

Terms of Reference

For the end-of-project evaluation of the project

“Democratic and Participator Sector Governing Institutions – Civil Society Engagement in Water Sector Management, Kenema District, Sierra Leone.”

Financed by Civil Samfund i Udvikling (CISU) and other private donors.

To be conducted during November/December 2020

1. Background

Since 2011, EWB DK in partnership with EWB SL has been implementing the project “Right to Water and Sanitation: Community Development in Kenema District, Sierra Leone”. During phase 1, 2011 – 2013, emphasis was given to raising local communities’ awareness of safe water supplies and hygiene, and constructing safe water points, i.e. hand-dug wells with a hand pump and rainwater collection (RWC) and latrines in three villages. While the construction of water supply systems was successful, the nationally adopted strategy of Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) was less so. Phase 1 of the project was funded by CISU through EWB.

Phase 2, 2013 - 2016, which was based on the experiences of phase 1. With strategic service delivery and promotion of sanitation and hygiene as entry point, phase 2 focused on a human rights based approach to the development of civil society and community based organizations; while concurrently strengthening capacity and knowledge of district officials (duty bearers) to enable them to fulfill their responsibilities for provision of water and sanitation in dialogue and together with beneficiaries (rights holders). Phase 2 incorporated a modified version of CLTS on the part of sanitation, allowing for subsidies to a certain degree.

The current Phase 3, 2018 - 2020, which is to be evaluated under this assignment, is based on the experiences of previous phases. The intervention supports improved livelihood in 26 rural. 21 communities are selected based upon previous implemented projects, and 5 additional communities have been selected in cooperation with district authorities, based upon pre-set criteria regarding i.e. organisation structures and potential for community empowerment. Basic empowerment, building and strengthening autonomy and self-determination, will be the main focus in 21 communities, while all 26 communities will be strengthened regarding civil society’s awareness of rights, and form a critical mass for advocacy from a community level towards district level. Triggering in the form of initiation of community empowerment using WASH as a strategic leverage point has been conducted in the participating communities during two former CISU-funded project. Hence, this phase steps up the focus on direct participation and work more strategically with strengthening of structures/institutions at district level, to secure participation of civil society in the local official decision making processes, specifically in the WASH sector.

The **overall development objective** of the project is: Improved livelihoods in 26 targeted communities based on participatory decision-making and local policy-making involving civil society and district level authorities within the water and sanitation sector of Kenema District.

This is to be achieved through the fulfilment of the following three intermediate objectives within strategic service delivery, capacity development and advocacy:

Intermediate Objective 1: Fulfilment of the right to clean water and improved levels of hygiene and sanitation ensured in 5 new targeted communities (new project communities).

Intermediate Objective 2: Civil society organized at community level, aware of rights and able to advocate for civil rights and transparency towards district level authorities (duty-bearers) on WASH and other community development issues (involving 26 communities).

Intermediate Objective 3: Improved implementation and transparency of national WASH policy at district level due to institutionalised coordination among district politicians and technical administration (duty-bearers) and relevant stakeholders at district level with functional, and invited spaces for participatory decision-making with civil society and citizens of Kenema District (rights-holders) ensured.

2. Objectives of the End of Project Evaluation

The objective of the evaluation is to:

- Assess the degree to which the project has reached its objectives, outputs and activities according to the indicators stated in the project description,
- Guide SEND and EWB-DK in improving strategic focus and knowledge when supporting future interventions on water and sanitation and community development in a wider sense,
- Guide EWB/DK in future projects involving national/local level authorities.

EWB-DK has worked with EWB-SL since the first phase of the project, however due to certain disagreements regarding capacity development of EWB-SL the cooperation ended during this phase of the project. SEND has from January 2020 taken over as the local implementing partner, based on its substantial local experience in particular related to community engagement.

3. Methodology of the evaluation

The evaluation will be based on a combination of desk study of available project data and documentation; interviews with EWB DK (online), SEND; interviews with core district and local stakeholders in SL; and site visits and focus group discussions in selected communities in Kemena District, to the extent the COVID-19 situation allows.

The evaluation must be conducted in accordance with the OECD/DAC criteria for evaluations¹. In evaluating impact of the project the consultant will include physical structures constructed also during the 2 previous phases, with a view to operations, maintenance and sustainability.

Prior to commencement of the assignment, the consultant will prepare an interview guide and a checklist for interview and focus group discussions, which will be discussed and agreed upon with EWB DK. The consultant will also present a detailed activity plan, to be approved by SEND and EWB-DK, which includes:

- Desk study of EWB-DK and SEND project material (the project description, project reports including ViewWorld reports, previous evaluation reports from all phases, and training material used in field);
- Interviews with SEND Staff;
- Interviews with SEND Board Members;
- Interviews with relevant district level stakeholder (local authorities – formal as well as informal, NGOs and other development agents operating in the sector in the region);
- Interviews and field investigation in communities including Health Development Committees and Wash committees, maintenance operators, Community Mobilizers.

4. Scope of work

The scope of the evaluation will comprise but not be limited to the areas and aspects specified in the following sections:

4.1 Coherence and relevance of the project

- To which degree is the project (its objectives and methodology) coherent with/**relevant** vis-a-vis national/local policies and strategies regarding the WASH sector?
- Is the project and its objectives responding/**relevant** to the needs of the target groups?
- Has the project been formulated based on recommendations and lessons learned from the previous phases?
- To which degree has the primary target group been included?
- Project document and LFA: Is there coherence between objectives, outputs, activities and problems? Are there clear and measurable indicators of progress towards targets/objectives?

4.2 Strategic service delivery/ensure the right to water and sanitation

- Was the project **effective** in service delivery vis a vis targets, time frame, and allocated resources:
 - Number of functional all year water points constructed as compared to targets?
 - Number of washing facilities constructed as compared to targets?

¹ See <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/50584880.pdf>

- Number of HH latrines constructed and number of villages declared ODF as compared to targets?
- Changed awareness and practices regarding hygiene and health?
- Are construction standards satisfactory?
- What has been done to secure the water quality?
- Are the washing facilities appropriate?
- Has CLTS been implemented **effectively** in accordance with guidelines?
- Quality of latrines?

- Have the services been provided **efficiently**; are the unit costs of water points and CLTS activities acceptable as compared to unit costs in other districts and other countries?

- What is the perceived **impact** of the project in terms of water supply, sanitation and hygiene? What are the perceived differences before and after project intervention? Are there any differences regarding health situation or time saved?

- Are the supplied services **sustainable**? Have procedures for O&M of water points been established? Including adequate technical capacities and skills to operate and maintain? Has an appropriate financing system been established? Are users paying for water services? Are revenues from water sales sufficient to recovers costs of O&M?

4.3 Capacity Development Support

HDCs, Wash sub-committees, and communities

Has capacity development of HDCs and Wash sub-committees been **effective** in terms of:

- Awareness raised among the community population regarding development issues and in particular water supply and sanitation? In which way?
- Community involvement in discussions and decision taking regarding the construction of water supply systems? In which way?
- How many Health Development Committees (HDC) with WASH Committees as a sub-committees have been established in extension of the construction of water systems and CLTS training and are still operational?
- Are the HDCs aware of rights and able to identify community needs particular in the WASH area? What kinds of needs have been identified?
- Are these referred to and promoted with appropriate authorities?

Impact (likely) of capacity development:

- Has awareness raising, primarily regarding water and sanitation, led to further organization of the communities, resulting in additional initiatives? How and which ones?

- Have networks (or clusters) been built among communities, aiming at mutual visits and exchange of information? Are these networks effective, meaning do they result in further joint actions?

Sustainability of capacity development support

- Will project results be sustained beyond the lifetime of the project? How?
- Will further need for capacity development be addressed and supported beyond the lifetime of the project? By who? Local authorities? Other NGOs?

Organizational development of partner organisation - SEND

- Has a capacity assessment of SEND been carried out by EWB-DK ?
- Has the capacity of the SEND been further developed (formal training, on-the-job training) during the project?
- Has SEND had the required capacity to achieve the expected results and document the results?
- Will SEND be able to sustain project?

4.4 Advocacy

- Has the technical assistance to the District WASH Committee been **effective**? What are the results of these efforts?
- Are the monthly district WASH Committee meetings **effective** in terms of action plans and monitoring of implementation of these plans?
- Has the project been effective in promoting participatory decision making including regular stakeholder meetings and participatory formulation of WASH action plans?
- What is the **impact** of advocacy activities vis a vis political and administrative levels in Kenema District (duty bearers) in terms of establishing participatory procedures and opening space for participatory decision making by rights bearers?
- Is there a development in terms of rights holders being invited for consultations? Is this the result of the project, or are other factors involved?
- How many joint field monitoring and supervision visits with the district politicians, technicians and community ward representative have been conducted?
- How have WASH standards for the district been formulated and shared with the communities?
- Are the results sustainable (previous phases) so far likely to be **sustainability** (results achieved during this project phase)?
- Has the WASH database been updated and used actively as a planning tool, and is it likely that it will be used and maintained beyond this project?
- Will district authorities continue coordination and participatory planning and decision making beyond the lifetime of the project?
- What is the logical next step in the consolidation of the work of the WASH Committee?
- Is the current mandate of the WASH committee relevant / or is further expansion of mandate/focus areas needed?

- To what degree is the WASH Committee able to address urgent and need agendas related to WASH and robustness of the population in the district due to recurrent and prolonged effects of climate change?

5. Areas of specific attention

Spin off effects of the Project

- Are there any positive / negative unexpected effects of the project?
- To what degree has the project ignited and positively fueled community development and organization beyond the immediate goals of the project?
- What is needed in order to secure the sustainability of the positive spin off effects of the project (if any)?
- Are there any particular lessons learned in the unexpected effects of the project?

6. Reporting requirements

The consultant will have the following reporting requirements:

- Presentation/discussion of preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendation with SEND staff and EWB-DK (online) prior to departure from Kenema;
- Draft report, 5 days after completion of field work;
- Final report, 7 days after reception of comments from EWB DK and SEND.

The report should include the following chapters: executive summary not exceeding 2 pages, description of the evaluation methodology, background information, separate chapters on findings, conclusions, and recommendations for the future. Findings should among other be supported and documented by pictures and film. The final report will also include a number of annexes including a list of people and organizations met/interviewed, and list of documents reviewed.

The report will consist of max 25 pages, excluding annexes and pictures.

7. Expertise required

One regional/local expert with relevant higher education and experience in development cooperation, HRBA, community development, WASH and conduction of evaluations in accordance with the OECD/DAC criteria (minimum 10 years of relevant experience).

8. Time frame

Preparation

5 days preparation; reading of documents, online meetings with EWB-DK key staff and SEND for practical arrangements including meeting schedule.

Field work (Kenema)

2 days desk study and preparation of interviews, including planning of the various meetings in cooperation with the Project Manager;

1 day interviews with the staff at the Kenema office;

2 day interviews in Kenema with authorities (WASH group) and NGOs working in the sector;

5 days interviews in the field with 3 most successful communities, 3 medium successful and 3 least successful communities, selected in dialogue with SEND and EWB-DK;

2 1/2 days preparation of preliminary findings and recommendations;

1/2 day presentation of a finding, conclusions and recommendations to SEND and EWB-DK (online).

Reporting

4 working days to draft report to email to EWB-DK and SEND after completion of field work

3 working days to finalize the report after having received from EWB-DK and SEND, including pictures and videos, to be emailed to SEND and EWB-DK.