NRM AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY.....	10
2.5 STRENGTHENING DIALOGUE AND ENGAGEMENT BETWEEN DEVELOPMENT STAKEHOLDERS AND THE EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES	10
3. THE EVALUATION	10
3.1 EVALUATION OBJECTIVES	10
3.2 METHODOLOGY.....	11
3.3 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS	12
3.4 EVALUATION PHASES.....	14
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS (EVALUATION CRITERIA)	16
4.1 RELEVANCE.....	16
4.2 EFFECTIVENESS	18
4.3 EFFICIENCY	27
4.4 IMPACT	29
4.5 SUSTAINABILITY	30
4.6 LESSONS LEARNT	32
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	33
5.1 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	33
ANNEXES	36
ANNEX 1. DATA COLLECTION TOOLS	36
ANNEX 2. LIST OF PEOPLE MET	38
ANNEX 3. TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	39

ACRONYMS

ABD	Area-Based Development
BDET	Business development and entrepreneurship training
BDS _c	Business plan development and start-up capital
CBO	Community-Based Organisation
CDA	Community development agreement
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency of Sierra Leone
FAO	Food and agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
IP	Implementing Partner
KYDC	Kono Youth District Council
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NMA	National Minerals Agency
NRM	Natural Resource Management
PPPs	Public-private partnerships
SDG-F	Sustainable Development Goals-Fund
SESA	Stakeholder engagements and sensitisation and awareness raising
TecVoc	Technical and vocational training programme
TNAA	Training needs assessment analysis
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDAP	United Nations Development Assistance Plan
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
YYFA	Yormatha Youth Farmers Association

PROJECT STATUS INFORMATION

Project title	“Enabling Sustainable Livelihoods Through Improved Natural Resource Governance and Economic Diversification in the Kono District, Sierra Leone”
Project ID	
Project Start Date/End Date	
Implementing Modality	National Implementation Modality (NIM)
Implementing Partner(s)	Environment Protection Agency Sierra Leone (EPA-SL); National Minerals Agency (NMA); National Youth Commission (NAYCOM); Koidu New Sembehun City Council; Kono District Council and NGOs; Government Technical and Vocational Center; Advocate for Social Justice and Development Sierra Leone (ASJD-SL); Hands Empowering the Less Privilege in Sierra Leone (HELP-SL); Advocacy Initiative for Development Sierra Leone (AID-SL)
Cluster name	Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Environment (IGSE)
Donors	SDG Fund; UNDP/TRAC

Project Objective	Inclusiveness, accountability, and transparency in natural resources management. Livelihoods improved through diversified and inclusive economic opportunities
UNDP RPD Outcome/ UNDP Strategic Plan RRF Outcome	2.1 Targeted MDAs are better able to revise, develop and implement gender responsive legal and participatory coordination frameworks to enable environmental sustainability across sectors, with particular focus on the extractive industry 2.2 Communities in targeted districts are engaged in design and implementation of gender responsive sustainable NRM and livelihood diversification

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Sustainable Development Goals Fund (SDG-F) is a development cooperation mechanism created in 2014 to support sustainable development activities through integrated and multidimensional joint projects. It builds on the experience, knowledge, lessons learnt, and best practices of the Millennium Development Goals Fund and experience. It focuses on the fostering of sustainable development, public-private partnerships, and gender and women's empowerment as crosscutting priorities in all its areas of work.

In Sierra Leone, the fund has supported the “Enabling Sustainable Livelihoods through Improved Natural Resource Governance and Economic Diversification in the Kono District, Sierra Leone” programme, which was implemented in the framework of a UN multi-agency Area-Based Development approach in Kono District, eastern Sierra Leone. The programme focuses on two broad, interlinked intervention areas that aim to enhance sustainable, inclusive governance of natural resources as well as diversification of sustainable livelihood opportunities in one of the most mineral-rich but least developed areas in the country. To promote accountability, organisational learning, stocktaking of achievements, performance, impacts, good practices, and lessons learnt from implementation towards SDGs, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) commissioned a final evaluation of the programme in April 2019.

The evaluation

The evaluation followed a three-phase stage:

Stage 1: Inception phase. The evaluation started with a kick-off meeting between the evaluators and the UNDP's designated evaluation manager. The main objectives of this meeting were to:

- Discuss and clarify the objectives and requirements stated in the terms of reference
- Allow the UNDP team to do a quick self-assessment of their performance
- Discuss the availability and quality of existing data
- Discuss the arrangements for the field mission

Following the kick-off meeting, the evaluators collected additional documentation available and continue their desk-based review of the literature. At the end of this phase, the evaluation team had a good understanding of the SDG-F activities and achievements to be evaluated. An inception report was submitted to the UNDP team at the end of this phase. The report included a brief presentation of the evaluation and a detailed methodology that would be used during the evaluation.

Stage 2: Field phase. After the evaluation team met with the evaluation manager to finalise the inception report and the schedule of the interviews, the in-country meetings started with a visit to the UNDP Resident Representative and the Freetown-based stakeholders. At the meetings were representatives of the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO), government counterparts, and some of the local organisations in Freetown. The national consultant, together with the UNDP-designated evaluation manager, afterwards made a field visit to discuss with the final beneficiaries and the representatives of the target communities. Data collected would be both quantitative (based on the document review and direct observations) and qualitative (based on the interviews and the direct observations from the evaluation team).

Stage 3: Analysis and synthesis phase. The evaluation team then carried out the overall analysis and synthesis of the collected information and drafted the final report. A first draft final report was submitted to the UNDP-designated evaluation manager according to the structure previously agreed in the inception report. The draft report was reviewed by UNDP and the project stakeholders before being finalised by the consultants.

Evaluation limitations and challenges

Some reluctance to the collection of information on efficiency and effectiveness was expected. The usefulness of such data might not have been obvious to some stakeholders. The plan to overcome these challenges included the following:

- *Involve stakeholders.* To deal with potential reluctance, the consultants took time to explain the value of the data being collected and how the data will positively serve to improve future programming for both UNDP and the stakeholders. The consultants stressed that the intent of the final evaluation was not to criticise but to adequately assess the programme performance, identify the lessons to be learnt, and constructively suggest recommendations for the future.
- *Minimise respondent burden.* Advance notice, keeping interviews short, and conducting interviews at times and places convenient to respondents were important, not only for obtaining reliable information, but also to encourage others within their network to cooperate
- *The other important limitations* were the limited time allocated to undertake the evaluation, the difficulty to find some project beneficiaries, the fact that some fish ponds and henhouses were no longer operational when the evaluator visited the field, and sometimes programme participants' poor memory recall. The team overcame these challenges by identifying multiple data points and providers and cross-checking the collected data with different sources.

Results

Given the incidence and depth of poverty in Sierra Leone, the challenge to reduce extreme poverty is enormous. Efforts to do so centre mainly on the need to accelerate economic growth at a rate that should exceed the population growth rate by several percentage points. As articulated in the PRSP II, current national development efforts focus on the creation of an enabling macro-economic environment that can enhance the generation of broad-based employment opportunities by the private and public sectors as well as investment in human capital and social services as the basis for socio-economic development. Priority has been placed on the key drivers of growth (eg, improving agricultural productivity and competitiveness, accelerating human development through improvement in education, health, water, and sanitation). Enhancing transparency and maintaining efforts to rein in corruption were also identified. Therefore, the objectives of the programme are still valid in the context of national policy objectives and SDGs.

The beneficiaries of the different programme components are calculated in the following matrix:

Indicators	Target	Achieved Target	Source of Verification
Output 1: Enhanced capacity for improved monitoring of environmental and social compliance and CDAs			
1.1 Enhanced capacity for improved environmental monitoring	1. At least 30 community members demonstrate increased ability to	1. 150 community members (80 women) gained knowledge in mined-out land reclamation and practically engaged in land	1. Reports and registers 2. GIS maps produced 3. Reports and registers 4. Reports and testimonies

Indicators	Target	Achieved Target	Source of Verification
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> rehabilitate mined-out land 2. <i>20 acres of mined</i> land rehabilitated 3. <i>50 artisanal miners</i> involved in alternative livelihood activities 4. <i>100 artisanal miners</i> aware of environmental impact of artisanal mining 5. <i>At least 2 monitoring/coordination</i> meetings conducted by local councils environmental committees on environmental management practices, including the NMA, EPA, and local stakeholders 6. <i>15 CSOs and 10 traditional groups</i> have knowledge in NRM policies and advocacy issues 7. <i>At least 4 advocacy</i> sessions held by CSOs on NRM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reclamation and development of plots 2. 20 acres of mined-out areas were reclaimed, developed, and under cultivation of various crops 3. 100 artisanal miners previously engaged in artisanal mining are now engaged in agriculture as an alternative livelihood 4. 150 miners are aware of environmental impact of artisanal mining 5. Two meetings were held in addition to several bilateral meetings and consultations 6. 150 youths and women (from more than 25 groups) are knowledgeable and can articulate issues on extractive policies, laws, and practices 7. 5 advocacy sessions on impact of artisanal mining on the environment, health, and safety of residents within the district 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Reports and registers 6. Reports, registers, and testimonies 7. Audio clips of phone discussions
1.2 Strengthened dialogue and engagement between development stakeholders and the extractive sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>15 NGOs trained</i> on improved ability for advocacy to promote constructive dialogue within the extractive sector 2. <i>4 dialogue forums</i> held between companies and district stakeholders 3. <i>At least 1 agreement reached</i> between stakeholders on NRM and local development partnership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 45 NGOs/CBOs were trained in improved advocacy skills 2. 4 dialogue forums were held 3. 1 partnership and cooperation agreement signed for the promotion of NRM and development agendas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reports and registers 2. Reports and registers 3. Signed communique and advocacy plan
1.3 Inclusive community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>50 key stakeholders</i> in Kono, including 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All 50 (10 women) stakeholders trained and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reports and registers

Indicators	Target	Achieved Target	Source of Verification
development processes facilitated	paramount chiefs, women, and youth representatives trained on budgeting, project design, and M&E related to CDAs 2. <i>Youth and women-focused programmes</i> are designed or implemented by the community development committee	supported in community consultations and program development 2. 2 schools and 1 market infrastructure are developed	2. Reports and procurement plans
Output 2: Local economy diversified through value chain development, increased entrepreneurship, economic productivity, and improved service delivery	1. <i>450 youths</i> given start-up kits after successful training 2. <i>At least 60 winners</i> of business idea competition have established enterprises using seed capital and training experience	1. 450 trained in entrepreneurship and developed business plans after mentorship on business start-ups 2. No business idea competition was held	Reports, beneficiaries

CDA = Community Development Agreement; NMA = National Minerals Agency; EPA = Environmental Protection Agency of Sierra Leone; CSO = Civil Society Organisation; CBO = Community-Based Organisation; M&E = monitoring and evaluation

More than 450 people (20% women), including youths and women, representing 25 organisations attended face-to-face sensitisation sessions; an additional 60,000 people were targeted in a mass media outreach campaign. Demand from women and youths for accountability increased with knowledge on NRM processes and resources available for local development. The community development committee accountability systems were improved through capacity support to respond to community demands through effective community consultation processes and administration of development funds.

The SDG-F programme had a stakeholder engagement and sensitisation and awareness-raising component. This intervention helped to sustain the land reclamation intervention in the district. It is common practice in the district to mine plots of land repeatedly, almost once every year. The local land-use planning within the mining chiefdoms in Kono District is such that any parcel of land under any other use (such as agriculture, housing, etc.) can be taken over for mining. With support from the NMA and the programme's local implementing partners, continuous engagements and dialogue with the paramount chiefs and other chiefdom authorities have prohibited the use of reclaimed land parcels for mining. This is noted to be a significant win for the programme according to the beneficiaries.

Conclusions and recommendations

The activities supported by the programme revolve around generating jobs for young people and women, strengthening local dialogue with a view to better taking into account the needs of communities, and building capacity. Communities in the Kono District that have been targeted are known to be very poor and vulnerable because of the mining done by multinationals. As a result, it is recognised that the SDG-F programme is entirely relevant and meets the needs of the beneficiaries.

Both the Sierra Leone Medium Term National Development Plan (MTNDP 2019-2023) as well as the United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2015-2018 have planned to fight poverty, stimulate economic growth and build community resilience. All three areas have also been targeted by the program. Therefore, the programme's objectives are still valid at the time of this evaluation because, although it has affected some community members, there are still many people who have not had access to the benefits of the programme and are still very vulnerable. UNDP has opted for joint programming with FAO and local organisations to maximise programme efficiency. Each entity has focused on the areas in which it has a comparative advantage through experience or means, which has reached the most people with the right level of resources.

At the time of this evaluation, all the planned outputs have been achieved. As a result, from the point of view of efficiency, the programme is a complete success.

At the time of the assessment, several fishponds and henhouses were shut down (one of the development initiatives discussed in section 4). The communities had just gone through a production cycle and had not put in place the necessary mechanisms to continue production. This is because UNDP and FAO have largely supported communities in the first phase of production without giving them enough time to learn. Similarly, the revenue management procedures were not always clear, which resulted in the organisations having no money left after only one production cycle. Similarly, UNDP and FAO directly purchased inputs such as fry and poultry feed, which were difficult to find in the country. A sustainable and continuous supply of inputs is therefore important for the sustainability of supported activities.

The activities promoted by the programme have largely contributed to the establishment of forums for dialogue in the communities as they required ongoing consultation between beneficiaries for strategic planning and day-to-day management.

The programme contributes to the achievement of SDG on job creation, the fight against extreme poverty, and the participation of women in community development. Yet the programme lacked a good gender strategy which, although the problems the programme identified and addressed primarily affected women and youth, men made up the bulk of the beneficiaries. This was not corrected and continued throughout the life of the programme.

With regard to sustainability, several beneficiaries saw their capacities increased with the professional training they received. Even if at the time of this evaluation they had not yet established a business, it is nevertheless true that the training received was relevant and will enable them to find a job that will potentially contribute to improving their living conditions.

At the end of the evaluation, the following recommendations have been made for the future:

No.	Recommendation	Priority	Means of Verification
For UNDP and FAO			
1.	The selection of beneficiaries for local development projects must be done by the communities themselves, but with adequate staff supervision to ensure that this selection meets the criteria and standards of inclusion advocated by the organisations.	High	Activity report, beneficiary selection reports
2.	The mobilisation of beneficiaries' financial participation is important to ensure their continued interest in the activities and objectives pursued by the programme.	High	Duly signed partnerships with CBOs
3.	It is important in future to provide more organisational support to the trained groups involved in the programmes supported by both organisations. This support would affect management as well as planning and financial management.	High	Partnership agreements with local communities
4.	The inclusion of other private sector actors, including input and financial service providers, is an element to be considered in the future to boost sustainability.	Medium	Partnership agreements with private sector actors
5.	To improve on the beneficiary impact and sustainability of future poultry project, the intervention strategies should be tailored to improve on the local supply of maize, which is the principal component of the poultry feed.	High	National development plans, partnership agreements signed
6.	The programme interventions are time bound, and usually new poultry firms would need more time than the programme's timeframe to function independently. Working with the already established poultry enterprises, which have learnt some good and bad lessons, should be considered very strongly. An innovative and knowledge-sharing forum should be established among these poultry firms to help weaker ones with useful practical information about poultry enterprise.	High	Activity report, project performance reports
For the local organisations			
7.	It is important for local organisations to maintain the groups formed and to mobilise regular financial participation from members to prepare for possible support from UNDP, FAO, or other development partners.	Medium	Monitoring reports, organisations activity reports
8.	Local organisations that have already benefited from the UNDP or FAO support for poultry houses and fishponds must immediately work to restart them to show their interest in these activities and their ambition to become autonomous.	Medium	Organisations activity reports
For the government of Sierra Leone			
9.	The Sierra Leone government needs to support the emergence of a private sector that can provide inputs for poultry and fish farming.	High	National development plans

No.	Recommendation	Priority	Means of Verification
10.	Support programmes for local communities need to involve public authorities much more, which in turn must integrate them into their planning cycle as they respond to the real needs of the population.	Medium	Activity reports

1. INTRODUCTION

The “Enabling Sustainable Livelihoods through Improved Natural Resource Governance and Economic Diversification in the Kono District, Sierra Leone” programme is a joint initiative by the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the lead implementing agency. The programme, also referred to as the Sustainable Development Goals Fund (SDG-F) programme, is implemented within the framework of a UN multi-agency Area-Based Development (ABD) approach in Kono District, eastern Sierra Leone. It focuses on two broad, interlinked intervention areas that aim to enhance sustainable, inclusive governance of natural resources as well as diversification of sustainable livelihood opportunities in one of the most mineral-rich but least developed areas in the country.

The programme had particular significance, given the ongoing Ebola outbreak that had devastating social and economic impacts on the country. It was designed with an overall goal to enhance sustainable livelihoods through improved natural resource governance and economic diversification in the Kono District. The primary approach was to increase knowledge and inclusive participation in natural resource governance, promote effective dialogue between all stakeholders in local development initiatives, and to promote alternative livelihood options for disadvantaged youths and women in the district. The programme was implemented between **1st /01/2015** and **31st/12/2018**.

A final evaluation was conducted from April to May 2019 as per the programme’s evaluation plan. The evaluation was undertaken by two independent evaluators: an international evaluator (the team lead) and a national counterpart as team member.

2. THE PROGRAMME

The SDG-F programme focuses on governance of natural resources and the diversification of livelihoods. Its goals are to:

- Promote inclusiveness, accountability, and transparency in natural resources management (NRM)
- Improve livelihoods through diversified and inclusive economic opportunities

The primary beneficiaries of the programme are urban citizens affected by the extractive industry, unemployed youths (15–35 years old), and targeted rural communities, with a particular emphasis on women. The programme focuses specifically on targeting beneficiaries who are living below the national poverty line of \$2 per day.

In partnership with FAO, UNDP’s response to “Enabling Sustainable Livelihoods through Improved Natural Resource Governance and Economic Diversification in the Kono District” covers five key areas of interlinked project interventions. Each of these is described below.

2.1 TECHNICAL AND VOCATIONAL SKILLS TRAINING FOR YOUTHS PROGRAMME

As noted in the 2014 Labour Force Survey and the 2015 National Population and Housing Census, youths and women are among the most vulnerable populations mainly because they lack the necessary skills and resources to be gainfully employed. For Sierra Leone to harness its

demographic dividend from its rich population resource of 39.7% youths and 52.8% women, specific policy initiatives and development interventions should be customised to fit the special needs of these two vulnerable segments of the population. It is against this backdrop that the UNDP has rolled out a package of several linked capacity-building and training interventions for women and youths, one of which is the technical and vocational skills training for youths programme in Kono District (Table 1).

Table 1: Technical and vocational skills training for youths programme in Kono District

No.	Business Skills Training		No. of People Trained		
	Area of training	Description	Male	Female	Total
1.	Agriculture	Livestock production: chicks, goats, and sheep	33	7	40
2.	Welding and panelling	Apprenticeship; training in aluminium frames; tools and equipment	14	0	14
		Blacksmithing: tools, materials	1	0	1
3.	Electricals & wiring	Shop; apprenticeship; tools/materials	56	2	58
4.	Refrigeration	Shop; acquisition of equipment	43	2	45
5.	Auto mechanic	Shop; apprenticeship; equipment/tools	18	1	19
6.	Heavy-duty truck driving	Drivers licences; vehicle; shop	83	1	84
7.	Heavy-duty machine operation	Drivers licences; vehicle; shop	51	2	53
8.	Building and construction (block laying)	Building licences (category A); equipment and materials	18	0	18
9.	Computer software/hardware	Shop; equipment	87	30	117
10	Total		404	45	449
11	Percentage total (%)		90	10	100

As shown in Table 1, 449 youths (404 males, 45 females) completed vocational skills training in nine economic areas of their interest in order to create and expand on their livelihood options. The duration of the training depended on the specific area of training. For example, training in electricals and auto mechanics lasted for 8 months; computer hardware and software, block-laying, refrigeration, and welding lasted for 6 months each; and the other areas lasted for more than 1 month. Sufficient time and mixed delivery methods that draw on both applied and theoretical exercises were used to equip beneficiaries with all the necessary skillsets to perform a specific task.

2.2 BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP SKILLS TRAINING AND BUSINESS START-UP AND SUPPORT SERVICES

A further needs gap assessment was carried out as a follow-up to mentoring and ensuring that all the 499 youths (404 males, 45 females) who had been trained under the technical and vocational skills training for youths programme could gainfully use the acquired skills and be engaged in alternative livelihood activities. On the basis of the gap assessment, UNDP launched a 12-week business and entrepreneurship training programme in which 550 youths (501 males, 49 females)

were coached, mentored, and provided with business ideas to help them establish or expand on their enterprises. During the training, each participant put together business ideas and developed a simple business plan. To actualise the business plans they developed, each of the youths was given business start-up capital of 1m Leones (SLL) (~\$113).

2.3 INCREASING PRODUCTION AND PRODUCTIVITY OF CROPS, LIVESTOCK, AND FISHERIES AND SUPPORT TO MARKET ACCESS AND SANITARY MEASURES FOR BETTER TRADE

In addition to providing alternative livelihood options for women and youths in Kono District, the programme helped to improve household food security and nutrition in local communities. Through its partnership with the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security and the Ministry of Fishery and Marine Resources, FAO established eight poultry farms and 24 fishponds which are owned and well-managed by youth groups in the district. These interventions have successfully secured alternative livelihoods for an estimated 1,200 women and youths, and have improved the local nutritional status of many households across the district's 14 chiefdoms.

2.4 NRM AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY

The programme's initiative uses environmental management techniques to support agriculture and boost local food security. Some 20 acres of land that were rendered useless because of ongoing mining activities within local communities have been reclaimed and reused for agriculture. A total of 150 youths (102 men, 48 women) have been trained on NRM and have gotten involved in small-scale land reclamation projects. Some artisanal miners have expressed a strong desire to start efforts at land reclamation when mining operations cease.

Moreover, these youth groups help to monitor and sensitise other community members about good environmental practices. They have the knowledge and capacity to understand and interpret environmental and mining policies and documents that affect their communities. They are also able to initiate and manage environmental issues arising within their communities.

2.5 STRENGTHENING DIALOGUE AND ENGAGEMENT BETWEEN DEVELOPMENT STAKEHOLDERS AND THE EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES

The programme realised the need for local communities, the extractive industries sector, and other development stakeholders to co-exist in strong partnership in order to achieve tangible and sustainable local development in the district. UNDP enhanced the capacity of civil society organisations (CSOs) and advocacy NGOs so that they could facilitate constructive dialogue between the district's relevant stakeholders and address grievances within local communities.

3. THE EVALUATION

3.1 EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The goal of this final evaluation is to determine whether the SDG-F programme has achieved its expected results, provide a detailed picture of the major accomplishments/weaknesses, and assess its sustainability.

The evaluation re-examines the programme's assumptions and parameters, with the specific objectives of measuring:

- The joint programme's contributions to solving the needs and problems identified in the design phase
- Its degree of implementation, efficiency, and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised.
- To what extent the programme has attained the results originally foreseen in its monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework, and others.
- The programme's impact on the attainment of the SDGs.

In addition, the evaluation sought to identify and document substantive lessons learnt and good practices on the specific topics of the thematic areas and crosscutting issues of gender, sustainability, and public-private partnerships (PPPs).

A list of potential key evaluation questions includes:

Program Logic. Is SDG-F's logic still relevant in light of the shifting socio-political and economic context in Sierra Leone? Are the expected results still applicable in each of the projects under the SDG-F?

Program Impact. What (if any) has been the substantive impact in the programme areas attributable to the activities? How (if at all) are targeted beneficiaries better able to effectively advocate for reforms and monitor government/mining companies activities? How (if at all) are CSOs, community-based organisations (CBOs), local development structures, and the GoSIERRA LEONE better able to improve community resource management processes and respond to the needs of the target communities?

Technical Effectiveness. What is the effectiveness of the SDG-F's expected results? Will activities achieve the programme's expected goals and results? What factors have contributed to or mitigated against its performance? Do community members in supported areas see the SDG-F's activities as effective?

Project Management. Is the current programme designed and staffed to work collaboratively and effectively across the different stakeholders? Are the M&E and reporting systems adequate? (Are there programmatic or organisational gaps that hinder the achievement of results? Is information being effectively captured and used internally and externally? How effective is the SDG-F structure in engaging civil society, government, donors, mining companies, and other stakeholders?

Sustainability. What are the sustainable elements of the SDG-F that will remain after it is completed? How can programme activities be enhanced? What have been its most appropriate exit strategies that will embed benefits into local communities?

Lessons Learnt. What are the lessons learnt from programme design, implementation, and monitoring? What could SDG-F be doing better to ensure that results are achieved and sustained? What are its successes that deserve replication or more funding?

3.2 METHODOLOGY

At the end of the programme cycle, the externally led final evaluation is a significant moment to reflect on the progress of a project/programme and to gauge the effectiveness and efficiency of how resources have been used and the results and impacts achieved. This also provides an opportunity to identify issues with implementation and redress them in similar, future

programmes. This final evaluation of the SDG-F programme is no exception; it is based on an iterative, mixed-methods design to capture the perspectives of all stakeholders. This approach enables a “360° evaluation”, incorporating the views and perspectives of UNDP and FAO staff, government of Sierra Leone officials, final beneficiaries, and other stakeholders.

These multiple lines of evidence will provide the considerable breadth of data needed to assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of the programme and to inform programmatic decisions for UNDP–Sierra Leone.

The specific objectives of the assignment were to:

- Make an overall independent assessment of the past performance of the SDG-F programme, paying particular attention to the impact of programme actions against its pre-established goal and objectives.
- Identify key lessons learnt and propose practical recommendations for both programme and UNDP management.

A set of broad strategic questions, with relevant sub-questions, was formulated to provide information about the extent to which the SDG-F programme has been implemented. The evaluation team sought to determine:

- **Programme relevance.** This entails an assessment of the extent to which the objectives of the programme are consistent with beneficiary needs, country context, national priorities in reducing poverty, as well as UNDP–Sierra Leone’s priorities outlined in the country poverty reduction papers.
- **Programme effectiveness.** Has the programme attained its intended targets as outlined in the programme’s results framework?
- **Programme efficiency.** How well have the various activities transformed the available resources into the expected results, in terms of quantity, quality, and timeliness? The results are compared against what was planned.
- **Programme impact.** What is the relationship between the programme’s purpose and overall goal and the progress made to date towards poverty reduction in Sierra Leone?
- **Programme sustainability.** How likely will the programme’s positive outcomes and positive benefits continue after external funding ends or non-funding-related interventions?
- **The UNDP’s added value and the coherence of the intervention.**

The evaluation concludes with a report featuring an evidence-based analysis of the prospects and conditions for successful delivery of proposed activities, results, and overall programme goals. It recommends ways to improve programme implementation in a potential second phase, or for future programming.

3.3 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The evaluation applied standard evaluation criteria, as defined by the Development Assistance Committee of the Economic Cooperation and Development, to assess performance, which includes relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. Some of the specific evaluations comprise the following:

Relevance: the extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people and the needs of the country, and achieving the SDGs:

1. How has the joint project contributed to solving the needs and problems identified in the design phase, in particular concerning the baseline situation?
2. To what extent was the joint project aligned with national development strategies and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)/United Nations Development Assistance Plan (UNDAP)?
3. To what extent was the joint project the best option to respond to development challenges described in the project document?
4. To what extent are the objectives of the joint project still valid in the context of national policy objectives and SDGs?
5. To what extent have the implementing partners (IPs) participating in the joint project added value to solve the development challenges stated in the project document?

Effectiveness: the extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved:

1. To what extent did the joint project attain the development outputs and outcomes described in the project document?
2. What good practice, success stories, lesson learnt, and replicable experiences have been identified? Describe and document them.
3. To what extent has the joint project contributed to the advancement and the progress of fostering national ownership processes and outcomes (the design and implementation of National Development Plans, Public Policy, UNDAF, etc.)?
4. To what extent did the joint project help to increase stakeholder/citizen dialogue and or engagement on development issues and policies?

Efficiency: the extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results:

1. To what extent was the joint project's management model (governance and decision-making structures—ie, lead agency, joint project coordinator, project management committee, and national steering committee), financial management and allocation of resources (ie, one work plan, one budget) efficient in comparison to the development results attained?
2. To what extent were the joint project's outputs and outcomes synergistic and coherent to achieve better results when compared with a single-agency intervention? What efficiency gains/losses were there as a result?
3. What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, and business practices did the IPs use to promote/improve efficiency?
4. What type of obstacles (administrative, financial, and management) did the joint project face and to what extent have these affected its efficiency?

Impact: the positive and negative effects of the intervention on development outcomes, SDGs:

1. To what extent and in what ways did the joint project contribute to the SDGs?
2. To what extent and in what ways did the joint project contribute to the targeted crosscutting issues: gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment, PPPs, and sustainability at local and national levels?
3. What impact did the matching funds have in the design, implementation, and results of the joint project?

4. To what extent did the joint project have an impact on the targeted beneficiaries? Were all targeted beneficiaries reached? Which were left out?
5. What unexpected/unintended effects did the joint project have, if any?

Sustainability: the probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term:

1. Which mechanisms already existed and which have been put in place by the joint project to ensure results and impact (ie, policy, policy coordination mechanism, partnership, networks)?
2. To what extent has the capacity of beneficiaries (institutional and/or individual) been strengthened such that they are resilient to external shocks and/or do not need support in the long term?
3. To what extent will the joint project be replicated or scaled up at local or national levels?

3.4 EVALUATION PHASES

The evaluation of the end of the SDG-F programme followed a three-phase approach:

- Phase I: Inception phase
- Phase II: Field phase
- Phase III: Analysis and synthesis phase

3.4.1 Inception phase

At the inception of the evaluation, online communication was established during an hour-long skype call kick-off meeting between the evaluators and the UNDP's designated evaluation manager. The main objectives of this communication were to hear about UNDP's expectations and provide the consultants with the programme's background documents.

Next the evaluators collected additional documentation available and continued their desk review of the literature. On the basis of existing technical reports and data from the period preceding the evaluation, the evaluators defined the baseline situation (or at least the situation before the interventions) under the assessment to be able to compare critical variables and results and see changes over time. By the end of this phase, the evaluation team had a firm understanding of the SDG-F activities and achievements to be evaluated, and submitted an inception report to the UNDP team.

3.4.2 Field phase

Once the inception report was approved, the team lead travelled to Sierra Leone and met with the national evaluator. Together they harmonised their understanding of the terms of reference and methodology in a 1-day meeting before meeting with the UNDP's evaluation manager at which both the inception report and the interview schedule (Table 2) were finalised. The evaluation team interviewed the UNDP staff who took part in the programme's implementation as well as their partners in government ministries, development organisations, and other community-based groups. During the development of the inception report, all the stakeholders involved in programme implementation, as either IPs or beneficiaries, were identified and representatives of each group of stakeholders interviewed. The evaluation team collected both quantitative data, based on the document review and direct observations, and qualitative data, based on the team's interviews and direct observations. Following the interviews in the field, the evaluators met to

synthesise the data they had collected. An exit–debriefing was held with the UNDP staff at the end of the field phase to discuss the preliminary results. The field phase lasted 6 days.

Table 2: SDG-F programme stakeholders interviewed during the field phase of the evaluation

Stakeholders	Questions to Be Explored
Final beneficiaries	What services/good did they receive? What way did that impact their lives as related to skills improvement and income generation? What are they doing with it now? What are their plans for the future?
IPs	What was the nature of the partnership with UNDP? How did that go? What are the main results? What went well? What did not go so well? What would they change should the same programme be implemented again? Any lessons learnt?
Government partners	What was the nature of the partnership with UNDP? How is that aligned with government priorities? What are the main results? What went well? What did not go so well? What were the major challenges? What would they change should the same programme be implemented again? Any lessons learnt?
FAO	What was the nature of the partnership with UNDP? How is that aligned with FAO’s priorities? What are the main results? What went well? What did not go so well? What would they change should the same program be implemented again? Any lessons learned?
UNDP	How were the stakeholders involved in the design of the SDG-F programme? What were the main results under the programme? What are the main successes? What about the challenges? How were they fixed? What steps were taken to collect the co-financing? How did it go? How would they rate the performance of the different IPs? What would they do differently in the future? Any lessons learnt?

The evaluation used a mixed-methods approach. Quantitative data were collected based on the performance reports that the programme and its partners had submitted as well as on direct observation done by the team during the field work. The qualitative information was derived from primary data sources whom the evaluators interviewed in both the field and in Freetown.

3.4.3 Analysis and synthesis phase

In phase III the evaluation team carried out the overall analysis and synthesis of the collected information and wrote a final report. (A first draft of the final report was submitted to the UNDP’s designated evaluation manager according to the structure Sierra Leone had previously agreed in the inception report.) The evaluation team discussed the draft report with the UNDP staff over skype 15 days after the team finished the field phase (phase II).

The evaluation framework consists of three inter-connecting analyses: (1) ascertaining what has changed in the fight against poverty in Kono since the inception of the SDG-F programme; (2) determining the major causes, influences, and opportunities associated with these changes; and (3) assessing the programme’s contributions to the changes as linked to its intended results.

In addition, the evaluation team reviewed the SDG-F’s overall design and performance, including its management, organisational, and operational effectiveness. This review identifies what aspects of the programme went well; what could have been done better or differently for greater relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability; what opportunities were taken and/or not taken; and what challenges emerged as the context changed and how these were

(or were not) addressed. Lastly, the evaluation assessed opportunities for the programme to formulate an effective exit strategy.

After the draft report was presented to and reviewed by the UNDP, the consultants addressed the subsequent comments in its final report.

Evaluation limitations and challenges

The evaluation team had expected some reluctance to efforts to collect information on efficiency and effectiveness. The usefulness of such data might not have been obvious to some stakeholders. The plan to overcome these challenges included the following:

- *Involve stakeholders.* To deal with potential reluctance, the consultants took time to explain the value of the data being collected and how this will positively serve to improve future programming for both UNDP and the stakeholders. The consultants stressed that the intent of the final evaluation was not to criticise but to adequately assess the programme performance, identify the lessons to be learnt, and constructively suggest recommendations for the future.
- *Minimise respondent burden.* Advance notice, keeping interviews short, and conducting interviews at times and places convenient to respondents were important, not only for obtaining reliable information, but also to encourage others within their network to cooperate.
- *The other important limitations* were the limited time allocated to undertake the evaluation, the difficulty to find some programme beneficiaries, the fact that some fishponds and henhouses were no longer operational when the evaluator visited the field, and sometimes programme participants' poor memory recall. The team overcame these challenges by identifying multiple data points and providers and cross checking the collected data with different sources.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS (EVALUATION CRITERIA)

4.1 RELEVANCE

Relevance: the extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people and the needs of the country and achieving the SDGs.

1. How has the joint project contributed to solving the needs and problems identified in the design phase, in particular concerning the baseline situation?

The recently concluded 2019–2021 Mid-term District Development Plan for Kono District ranked farming, small-trading, and mining as the three principal economic activities in the district. Rice-farming ranked the highest (a priority score of 9.5 out of 10) as the most important livelihood activity that is contributing the most to household incomes in the district. This suggests that even though mining represents one of the major economic activities of people in Kono District, it does not offer much in terms of household incomes. In addition, crop-farming largely dominates the agricultural sector and local employment in the district. These raise serious concerns and highlight the need to diversify the livelihood options of local people in Kono, especially the economically active population. The SDG-F programme rolled out seven main project interventions to provide youths (and women) in Kono with alternative livelihood options in areas other than crop-farming and mining. The programme further strengthened the local governance system in the naturally mineral-rich district.

The programme's seven main interventions are the following:

1. Poultry production
2. Fishpond production
3. Business development and entrepreneurship training (BDET)
4. Technical and vocational (TecVoc) training programme
5. Business plan development and start-up capital (BDSc)
6. Land reclamation
7. Stakeholder engagements and sensitization and awareness raising (SESA) programmes

As this was a joint initiative, UNDP led the implementation of five components (ie, BDET, TecVoc, BDSc, land reclamation, and SESA) and had general oversight responsibility of the programme. FAO implemented the agricultural components of the programme, poultry and fishpond production.

The involvement of UNDP and FAO in areas in which they have proven expertise has enabled services to be provided adequately. And the use of local organisations and expertise facilitated contact with beneficiary communities and adaptation of the response.

1. To what extent was the joint project aligned with national development strategies and the UNDAF/UNDAP? To what extent was the joint project the best option to respond to development challenges described in the project document?

The programme takes an integrated approach to enabling sustainable livelihood opportunities in the framework of a UNDP-led multi-agency (ie, UNDP, FAO, UNICEF, World Food Programme, United Nations Capital Development Fund, United Nations Population Fund) ABD initiative in Kono District in eastern Sierra Leone. The programme builds on the recommendations of multiple scoping missions to the district as well as the outcomes of a 90-day quick impact project implemented in the framework of the multi-agency ABD approach. The programme is demand-driven and interventions are aligned with the UNDAF principles, including a human rights-based approach. It will contribute to addressing several Millennium Development Goals through its cross-sectoral and holistic approach to reducing poverty and inequality by building capacity for sustainable and inclusive governance of natural resources, productive employment, inclusiveness, and mainstreaming gender equality. The programme includes strategic interventions enabling participatory processes in economic diversification and employment-creation opportunities, as well as improved and better informed governance of natural resources in order to achieve the overall objective, namely, to increase sustainability of livelihoods for youths, women, and poor in Kono District and contribute to conflict prevention. The programme will also have a positive impact on these vulnerable groups that will be most affected by the ongoing Ebola crisis.

The programme supported diversification in sectors that offer potential to create jobs and business opportunities. Strategic PPPs were established with regional and local businesses and councils. These partnerships promoted job creation and income generation for youths and women. The programme also provided seed capital for youth start-ups.

Partnerships were being formed around agriculture, aquaculture, value-added trade, and mini-processing and production activities. Communities gained knowledge and skills to establish and

manage mini-aquaculture enterprises and poultry farms. The joint project has helped to tackle the development challenges identified in the project document.

2. To what extent are the objectives of the joint project still valid in the context of national policy objectives and SDGs?

Given the incidence and depth of poverty in Sierra Leone, the challenge to reduce extreme poverty is enormous. Efforts to do so centre mainly on the need to accelerate economic growth at a rate that should exceed the population growth rate by several percentage points.

As already articulated in the PRSP II, current national development efforts focus on the creation of an enabling macro-economic environment that can enhance the generation of broad-based employment opportunities by the private and public sectors as well as investment in human capital and social services as the basis for socio-economic development. Priority has been placed on the key drivers of growth such as improving agricultural productivity and competitiveness; and accelerating human development through improvement in education, health, water, and sanitation. Enhancing transparency and maintaining efforts to rein in corruption were also identified. The premise of SDG-F activities is that the problem of achieving full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people, in Sierra Leone hinges on a number of factors. These include accelerating growth and investment in areas such as agriculture that are important to the poor, improving quality and access to essential rural social services, promoting rural employment and industry, and strengthening the capacity for M&E of the country's employment situation. Most of the programme's budget has been invested in agriculture-related activities or in job creation and its objectives are therefore still valid for national policy objectives and SDGs.

4.2 EFFECTIVENESS

Effectiveness: The extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved.

1. What was achieved with the programme's activities?

4.2.1 Poultry production

This FAO-led initiative successfully established eight poultry firms in 6 of the 14 chiefdoms in Kono District. The aim was to create alternative sustainable livelihood options and increase incomes for local youths, improve household nutrition, and contribute to food security in the local communities.

Selection of beneficiaries and poultry site selection. Local and tribal authorities, mainly as the paramount chiefs, and the Kono Youth District Council (KYDC) largely selected the programme's beneficiaries. FAO worked closely with local stakeholders and the KYDC to mobilise youths into groups of an average of 60 members. It was not clear what other criteria were used for selecting the beneficiaries, but group members were 18–35 years old; a large number of women were involved and participated actively. There was almost equal representation of males and females in the poultry groups, though there were more women than men in some cases. In addition, the youth groups consisted of members from existing farmer-based organisations and agricultural business centres.

FAO hired a poultry expert to select the sites for the poultry houses within the preselected chiefdoms, in close collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security. Selection also actively involved local stakeholders, mainly the poultry youth groups, the KYDC chairman, and the paramount chiefs of the individual chiefdoms. This was part of FAO's strategy to enhance local ownership for the sustainability of the intervention.

The poultry production package from FAO. The poultry production package received from FAO by each group included a poultry house that was equipped with the necessary basic poultry production equipment, 500 layer-birds, and enough poultry feed for 6 months. Training programmes were conducted for participants of the poultry groups to give them the required poultry management skills. This is important, as seven of the eight poultry firms were new in the business and basic veterinary services are scarce in the district. Interviews with the management of some poultry groups indicated that the skills-training helped, as most of the poultry firms were thereafter able to manage their day-to-day affairs.

According to FAO's project officer in charge and some poultry youth groups, each poultry house was stocked with about 500 layer-birds, some of which were laying eggs as they were delivered. Yet a misunderstanding over the age of the birds that were delivered arose between the poultry youth groups, FAO staff in charge, and the birds' dealer, Pajaj Poultry. FAO paid for ISA brown layer-birds to be supplied to the poultry youth groups at 23 weeks old in order to minimise the risk of disease outbreak and death with the newly inexperienced poultry firms. However, the birds had quit laying eggs spent only about 6 months after delivery in June 2018. Beneficiary youth groups believed the birds were much older as they indicated that some of the birds were no longer laying. According to experts, the ISA brown breed starts laying at about 20 weeks old and will continue laying at peak production at least one egg per day for about 2–2.5 years (ie, 24–30 months). All the eight poultry firms sold their birds by the end of December 2018 (only 6 months after stocking) because they had either stopped laying eggs or were laying fewer eggs than anticipated. Therefore it is more likely that the birds were far older than 24 weeks. This definitely squeezed the profit margins of the poultry firms and, consequently, their ability to raise enough money to restock.

Poultry production and sales. The eight poultry firms were stocked at different times, mainly due to the scarce and limited availability of the breeds and imported poultry feed in the country. Most firms received their birds on May 21st 2018, whereas a few others were stocked exactly 1 month later on June 21st. Nevertheless, each poultry firm received 500 ISA brown layer-birds, at an average of about 2% irreplaceable losses. The poultry groups were advised by FAO staff to sell their stock after 6 months when the birds could no longer lay eggs.

The birds were delivered to the poultry firms at laying stage, according to the poultry youth groups and FAO staff. This means that the birds were older than 21 weeks, consuming a 50-kg bag of mixed feed per day. As this was the case, FAO gave for free a 6-month supply (about thirty 50-kg bags per month) of feed to each poultry firm. According to the poultry firms, there was a serious problem of unbalanced or nutrient deficiency in the feed supplied in August. It was then that the firms experienced a sudden drop in egg production—some recorded as few as 10 eggs per day—bird pecking, and other problems. FAO later corrected the problem by supplying the correct feed the following month. For some of the firms the trend in egg production returned to normal.

As part of the intervention package, the poultry houses were equipped with basic equipment and supplies. As most of the established poultry firms lack any prior experience in the business, the birds were delivered after receiving the required vaccine dosage. In addition, each of the poultry firms were given practical training in poultry production and management.

The provision of free feed to poultry firms throughout the intervention phase presents a serious challenge for the newly established firms that have no idea about the cost and source of the feed they were using. The programme ended just as most of the firms were selling their stock of birds; hence there was inadequate time and provision for market linkages for both inputs and products. They will be faced with serious challenge to access and purchase the feed and other services in order to be able to operate independently after the programme ends.

According to the records of the poultry firms interviewed, peak production was recorded at an average of 300 eggs per day in July (for poultry firms stocked on May 21st 2018) and September (for firms stocked on June 21st). Yormatha Youth Farmers Association (YYFA) in Tombodu, Kamara Chiefdom, the only beneficiary youth group with existing poultry prior to the FAO’s intervention, recorded the highest egg production at 365 eggs per day from September 1st–30th (see Table 3). In addition to recording the highest egg production, the YYFA kept good records and was the only poultry firm that had restocked with another set of 500 ISA brown birds after selling the initial 500 birds supplied by FAO. The YYFA was therefore selected as a detailed case study for evaluation of the poultry intervention.

Table 3: Cost of imported and locally prepared poultry feed

Item	Poultry Feed	Cost/50-kg bag (SLL)	Comment
1	Mixed local	220,000	Prepared locally with imported concentrate, imported limestone, and maize (60% local and 40% imported)
2	Imported	287,000	100% imported and readymade

Source: YYFA poultry, Kono District, 2019.

4.2.2 Fishpond production

FAO established 24 fishponds in Kono District, with each chiefdom having at least 1 fishpond. As with the poultry enterprises, the fishponds were established to serve as an alternative livelihood option to the crop-farming and mining-dominated district while also contributing to improved nutrition and household food security.

Selection of beneficiaries for fishpond production. As with the eight poultry enterprises, the beneficiary selection with the fishpond youth groups was done mainly by the chiefdom leaders and the KYDC. The beneficiaries were primarily youths who were mobilised into groups of 30 members. Each group comprised at least 50% women. In chiefdoms where FAO has not established the poultry enterprises, the fishpond youth groups were independent groups, whereas for the remaining chiefdoms the groups were established under the poultry youth groups. In other words, the youth groups run the poultry and fishpond side by side.

The fishpond package. The fishpond package was similar to the poultry intervention package. Twenty-four mud-fishponds were constructed in inland-valley swamp areas where the capacity to retain water is much higher. This was to ensure that the ponds do not dry out, especially

during the dry season. Each fishpond was stocked with 800–1,000 tilapia fish. The youth groups were also supplied with feed.

According to the youth groups interviewed, fish were harvested once every quarter of the year. The YYFA reported that about 3m SLL was generated from the sale of the first harvest. This, however, excludes other costs like transport and labour.

4.2.3 The BDET programme

The BDET programme was one of the initial UNDP-led interventions. It was designed to offer youths with business and entrepreneurial skills trainings to enhance their capacities to manage their own businesses and become self-employed. The programme was initiated by a rapid training needs assessment analysis (TNAA) study in which training needs and skills gap of 450 youths were identified. A 3-day tailor-made training programme was organised in the district as well.

Beneficiaries of the BDET programme. The main beneficiaries of the SDG-F programme are youths and women in Kono District. It is important to note that all beneficiaries of the BDET programme overlap entirely with those of two of the UNDP-led interventions (TecVoc and BDeSc) and largely the same beneficiaries of the SESA programme. This makes the selection of beneficiaries for the BDET programme strategic for the SDG-F programme to achieve its intended purpose of benefiting youths and women in Kono District.

The beneficiary selection process was carried out mainly by the KYDC and facilitated by UNDP project staff. According to the deputy chairman of the KYDC, several radio discussions and other sensitisation and awareness-raising sessions were held in the district. These were followed by a call for applications from interested youths in the district, irrespective of literacy or educational background, skills, and other barriers that could limit the participation of local people. Interviews were conducted only to verify a few criteria such as the age (mainly youths 18–35 years old) and residence (within Kono District).

At the end of the process, 454 youths were selected. Of these about 91% were from Tankoro and Gbense chiefdoms (2 of the 14 chiefdoms in the district), but only 46 (10%) were women. About 60% of the total beneficiaries claimed to have attained senior secondary school level of education. Although about 22% of the 454 beneficiaries had low levels of education, all had basic literacy and numeracy skills.

The skillset of the youths selected indicated that almost 39% were unskilled. Yet the remaining were engaged in various livelihood activities such as commercial retail trade, commercial motorbike-riding, mining, security, teaching, mobile phone top-up selling and charging, and agriculture. These youths wanted to be trained in various skill areas, with driving, heavy-duty machine operation, and computer proficiency topping the list of preferences.

The BDET training. The SDG-F's business development services consultant who conducted the TNAA study delivered a 3-day BDET training programme for the 454 youths. As noted above, this was to prepare the business mindset and capacity of the youths so that they could better manage existing businesses and expand or establish new ones in order to become self-employed. Training manuals were developed and the delivery was very interactive, employing a mixed approach of theory and practical exercises or applied business techniques. Beside the lead

trainer, invited guests from carefully selected, well-established enterprises and companies made presentations where they shared useful experience and practical insight with trainees in their areas of interest.

4.2.4 The TecVoc training programme

In partnership with the Government Technical and Vocational Centre, Dorma, Koidu City in Kono District, UNDP provided technical and vocational skills training for 449 of the youths who had earlier benefited from the BDET programme in nine desired-skills areas (Table 4).

Table 4: Technical and Vocational skills training for youths in Kono District

No.	Business Skills Training	No. of People Trained			Training Duration (in months)
	Area of training	Male	Female	Total	
1.	Agriculture	33	7	40	1
2.	Welding and panelling	15	0	15	6
3.	Electricals and wiring	56	2	58	8
4.	Refrigeration	43	2	45	6
5.	Auto-Mechanic	18	1	19	8
6.	Heavy-duty truck driving	83	1	84	2
7.	Heavy-duty machine operation	51	2	53	3
8.	Building and construction (block laying)	18	0	18	6
9.	Computer software/hardware	87	30	117	6
10.	Total	404	45	449	

From Table 1 it is clear that few women took part in the selection of beneficiaries; hence their participation in the TecVoc training programme was quite low, at only 10.0%. According to the deputy chairman of the KYDC, the number of female applicants was very low, so most female applicants (if at all) were shortlisted and selected among the beneficiaries. He was certain that the selection process largely favoured women, but very few women expressed interest in the TecVoc training programme, which was announced on several radio programmes across the district.

What is more, about two-thirds of the female beneficiaries opted for computer training, followed by 15.5% who were trained in agriculture. None of the female beneficiaries opted for building and construction and welding and panelling, likely because of the physical nature of the trades.

In general, although the process employed by the KYDC to select beneficiaries tended to favour women, it is highly likely that women were misrepresented in the process of selecting the nine desired-skills training areas. Women would have taken advantage of the opportunity to participate in the training programmes if the selected nine skillsets were within their productive and community roles and activities such as tailoring, clothing, textiles (“gara” tie-dying), and catering. These are equally well-paid and income-generating livelihood ventures like any of the nine selected training areas shown in Table 1.

The duration of the TecVoc training programme ranges from 1 month (for agriculture) to 8 months (for electricals and wiring and auto mechanic). The TNAA study indicated that 38.5% of the youths had no skills and the remaining 61.5% of youths possess skills in limited areas that largely differ from the selected nine areas covered in the TecVoc training. This implies that most of the 449 youths who benefited from the TecVoc training were beginners who had very little or virtually no idea about the areas in which they were trained. Extending the training for a much longer duration would have helped the youths acquire the right skillsets to establish themselves and become self-employed.

Benefits from the TecVoc training programme. Asked about how they have been able to use the acquired skills to enhance their incomes and livelihood options, nearly all of the youths interviewed appreciated the programme, which they said has defined a career path for them, as most of them were untrained in the things they were doing for a living. They were optimistic about being successful and able to realise more incomes from the skillsets they had acquired from the TecVoc training after apprenticeship, which most of them were still doing to acquire more knowledge and practical skills.

Few of the beneficiaries who were practicing and had previous experience in the areas they received training on indicated that they have broadened their network of clients or customers. This they said is due to the increased quality of work they can now deliver and were exposed to new clients during the practical sessions of the TecVoc training. Combined with the BDET programme, these beneficiaries testified that they have been able to manage their finances well and increase their revenue sources and incomes.

Beneficiary concerns about the TecVoc training programme

The duration of the training. The beneficiaries raised general concerns about the duration of training, which they considered too short, particularly for most of the beginners to be able to acquire sufficient skills to operate independently and be self-employed. Asked what they have been able to do with the acquired skillsets, most of the beneficiaries indicated they were engaged in apprenticeships whereas others have been able to enrol for further studies at the Government Technical and Vocational Centre.

Certificates received a year after completing training. Beneficiaries also cited the length of time it took them to receive their certificates as a major hindrance to securing a job or fulfilling their potentials after the TecVoc training. All the beneficiary youths were only able to receive their certificates from the deputy chairman of the KYDC on Saturday, 23rd April 2019. This is about 3 days before field data collection for this evaluation and over 1 year after completing the training in March 2018. Because of this delay, some beneficiaries indicated that they have not been able to apply or secure jobs with the skills they learnt during the TecVoc training, as there was no proof of certification.

The authenticity of the TecVoc training certificates. The beneficiaries were not happy with the TecVoc training certificates, which they said lacked a stamp or seal, logo of UNDP, and the logo of the government of Sierra Leone. In addition, they were concerned that no formal certification ceremony was organised to involve the IPs, government officials, and UNDP. Individual beneficiaries collected the certificates from the deputy chairman of the KYDC. Some beneficiaries presented a sample of the BDET certificate which they describe as being more authentic than the TecVoc training certificates

Since the TecVoc training certificates were issued only 3 days before the interviews, it will be difficult to determine whether any of the beneficiaries could have their certificate rejected when presenting it during a job interview or in an office.

4.2.5 Business plan development and start-up capital

The UNDP implemented the BDS_c in partnership with Advocate for Social Justice and Development and Advocacy Initiative for Development. As indicated earlier, beneficiaries of this intervention are the 449 youths who received the TecVoc training. The rationale for this intervention is that, upon successful completion of the TecVoc training, beneficiaries would need basic tools and basic equipment to work with. The participants were organised in groups of participants who had received the same set of TecVoc training. They were encouraged to open a group bank account—something the groups indeed did. The idea with the group account was that start-up capital will be paid through the respective bank accounts. Depending on the number of individuals in a group, a flat amount of 1m SSL was to be paid for each group member participant. Also as a group, they will be able to afford the basic start-up tools and equipment. According to the participating beneficiaries, the start-up capital money was paid to individuals in cash and not through their newly opened group bank accounts, which incurred some costs and a certain amount had to be deposited in order to activate the accounts. When asked whether they used the money for its intended purpose, the participants interviewed indicated that only 20–30% of the amount was spent to purchase start-up tools, equipment, or machines. The rest of the money was spent to settle personal problems and household use. Most of the participants also admitted that the tools bought did not last long because of their poor quality.

Before the start-up capital was disbursed, beneficiary participants were trained in business development services and developed individual business plans. They were shown how to develop modest business plans with a budget that should not exceed the start-up amount of 1m SSL.

4.2.6 Land reclamation

This initiative reclaimed about 20 acres of land that were rendered useless by the ongoing mining activities in the district and reused for agriculture. More than 150 women and youths have been trained on NRM. These youths have engaged themselves in small-scale land reclamation projects, including as some artisanal miners who have expressed strong willingness to start land reclamation at the end of mining operations.

Furthermore, these youth groups help to monitor and sensitise other community members about good environmental practices. They have the knowledge and capacity to understand and interpret environmental and mining policies and documents that affect their communities. They also can initiate and manage environmental issues arising within their communities.

1. To what extent did the joint project attain the development outputs and outcomes described in the project document?

The outputs described in the project document were achieved as a whole at the end of the programme. FAO, UNDP, and local organisations were all able to deliver the number of planned outputs. (Note that the use of local expertise for the majority of tasks facilitated the achievement of results.) FAO and UNDP are two organisations with significant experience in their areas of intervention. They were able to guide the implementation of the activities that fall under their

responsibility until their finalisation. Because local organisations are familiar with their respective communities, they have facilitated the implementation by providing this expertise (Table 5).

Table 5: The beneficiaries of the different programme components

Indicators	Target	Achieved Target	Source of Verification
Output 1: Enhanced capacity for improved environmental monitoring			
1.1 Enhanced capacity for improved environmental monitoring	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>At least 30 community members demonstrate increased ability to rehabilitate mined-out land</i> 2. <i>20 acres of mined land rehabilitated</i> 3. <i>50 artisanal miners involved in alternative livelihood activities</i> 4. <i>100 artisanal miners aware of environmental impact of artisanal mining</i> 5. <i>At least 2 monitoring/coordination meetings conducted by local councils environmental committees on environmental management practices, including the NMA, EPA, and local stakeholders</i> 6. <i>15 CSOs and 10 traditional groups have knowledge in NRM policies and advocacy issues</i> 7. <i>At least 4 advocacy sessions held by CSOs on NRM</i> 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 150 community members (80 women) gained knowledge in mined-out land reclamation and practically engaged in land reclamation and development of plots 2. 20 acres of mined-out areas were reclaimed, developed, and under cultivation of various crops 3. 100 artisanal miners previously engaged in artisanal mining are now engaged in agriculture as an alternative livelihood 4. 150 miners are aware of environmental impact of artisanal mining 5. Two meetings were held in addition to several bilateral meetings and consultations 6. 150 youths and women (representing more than 25 groups) are knowledgeable and can articulate issues on extractive policies, laws, and practices 7. 5 advocacy sessions on impact of artisanal mining on the environment, health, and safety of residents within the district 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reports and registers 2. GIS maps produced 3. Reports and registers 4. Reports and testimonies 5. Reports and registers 6. Reports, registers, and testimonies 7. Audio clips of phone discussions

Indicators	Target	Achieved Target	Source of Verification
1.2 Strengthened dialogue and engagement between development stakeholders and the extractive sector	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 15 NGOs trained on improved ability for advocacy to promote constructive dialogue within the extractive sector 4 dialogue forums held between companies and district stakeholders At least 1 agreement reached between stakeholders on NRM and local development partnership 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 45 NGOs/CBOs were trained in improved advocacy skills 4 dialogue forums were held 1 partnership and cooperation agreement signed for the promotion of NRM and development agendas 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reports and registers Reports and registers Signed communique and advocacy plan
1.3 Inclusive community development processes facilitated	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 50 key stakeholders in Kono, including paramount chiefs, women, and youth representatives trained on budgeting, project design, and M&E related to CDAs Youth and women-focused programmes are designed or implemented by the community development committee 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> All 50 (10 women) stakeholders trained and supported in community consultations and program development 2 Schools and 1 market infrastructure are developed 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reports and registers Reports and procurement plans
Output 2: Local economy diversified through value chain development, increased entrepreneurship, economic productivity, and improved service delivery	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 450 youths given start-up kits after successful training At least 60 winners of business idea competition have established enterprises using seed capital and training experience 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 450 trained in entrepreneurship and developed business plans after mentorship on business start-ups No business idea competition was held 	Reports, beneficiaries

NMA = National Minerals Agency; EPA = Environmental Protection Agency of Sierra Leone

- To what extent has the joint project contributed to the advancement and the progress of fostering national ownership processes and outcomes (the design and implementation of National Development Plans, Public Policies, UNDAF, etc.)?

The Kono District was identified as the target region for the ABD approach by the United Nations Country Team. The district is one of the least developed areas in Sierra Leone and is characterised by extensive and complex development challenges as well as potential for conflict. At the time the SDG-F programme was designed, Kono had experienced significant problems due to the war and the prevailing conflict. Social and economic development in Kono District

has been challenged, and the infrastructure destroyed as a result of the conflict had yet to be rehabilitated to its pre-war state. The environment was also deeply harmed by the activities of artisanal diamond diggers: deep pits dug by people searching for diamonds were left uncovered and were filled with stagnant water, thus posing serious environmental and health risks to the local population. Unemployment rate was still high amongst the youths in Kono. They constituted a large portion of the total district population and were largely unemployed, subjugated, and marginalised. What is more, youths in Kono District faced limited opportunities for education/training, viable employment, health and social services. They were also susceptible to a growing tendency for violence and crime. All of these factors were among the reasons why the SDG-F programme selected Kono. Most of the development plans in place when the programme started had identified Kono District as a priority place for development programmes targeting youth employment, agriculture development, and conflict mitigation.

3. To what extent did the joint project help to increase stakeholder/citizen dialogue and or engagement on development issues and policies?

The SDG-F programme had a stakeholder engagement and sensitisation and awareness-raising component. This intervention helped to sustain the land reclamation intervention in the district. It is a common practice in the district to mine plots of land repeatedly, almost once every year. The local land-use planning within the mining chiefdoms in Kono District is such that any parcel of land under any other use (eg, agriculture, housing, etc.) can be taken over for mining. With support from the National Mineral Agency (NMA) and the programme's local IPs, continuous engagements and dialogue with the paramount chiefs and other chiefdom authorities have prohibited the use of reclaimed land parcels for mining. This is a significant win for the programme, as noted by the beneficiaries. They hope that even at the end of the programme's intervention, NMA and local NGOs will continue to provide them with needed support to be able to sustain the already reclaimed plots of land and possibly expand the plot area.

Also, the selection of the final beneficiaries was left to the communities. They were the ones who designated the potential beneficiaries at community level, after which the UNDP or FAO technician would perform a quick audit/check before identifying the ones who really matched the criteria. The final list was then negotiated with the target communities. The negotiation of the final list of beneficiaries was a platform for discussing broader community development issues and ways that they could tackle them.

4.3 EFFICIENCY

Efficiency: The extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results.

1. To what extent was the joint project's management model (governance and decision-making structures (ie, lead agency, joint project coordinator, project management committee, and national steering committee), financial management, and allocation of resources (ie, one work plan, one budget) efficient in comparison to the development results attained?

The designated UNDP and FAO project staff had day-to-day contact with the IPs and most of the SDG-F programme's beneficiaries. The continual communication with those stakeholders has allowed the programme to detect potential problems in a timely manner and act to solve them. Note that at times distance was an issue. Some contractors have failed to communicate their plans with the beneficiaries, leading them to wonder whether the programme would fulfil its

commitments. For example, some beneficiaries were still asking whether the programme is going to help them restock the poultry houses and fishponds after it had ended a few months ago.

On UNDP's side, management staff turnover was high. Over its lifetime the programme had three designated managers; this did not facilitate implementation.

UNDP was the lead implementing agency and FAO was a subcontractor. But both agencies have made adequate use of the human resources available at ministerial level to plan and implement their activities. In its role, UNDP ensured that the work was completed as planned and that procurement rules and regulations were being followed appropriately. The implementation and execution approach chosen is consistent with the approach adopted by UNDP with respect to its procurement rules and regulations. By working with locally owned businesses and the staff of the local CBOs, UNDP and FAO promoted local ownership and capacity building. The approach required more control and supervision because the counterparts did not necessarily use UNDP principles when procuring and managing funds. Another issue is that public partners worked based on their own objectives and plans, which required the programme occasionally to push more in order to have its priorities put forward. Implementation of the activities by private sector actors was all based on contractual arrangements.

2. To what extent were joint project's outputs and outcomes synergistic and coherent to achieve better results when compared to single-agency intervention? What efficiency gains/losses where there is a result?

Multi-stakeholder involvement facilitated programme planning and implementation. UNDP is recognised in some areas. But, for example, in agricultural development and fish-farming FAO has a proven track record and is far more significant. The same is true of peacebuilding and community development in general: UNDP's recognised experience in these areas is far more significant and important than for other partners. Local communities' knowledge of local partners has meant that the programme was able to proceed without major problems. Beneficiaries were quickly identified and enrolled in activities without loss of time. The achievement of programme results has been greatly facilitated by a synergistic approach adopted by stakeholders.

3. What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, business practices did the implementing partners use to promote/improve efficiency?

UNDP was the main recipient of the funds; FAO was a sub-recipient. Both have contracted local organisations and public and private sector actors to implement certain activities. Each entity oversaw the implementation of the activities for which it was responsible. In the same way, having each organisation responsible for achieving the results in front of the contracting organisation facilitated field monitoring. It should be noted, however, that there was not much interaction between organisations in the field. Indeed, although UNDP, FAO, and the ministries regularly met at the steering committees to discuss progress and problems, it was not the same for grassroots organisations. Two organisations may be in the same area and each one focuses solely on its own set of activities regardless of what others are doing, or with whom they are doing it.

That UNDP was solely responsible for the SDG-F programme facilitated the financial transactions. The requests for funds were made jointly, and UNDP sent the package to the

highest level on behalf of all. The involvement of the ministerial departments meant that the programme could count on their support up to a certain level without paying for their salaries.

4. What type of (administrative, financial and management) obstacles did the joint project face and to what extent have these affected its efficiency?

Purchasing inputs by partners not traditionally linked to UNDP has been problematic. These partners wanted to be paid before their benefits, which was not acceptable by UNDP. Similarly, because the programme includes many CBOs, they were not always used to UNDP procedures for financial management. They had to be trained and closely monitored to ensure that they followed these procedures adequately.

It has not been easy to find multiple service providers in bids. For example, to buy the fish fingerlings, only one person could satisfy the request. The same is true for the fish feed. It was necessary to make arrangements that could then ensure that the programme could get them by following the procedures but with a limited number of suppliers. Several of the experts involved in the programme were civil servants. To mobilise some of them, the programme had to contract them as external consultants.

4.4 IMPACT

Impact: The positive and negative effects of the intervention on development outcomes, SDGs.

1. To what extent and in what ways did the joint project contribute to the SDGs?
2. To what extent and in what ways did the joint project contribute to the targeted crosscutting issues: gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment, PPPs, and sustainability at local and national levels?

Sierra Leone is a patriarchal society. Women are vulnerable to gender-based violence, and discrimination is exacerbated by lack of access to land and economic dependency on men. By providing women with increased financial stability and independence, the programme helped to challenge deep-rooted gender norms, influence the normal power structure, and promote women's rights. When women have an income, substantial evidence indicates that it is more likely to be spent on food and children's needs. The majority of economic activity in Sierra Leone is attributed to women; however, this is predominantly via the informal sector—small-scale farming and small trading. Lack of access to decent work for women in Sierra Leone contributes to poverty and to gender-based discrimination. The programme also contributed to the achievement of SDGs under Pillar 8 of the Government's Agenda for Prosperity; namely, to empower women and girls through education, participation, and representation in decision-making and access to equal justice and economic opportunities. Nonetheless, gender and social inclusion were very poor at the very outset of the programme. Despite a design calling for 50/50 male-female youth targets, training categories identified were not quite female friendly and very little effort was done to involve women's organisation at the inception stages of programme. Only 10% (46) of women (out of 450 youths) participated in the nine categories of vocational skills training. Formal application processes might have limited illiterate female youths and young women from applying for the vocational training opportunities support in the SDG-F programme. As part of the land reclamation of 20 acres of mined-out pits, however, 114 women (out of 200 people) benefited from agricultural livelihood support invested by the programme.

3. To what extent did the joint project have an impact on the targeted beneficiaries? Where all targeted beneficiaries reached? Which were left out?

In terms of numbers, the programme reached all the beneficiaries who were identified in its initial plan. Those who have been trained have increased their knowledge and skills that allow them to start a business later. Those involved in poultry and fish production were also trained. Their groups received inputs for a production cycle. The majority, however, was unable to continue the activity after the programme's support ended. The difficulties of supplying inputs are the main causes. In addition, the management of the proceeds from these activities has not been clearly defined. This is why, after a production cycle, most fishponds and henhouses stopped operating. FAO, however, has identified these difficulties and intends to continue the programme in the same areas and beyond with its own budget. This new programme will build on existing experience and provide solutions for sustainable input supply and financial management.

4. What unexpected/unintended effects did the joint project have, if any?

At the time of this evaluation, no unexpected/unintended effects attributable to the programme were noted.

4.5 SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability: The probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term.

1. Which mechanisms already existed and which have been put in place by the joint project to ensure results and impact (ie, policy, policy coordination mechanism, partnership, networks)?
2. To what extent has the capacity of beneficiaries (institutional and/or individual) been strengthened such that they are resilient to external shocks and/or do not need support in the long term?

Beneficiaries who were trained under the SDG-F programme now have the opportunity to launch their businesses in future, provided they mobilise resources for that. The programme was not intended to facilitate this exercise and was limited to providing them with a starter package at the end of the training. It should be noted that the use of this starter package has not always been linked to the training received. The committees set up to facilitate dialogue with mining companies have also been strengthened and will continue to benefit their communities.

In terms of fish- and chicken-farming, there is a real opportunity to continue in future if communities can mobilise resources to revive production after the first cycle. This was not really the case at the time of this evaluation. For example, during the field visit, it was a concern that out of the eight poultry firms established by the programme, only one had restocked after the sale of the 500 birds supplied by FAO. It was even more worrisome that the programme ended just at the time the 6-month poultry feed supply was exhausted and the birds were sold. This was done without an exit plan in place to ensure that the poultry firms restock and start managing their business all by themselves, including buying poultry feed and other inputs. Interviews with some of the poultry firms suggest that they all have a plan to restock but were generally challenged financially to do so.

The experienced YYFA poultry indicated that one of the biggest challenges poultry firms in Kono should overcome in order to stay in business is the poor access to and high cost of poultry feed. As Table 3 showed, although the cost of preparing local feed is cheaper, the supply of local

raw materials is scarce. Imported feed is readily available relative to local poultry feed, but it is much more expensive. According to YYFA poultry, the firm is only able to prepare local feed for its current stock of 500 ISA brown birds with about 60% of local maize. The rest of the 40% maize and other essential raw materials such as concentrate and limestone are imported. The YYFA indicated that the higher the percentage of local raw materials it uses to prepare feed, the cheaper the cost of the feed, hence higher revenue and profit margin. The bulk of poultry expenses is incurred on the daily feed, they noted with emphasis.

Seven of the eight established poultry firms are new to the poultry business. None bought feed for their birds throughout the programme's intervention. The high cost of poultry feed remains a critical challenge that the new firms have yet to face after restocking in order to survive. The YYFA established an agricultural component to poultry production, in which the youths use part of the generated dung as organic manure to cultivate maize. This is currently done at pilot phase, as a huge quantity of the maize used in the feed preparation is bought off-farm.

3. To what extent will the joint project be replicated or scaled up at local or national levels?

The installation of fishponds and henhouses can easily be taken over by any actor interested in local development and improving the living conditions of the Kono people; however, some problems need to be solved. This is the case, for example, with poultry food, fish, and fry supply. The populations targeted by the SDG-F programme traditionally group together to defend their interests. If the programme were to be replicated in the same areas, the level of organisation might not be a problem. But if the programme is to be replicated elsewhere, it will have to make organisational development a priority.

The beneficiaries who were trained said they were all satisfied with the programme, while emphasising the need to align the support given as a starter package to their realities. In this case for example, those who had gone through driving school have had a starter package that does not allow them to do something individually. The programme could in fact, for all the beneficiaries, facilitate the liaison with the financial service providers, and accompany them to benefit from financing to be reimbursed. In this case, the role of the programme could focus more on support and monitoring.

The government has a fishpond development plan that it is currently implementing. It plans to expand it to more communities; but the following problems will need to be addressed in the future:

- The feed that was supplied to the groups were starter feeds, and the groups lack access to the appropriate feed elsewhere. (The groups expressed having no idea about where to purchase the required feed.) The groups believed that this might have slowed fish growth.
- All the fishponds were earth-ponds. According to the groups, this makes harvesting in the muddy water very difficult and time consuming. In addition, the groups expressed concern that it was difficult to distinguish between the matured fish and fingerlings, with some fish hiding in the mud during harvest. It was generally difficult to manage the ponds and monitor the growth or abundance of the fish in the muddy water.
- Another challenge the groups experienced with the fishpond was the lack of a preservation facility or system. Because of this, the groups are forced to sell their fish on the same day of harvest in order to avoid post-harvest losses. Consequently, the groups are unable to negotiate better prices, hence the profit margins are squeezed.

Finally, FAO has decided to replicate the programme, taking care to solve most of the problems that have already been noted.

4.6 LESSONS LEARNT

1. What good practice, success stories, lesson learnt, and replicable experiences have been identified?

At the end of the programme, several lessons learnt during implementation have been identified as very critical:

- Effective, timely involvement of locally based women's organisations in the district will provide critical contributions in effectively attracting and enrolling more female youths in the similar livelihoods programmes in future. A more female-friendly recruitment enrolment process should be deliberately applied to increase the numbers of female participants.
- High expectations of programme to provide daily allowances for vocational skills training activities attracted some youths for the wrong motives which discouraged many trainees and lowered daily attendance. Inception activities were not sufficiently adequate in disseminating programme information and implementation plans. Misinformed youths many times targeted and protested against IPs, leading to delays in activity delivery.
- Providing initial clarifications on what the programme's implementation plans, resources, and explicit criteria of enrolment can offer significant clarifications in managing participants' and public expectations about the programme.
- Divided stakeholder interests and stereotypical notions about one another in the extractive sector created an adversarial atmosphere among stakeholders and furthered apprehension about stakeholder dialogue. Bilateral stakeholder consultations through a well-known and respected CSO (IP) leveraged the need for open discussions and dialogue among stakeholders. CSOs were trained in new approaches of advocacy and developed a development-focused and partnership-based advocacy plan that all other stakeholders contributed to and adopted.
- Adequate bilateral and multi-stakeholder consultations focused on community interests and local development issues will drive a strong need for partnership and synergy-building among previously opposing stakeholders.
- The initial investment in building and stocking of poultry farms and fishponds has laid a solid foundation for the farmers to build on and expand the business. Also, the feed mill that is being run by the private sector will not only serve the beneficiaries of the project, but it will also provide similar services to other farmers.
- Collective or group approaches (self-help groups or CBOs) can foster knowledge-sharing and economic links among stakeholders and can overcome some of the constraints faced by individuals.
- Simple, low-cost technologies for subsistence-oriented aquaculture are more likely to be successfully adopted by farmers living in remote areas with limited access to inputs, fingerlings, and technical support.
- The targeted beneficiaries for the poultry houses and fishponds are youths. But because the return on investment is not readily available, it may take some time. Some of the youths preferred to forego the benefit of poultry and fish-farming for that of mining for diamonds or gold, which possibly could of provide unexplained wealth for such categories of people. The

SDG-F programme team had to work with the few beneficiaries who were committed and business-minded.

- Interference of leadership authority in programme implementation is very prominent in Kono District. Youth leaders and other key stakeholders always want to dictate the direction of programme activities in favour of their areas of self-interest. Continuous consultations with local leaders were the key strategies used during programme implementation.
- Reaching selected beneficiary communities was challenging because of deplorable roads and poor communication networks. During the inception meeting held with key stakeholders of the beneficiaries' communities, specific locations were agreed to benefit directly from the programme. But the long distances and deplorable road conditions frequently delayed the rate of programme implementation.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1.1 Conclusions

The activities supported by the programme revolve around generating jobs for young people and women, strengthening local dialogue with a view to better taking into account the needs of communities, and building capacity. Communities in the Kono District that have been targeted are known to be very poor and vulnerable because of the mining done by multinationals. As a result, it is recognised that the SDG-F programme is entirely relevant and meets the needs of the beneficiaries.

The national development plans as well as the United Nations Development Assistance Framework are all planning to contribute to finding the appropriate solutions to the same problems targeted by the programme. The programme's objectives are still valid at the time of this evaluation because, although it has affected some community members, there are still many people who have not had access to the benefits of the programme and are still very vulnerable. UNDP has opted for joint programming with FAO and local organisations to maximise programme efficiency. Each entity has focused on the areas in which it has a comparative advantage through experience or means, which has reached the most people with the right level of resources.

At the time of this evaluation, all the planned outputs have been achieved. As a result, from the point of view of efficiency, the programme is a complete success.

At the time of the assessment, several fishponds and henhouses were shut down. The communities had just gone through a production cycle and had not put in place the necessary mechanisms to continue production. This is because UNDP and FAO have largely supported communities in the first phase of production without giving them enough time to learn. Similarly, the revenue management procedures were not always clear, which resulted in the organisations having no money left after only one production cycle. Similarly, UNDP and FAO directly purchased inputs such as fry and poultry feed, which were difficult to find in the country. A sustainable and continuous supply of inputs is therefore important for the sustainability of supported activities.

The activities promoted by the programme have largely contributed to the establishment of forums for dialogue in the communities as they required ongoing consultation between beneficiaries for strategic planning and day-to-day management.

The programme contributes to the achievement of SDG on job creation, the fight against extreme poverty, and the participation of women in community development. Yet the programme lacked a good gender strategy which, although the problems the programme identified and addressed primarily affected women and youth, men made up the bulk of the beneficiaries. This was not corrected and continued throughout the life of the programme.

With regard to sustainability, several beneficiaries saw their capacities increased with the professional training they received. Even if at the time of this evaluation they had not yet established a business, it is nevertheless true that the training received was relevant and will enable them to find a job that will potentially contribute to improving their living conditions.

5.1.2 Recommendations

At the end of the evaluation, the following recommendations have been made for the future:

No.	Recommendation	Priority	Means of Verification
For UNDP and FAO			
1.	The selection of beneficiaries for local development projects must be done by the communities themselves, but with adequate staff supervision to ensure that this selection meets the criteria and standards of inclusion advocated by the organisations.	High	Activity report, beneficiary selection reports
2.	The mobilisation of beneficiaries' financial participation is important to ensure their continued interest in the activities and objectives pursued by the programme.	High	Duly signed partnerships with CBOs
3.	It is important in future to provide more organisational support to the trained groups involved in the programmes supported by both organisations. This support would affect management as well as planning and financial management.	High	Partnership agreements with local communities
4.	The inclusion of other private sector actors, including input and financial service providers, is an element to be considered in the future to boost sustainability.	Medium	Partnership agreements with private sector actors
5.	To improve on the beneficiary impact and sustainability of future poultry project, the intervention strategies should be tailored to improve on the local supply of maize, which is the principal component of the poultry feed.	High	National development plans, partnership agreements signed
6.	The programme's interventions are time bound, and usually new poultry firms would need more time than the programme's timeframe to function independently. Working with the already established poultry enterprises, which have learnt some good and bad lessons, should be considered very strongly.	High	Activity report, project performance reports

No.	Recommendation	Priority	Means of Verification
	An innovative and knowledge-sharing forum should be established among these poultry firms to help weaker ones with useful practical information about poultry enterprise.		
<i>For the local organisations</i>			
7.	It is important for local organisations to maintain the groups formed and to mobilise regular financial participation from members to prepare for possible support from UNDP, FAO, or other development partners.	Medium	Monitoring reports, organisations activity reports
8.	Local organisations that have already benefited from the UNDP or FAO support for poultry houses and fishponds must immediately work to restart them to show their interest in these activities and their ambition to become autonomous.	Medium	Organisations activity reports
<i>For the government of Sierra Leone</i>			
9.	The Sierra Leone government needs to support the emergence of a private sector that can provide inputs for poultry and fish farming.	High	National development plans
10.	Support programmes for local communities need to involve public authorities much more, which in turn must integrate them into their planning cycle as they respond to the real needs of the population.	Medium	Activity reports

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1. DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

Name :	
Position:	
Department/Institution	
Date:	
Questions	
How did the interventions under this SDGF project, align with the country needs and priorities with regard to sustainable poverty alleviation?	
How was your institution involved in the negotiations that lead to the design and implementation of this project?	
How relevant to its intended beneficiaries are the project objectives?	
How do you find the overall institutional arrangements under this project? How is the collaboration with UNDP?	
How do you find the establishment of the Steering committees? Does it serve its purpose?	
Do you think the project is generated its expected results?	
What are some of the impacts of this project that surprised you? Where negative, what have you done to mitigate?	
Did you discover any significant risk/challenge risk during implementation? If Yes what were they and how were they addressed during implementation?	
What were the most effective coordination and management strategies used by the project ?	
What operational issues did you have during implementation? And how were they addressed?	
What would you have wanted different with this project?	
What, do you think, is most innovative about your approach to this project? To project delivery?	
How often did you receive regular performance reports/update from the project?	
Other comments:	

Questionnaire for the staff of the implementing partners including UNDP

Name and position of interviewee	
Institution:	
Institution	
Date:	
Questions	
What process did you use to ensure the project expected results were consistent with your priorities, and vulnerable communities in Kono?	
What are the nature, quantity and quality of results against those intended? What difference was made in the lives of the beneficiaries and their households?	
Did the project generate the results you expected – Was there a point you realized the intervention logic or assumptions were not quite accurate and how did you address?	

What are some of the impacts of this project that surprised you? Where negative, what have you done to mitigate?	
What were the major risks/challenges to this project?	
Was gender considered during the project inception phase, and how? How has gender been added or adjusted during the project lifecycle? How about environmental impacts?	
What operational issues have you encountered during implementation, and how did you address them?	
What, do you think, was most innovative about your approach to this project? To project delivery?	
How often did you meet with the implementing partners/beneficiaries? In your opinion, is it too much, too infrequent, or just right for your needs?	
Did you see any noticeable income change as a result of project activities? If Yes How and where?	
How satisfied are you with the partnership with the other stakeholders?	
What could be the three major lessons learned that your organization could take from this project?	
What's next now for the communities in Kono?	
Other comments:	

Discussion guide with project beneficiaries

Name: List of the people interviewed	
Location/group	
Date:	
Questions	
How are the interventions under this project addressing your revenues, food security and employment needs?	
Are the objectives still relevant, valid and consistent with your different needs?	
Which activities are you involved in?	
How has the project made a difference in your lives?	
Did the project generate the results you expect from it?	
What do you think are the top three things that work really well with the project?	
What do you think are the top three things that could have be improved or done differently to improve the project outcomes?	
Which of your capacities/skills has the project changed? And how?	
How were women involved in the project, as opposed to men?	
Do you have any noticeable income change following your participation in the project activities? Explain please!	
Other comments:	

ANNEX 2. LIST OF PEOPLE MET

Group	Location	Interview	Intervention	Implementing Partner
Wondaema Youth Organization	Koidu, Tankoro chiefdom	Key Informant Interview	Poultry Fishpond	FAO
Yormatha Youth Farmers Association	Tombudu, Kamara chiefdom	Key Informant Interview	Poultry Fishpond	FAO
Moindefeh Yormatha Youth Development Organization	Koidu, Gbense chiefdom	Key Informant Interview	Poultry	FAO
Nimiyama Youth Coalition	Sewafe town-Nimiyama Chiefdom	No one to talk to	Poultry	FAO
Principal, Government Technical and Vocational Center, Kono	Koidu	Key Informant Interview	Technical and Vocational Skills Training	UNDP and GTVC-Kono
Tankoro Women Cooperative Association	Koidu, Tankoro chiefdom	Focus Group Discussion	Land Reclamation	UNDP and ASJD, NMA, Chiefdom Stakeholders
Momonordema Women Association		Focus Group Discussion	Land Reclamation	UNDP and ASJD, NMA, Chiefdom Stakeholders
Beneficiaries of the Technical and Vocational Skills Training Auto mechanic Electrical Installation and Fitting Masonry (building & construction)	Koidu	3 Key Informant Interview	Technical and Vocational Skills Training	GTVC Kono
Kono District Youth Commission	Koidu	Key Informant Interview	All interventions	
ASJD	Koidu	Key Informant Interview	Land reclamation	

ANNEX 3. TERMS OF REFERENCE

FINAL EVALUATION OF SDG-F JOINT PROGRAMMES

1. General Context: the SDG-F

The Sustainable Development Goals Fund is a development cooperation mechanism created in 2014 to support sustainable development activities through integrated and multidimensional Joint Programmes. It builds on the experience, knowledge, lessons learnt, and best practices of the MDG Fund and the MDG experience, while focusing on the fostering of sustainable development, public-private partnerships and gender and women's empowerment as cross-cutting priorities in all our areas of work. The SDG Fund aims to act as a bridge in the transition from MDGs to SDGs providing concrete experiences on how to achieve a sustainable and inclusive world as part of 'Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development.'

In Sierra Leone, the programme is implemented in the framework of a UN multi-agency Area-Based Development (ABD) approach in the Kono district, eastern Sierra Leone. The programme focuses on two broad, interlinked intervention areas that aim to enhance sustainable, inclusive governance of natural resources as well as diversification of sustainable livelihood opportunities in one of the most mineral-rich, but least developed areas in the country. The programme has particular significance given the Ebola outbreak that is having devastating social and economic impacts on the country. This programme will contribute greatly to the response and recovery phases through support to the most vulnerable people in Kono, whose livelihoods are gravely affected by the crisis.

The programme is designed with a strong focus on achieving tangible results by building on and complementing previous or ongoing activities of UNDP, FAO, and other partners.

1) Inclusiveness, accountability, and transparency in natural resources management.

1.1: Enhanced capacity for environmental monitoring

Enhancing the implementation of legal frameworks is a key priority to promote people-centered and environmentally sustainable exploration and exploitation of natural resources. The capacity of the Environment Protection Agency (EPA), Local Councils, communities, and especially women, will be enhanced to actively participate, interpret, and process environmental and social sustainability impact assessments (ESIA's), as well as to monitor their implementation. Support will be provided to expand open-access GIS-databases of natural resource use and environmental change to foster transparency and accountability.

1.2: Strengthened dialogue and engagement between development stakeholders and the extractive sector

Existing platforms established by local NGOs will be engaged to advocate for open and inclusive management of natural resources. The programme will strengthen the capacity of these NGOs to promote constructive dialogue with the extractive sector on economic, social, and cultural rights, with specific focus on women's empowerment.

Opportunities will be identified to address grievances from communities affected by the kimberlite mining industry in the centre of Koidu city, through improved participatory processes with the Community Relations Committee (CRC). Women, who are often left out of these discussions despite being disproportionately affected by unsustainable natural resource management activities, will be equally represented. The programme will strengthen the capacity of women in targeted communities to participate actively in constructive dialogue with the extractive sector.

1.3: Inclusive community development processes facilitated

Community Development Agreements (CDAs) are required by law, and involve the allocation of revenue from extractive activities to local communities. However, insufficient bargaining capacity within communities has led to imbalanced negotiations with the industrial extractive sector. The programme will enhance stakeholder capacity to meaningfully engage in CDA needs assessments, prioritization, planning, budgeting, and monitoring processes. Particular attention will be paid to including provisions that are dedicated to youth employment. Gender equality will also be a high priority – for example ensuring that women are fully involved in the processes and that the specific needs of women, men, girls and boys are met when negotiating CDAs.

2) Livelihoods improved through diversified and inclusive economic opportunities

2.1. Local economy diversified through value chain development, increased entrepreneurship, economic productivity, and improved service delivery.

The programme will support diversification in sectors that offer potential for job creation and business opportunities. Strategic Public-Private Partnerships will be established with regional and local businesses and Local Councils for risk sharing and resource leveraging, with specific focus on promoting job creation and income generation for youth and women.

Partnerships will be formed around agriculture, aquaculture, value added trade, mini-processing and production activities, which will be based on the thorough analysis of local market needs. As a first priority communities will be equipped with knowledge and skills to establish and manage mini-aquaculture enterprises and poultry-farms. This will contribute to creating livelihood diversification opportunities, as well as improving food and nutrition security, especially in rural areas. Other barriers to economic diversification will be addressed by providing vocational training, building business skills, and offering seed capital and enterprise development to boost self-employment, both in urban and rural areas, based on gaps analyses.

2.2. Economic opportunities for women increased to combat gender inequality

Specific attention in creating economic opportunities by the programme will be directed towards women. Lack of access to decent work for women in Sierra Leone contributes to poverty and to gender-based discrimination. Key entry points for contributing to women's economic empowerment will be elaborated.

Acknowledging that women's economic empowerment requires transforming gender relations at all levels, men, diverse groups will be engaged to work towards gender equality, and to question violence and non-equitable versions of manhood. Women's groups will empower them to play more active roles in decision-making processes.

2. OVERALL GOAL OF THE EVALUATION

To promote accountability, organizational learning, stocktaking of achievements, performance, impacts, good practices and lessons learnt from implementation towards SDGs.

3. KEY PROJECT OUTPUTS PRODUCED

- **Development of the Kono-Model Community Development Agreement**
- **Establishment and strengthening of community development committees; build capacity of members on project management**

- **Raising awareness of youths on extractive laws and Strengthening the advocacy skills of NGOs**
- **Strengthen the capacity of EPA to effectively manage and share monitoring data**
- **Constructed, stocked and supported youths to manage 8 poultry and 24 fish ponds**
- **Trained youths in vocational skills and supports with business development services**
- **Supported district level institutions & structures and NGOs to develop bylaws to control environmental degradation from artisanal mining**
- **Rehabilitated mined-out pits to restore site for other purposes**
- **Conducted studies to understand market issues, sources of conflict and grievances in mining communities.**

4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

This final evaluation has the following **specific objectives**:

- Measure to what extent the joint programme has contributed to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase
- To measure joint programme's degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes, against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised
- Measure to what extent the joint programme has attained the results originally foreseen in their project document, M&E frameworks, etc.
- To measure the impact of the joint programme on the achievement of the SDGs
- To identify and document substantive lessons learnt and good practices on the specific topics of the thematic areas and crosscutting issues: gender, sustainability and public private partnerships

5. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation will apply the OECD/DAC criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Specific evaluations may include but are not limited to the following:

Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country and achieving the SDGs

- How has the joint programme contributed to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase, in particular with reference to the baseline situation?
- To what extent was the joint programme aligned with national development strategies and the UNDAF/UNDAP?
- To what extent was joint programming the best option to respond to development challenges described in the programme document?
- To what extent are the objectives of the joint programme still valid in the context of national policy objectives and SDGs?
- To what extent have the implementing partners participating in the joint programme contributed added value to solve the development challenges stated in the programme document?

5.1 Effectiveness: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved

- To what extent did the joint programme attain the development outputs and outcomes described in the programme document?

- What good practices, success stories, lessons learnt and replicable experiences have been identified? Please describe and document them
- To what extent has the joint programme contributed to the advancement and the progress of fostering national ownership processes and outcomes (the design and implementation of National Development Plans, Public Policies, UNDAF, etc.)
- To what extent did the joint programme help to increase stakeholder/citizen dialogue and or engagement on development issues and policies?

5.2 Efficiency: Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results

- To what extent was the joint programme's management model (governance and decision-making structure, i.e. lead agency, Joint Programme Coordinator, Programme Management Committee and National Steering Committee, financial management and allocation of resources, i.e. one work plan, one budget) efficient in comparison to the development results attained?
- To what extent were joint programme's outputs and outcomes synergistic and coherent to achieve better results when compared to single-agency interventions? What efficiency gains/losses were there as a result?
- What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, business practices did the implementing partners use to promote/improve efficiency?
- What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the joint programme face and to what extent have these affected its efficiency?

5.3 Impact – Positive and negative effects of the intervention on development outcomes, SDGs

- To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to the SDGs?
- To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to the targeted cross-cutting issues: gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment, public private partnerships (PPPs) and sustainability at the local and national levels?
- What impact did the matching funds have in the design, implementation and results of the joint programme?
- To what extent did the joint programme have an impact on the targeted beneficiaries? Were all targeted beneficiaries reached? Which were left out?
- What unexpected/unintended effects did the joint programme have, if any?

5.4 Sustainability: Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term

- Which mechanisms already existed and which have been put in place by the joint programme to ensure results and impact, i.e. policy, policy coordination mechanisms, partnerships, networks?
- To what extent has the capacity of beneficiaries (institutional and/or individual) been strengthened such that they are resilient to external shocks and/or do not need support in the long term?
- To what extent will the joint programme be replicated or scaled up at local or national levels?

6. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

This final evaluation will make use of:

- **All relevant secondary information sources**, such as reports, programme documents, internal review reports, programme files, strategic country development documents, evaluations and

- **Primary information sources** including: interviews, surveys, etc. to ensure participatory approach and appropriate consultation and engagement of stakeholders
- **Triangulating of information** to allow for validation and discern discrepancies

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in the inception report and the final evaluation report, and should contain, at minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory approaches.

7. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The Evaluator will provide the following deliverables:

7.1 Inception Report

This report will be 10 to 15 pages in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for data collection. It will also include a proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. The desk study report will propose initial lines of inquiry about the joint programme this report will be used as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the Evaluator and the evaluation reference group. The report will follow this outline in Annex II:

7.2 Draft Final Report

The draft final report will follow the same format as the final report (described in the next paragraph) and will be 30-40 pages in length. See Annex III for the template.

7.3 Final Evaluation Report

The final report will be 30-40 pages in length. It will also contain an executive summary of no more than five pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be sent to the evaluation reference group. This report will follow the template and follow the outline as given in Annex III.

8. ROLES OF ACTORS IN THE EVALUATION – EVALUATION REFERENCE GROUP

The main actors in the evaluation process are the UNDP country Office, the management team of the joint programme (UNDP/FAO), including the Joint Programme Manager, M&E Officer, in addition to the Programme Management Committee. This group of institutions and individuals will serve as the **evaluation reference group**. Its role will extend to all phases of the evaluation, including:

- Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design
- Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation
- Providing input on the evaluation planning
- Prepare communication and dissemination plan
- Providing input and participating in the drafting of the Terms of Reference
- Facilitating the Evaluator's access to all information and relevant documentation, as well as to key actors, stakeholders and informants
- Monitoring the quality of the process and deliverables generated
- Prepare improvement/action plan following the submission of the final evaluation report

- Disseminating the results of the evaluation, especially among the organizations and entities within their interest group

9. TIMELINE FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The detailed schedule of the evaluation and length of the assignment will be discussed with the Consultant prior to the assignment. The estimated duration of the assignment is up to 20 days and the tentative schedule is as follows:

- Desk review, inception methodology for evaluation and field work (10 days);
- Preliminary Report and Validation of Preliminary Report (5 days);
- Feedback from key stakeholders and UNDP and Final Report (3 days)

10. USE AND UTILITY OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation reference group and any other stakeholders relevant for the joint programme will jointly design and implement a complete **communication and dissemination plan** to share the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations with the aim to advocate for sustainability, replicability, scaling up or to share good practices and lessons learnt at local, national or/and international level.

The **communication and dissemination plan** should at least aim to target all members of the NSC and PMC and other relevant stakeholders as necessary.

11. ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation of the joint programme is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

- **Anonymity and confidentiality** - the evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality
- **Responsibility** - the report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen between the Evaluator and the Joint Programme in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The team must corroborate all assertions, or disagreement with them noted
- **Integrity** - the Evaluator will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the TOR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention
- **Independence** - the Evaluator should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof
- **Incidents** - if problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to the SDG Fund contact at UNDP. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by the Secretariat in these terms of reference
- **Validation of information** - the Evaluator will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report
- **Intellectual property** - in handling information sources, the Evaluator shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review
- **Delivery of reports** - if delivery of the reports is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is clearly lower than what was agreed, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable

12. TEAM COMPOSITION AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT

The Evaluation Team will include one team leader (an international consultant) and a national consultant. The presence of an international consultant is deemed desirable given the complexity and sensitivity of some of the issues concerned, and therefore to safeguard independence and impartiality of the evaluation.

The Consulting Team with support from UNDP Sierra Leone shall be responsible for setting up meetings with all key stakeholders of the project, both government and non-governmental organizations.

13. COMPETENCIES OF THE EVALUATOR(S)

The Consultants (1 international and 1 local-with the external consultant serving as lead consultant in the process) shall have the following skills and knowledge:

13.1 Skills

- Must have acquired a master's degree in Natural Resource Management, Environmental Sciences, development studies or any related social science discipline.
- At least seven (7) years' experience in conducting external project evaluations using different approaches and these will include non- traditional and innovative evaluation methods
- Expertise in gender, alternative livelihoods and human rights based approaches to evaluation
- experience in conducting or managing evaluations, research or review of development programmes, and experience as main writer of an evaluation report.
- Experience in collecting qualitative and quantitative data
- A strong commitment to deliver timely and high-quality results, i.e. credible evaluation and report
- Strong team leadership and management track record
- Good interpersonal and communication skills, an ability to communicate with various stakeholders, and an ability to express ideas and concepts concisely and clearly;
- Good knowledge of the Extractive sector systems; a previous working experience in Sierra Leone will be an asset.

13.2 Local Knowledge

- Must have acquired a master's degree in Natural Resource Management, Environmental Sciences, development studies or any related social science discipline.
- Regional/Country experience and knowledge: in-depth knowledge of Sierra Leone
- Language proficiency: fluency in English and Sierra Leonean languages
- Should be experienced in the extractive sector or technical areas addressed by the evaluation.
- Should be an evaluation specialist and be experienced in using evaluation methodologies suitable for this project.