

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE FINAL EVALUATION  
OF THE JOINT PROJECT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SUSTAINABLE  
PRO-POOR FINANCIAL SECTOR IN SIERRA LEONE**

**Project Data Sheet**

**County:** Sierra Leone

**Programme Title:** Development of a Sustainable Pro-Poor Financial Sector in Sierra Leone

**Programme nbr:** SIL/03/C01

**Programme ATLAS Code (by donor):** UNCDF  
UNDP  
Donor

**Financial Breakdown (by donor)**

<b>UNCDF</b> <b>UNDP</b> <b>Kfw</b> <b>Cordaid</b> <b>Government</b>	\$3.0 million \$2.5 million €3.0 million €1,017,516
<b>Delivery to date (per donor):</b>  <b>UNCDF</b> <b>UNDP</b> <b>Donor</b> <b>Government</b>	To be provided by Country Office
<b>Total project Budget</b>	\$8.83 million

**Executing Agency:** UNCDF

**Implementing Agency:** Enterprising Solutions Global Consulting

**Approval Date of project:** July 2004

**Project Duration** 2004-2009

**Project Amendment:**

**Evaluation Date:** Mid termd2009

**Composition of Evaluation Team:**

Team Leader: Microfinance specialist - International

Team Member: Socio-economist – International

Team Member: Microfinance specialist – National

**Additional Current UNCDF projects:**

**Previous UNCDF Projects: None**

**Availability of previous evaluation reports: See Annex**

## ACRONYMS

American Refugee Committee	ARC
Association for Rural Development	ARD
Bank of Sierra Leone	BoSL
	BISFA
	CCA
Catholic Organization for Relief and Development AID	CORDAID
Community Empowerment & Development Agency	CEDA
Consultative Group to Assist the Poor	CGAP
Financial Self Sustainability	FSS
Government of Sierra Leone	GoSL
Grassroots Gender Empowerment Movement	GGEM
Internationale Projekt Consult	IPC
Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau	KfW
	LD
Lift Above Poverty Organization	LAPO
Marampa Masimera Community Bank	MMCB
Matru Community Bank	MCB
Memorandum of Agreement	MOA
Microfinance	MF
Microfinance Institution	MFI
Microfinance Investment and Technical Assistance Facility	MITAF
Ministry of Finance and Economic Development	MoFED
Non Governmental Organization	NGO
Operational Self Sustainability	OSS
Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper	PRSP
Resident Technical Advisor	RTA
Salone Microfinance Trust	SMT
Segbwema Community Bank	SCB
Sierra Leone Association of Microfinance Institutions	SLAMFI
Technical Service Provider	TSP
Terms of Reference	ToR
United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone	UNAMSIL
United Nations Capital Development Fund	UNCDF
United Nations Development Assistance Framework	UNDAF
United Nations Development Programme	UNDP
United Nations Office for Project Services	UNOPS
Village Savings And Loan Associations	VS&LA
Volunteer Service Organization	VSO
Yoni Community Bank	YCB
Youth Employment Secretariat	YES

## **Background**

### **1.1. Country Context**

Ten years of war resulted in a decline in social indicators putting Sierra Leone at the bottom of UNDP's Human Development Index. More than 80 percent of the population has an income below the poverty line of \$1 per day. The improved security situation provided through the support of UNAMSIL has facilitated the resumption of economic activities.

At project start the microfinance sector in Sierra Leone was at a nascent stage. It was estimated that the demand for credit for productive purposes ranged between 90,000 and 160,000 customers with a combined loan volume ranging from US\$ 24.8 to \$43.5 million. Although many operators had adopted a business like approach and were committed to reach profitability and scale, the supply reached less than 13,000 customers with a combined loan portfolio of less than US\$ 1,000,000. A shift had recently been made from a relief towards a business-like orientation with a focus on sustainability. This shift was accelerated by the microfinance policy that was approved by the Government in 2003. This policy provides a framework that is conducive for the development of the microfinance sector and its integration into the commercial financial sector.

### **1.2. Project Summary**

The Government of Sierra Leone (GoSL) launched a programme in 2004 to develop a sustainable pro-poor financial sector, with support from the main co-financing partner, KfW Bankengruppe (KfW), the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Cordaid. The total initial programme cost is US\$8.83 million. To meet this objective, they have established a facility, the Microfinance Investment and Technical Assistance Facility (MITAF) whose objective is to accelerate microfinance sector growth through concerted support at all levels – MFIs, support institutions, Bank of Sierra Leone, government, donor/investors and the broader microfinance community. Enterprising Solutions Global Consulting and Micro Service Consult have been contracted to manage the five year project. MITAF's structure includes an Advisory Committee (composed of the GoSL and the donors) and an Investment Committee (composed of donors only). Terms of Reference for the two bodies are included in the amended project document. MITAF's institutional location is 9A Spur Loop, Wilberforce, Freetown, Sierra Leone.

MITAF recommends funding for MFIs through grants, debt, convertible debt and equity. The technical assistance support ranges from in-house coaching, to a local, regional and international training program, to study tours to other MFIs and central banks and the sponsoring of long term resident technical advisors and conferences.

### **1.3. Project Expected Results**

The overarching goal of the programme is to increase sustainable access to financial services for poor and low-income people in Sierra Leone. The programme contributes to this goal by establishing the range of building blocks needed for the development of an inclusive financial sector in Sierra Leone, with microfinance as an integrated part of the financial system. The four outputs to be achieved by MITAF are the following:

**Intended Outcome as stated in the Country Results Framework:** Contribute to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, including the overarching goal of cutting absolute poverty in half by 2015, by increasing sustainable access to financial services for the poor from Sierra Leonean microfinance institutions.

**Outcome indicator as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and target:** Enhanced private sector participation through a combined active client base of the microfinance industry of 93,000 micro and small businesses in year 5 (baseline 13,000 active clients in year 0).

Outputs	Consortium Refined Output Targets	Results at Mid Term Evaluation	Results as of March 2009
<p><b><u>Intended Output 1:</u></b> Potential leaders of MF industry have reached sustainability and have considerably increased their outreach to develop a competitive, sustainable pro-poor financial sector.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Increase, from the baseline 13,000, the number of active clients of selected MFIs to 15,000 by end 2004, to 20,000 by end 2005, 30,000 by end 2006, 50,000 by end 2007, 75,000 by end 2008, and to 93,000-100,000 at project completion in July 2009;</li> <li>□ At least 1 MFI has reached financial self-sufficiency at project completion;</li> <li>□ At least 3 MFIs have adopted international standards in governance, systems and policies; and</li> <li>□ At least 2 MFIs have a large branch network that covers a major part of Sierra Leone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 42,768 active clients served by 9 MFIs<sup>1</sup></li> <li>• 5 MFIs report more than 100% operational self-sufficiency</li> <li>• Although progress is being made, no MFIs have yet achieved international standards in all of these areas.</li> <li>• 1 MFI has branches in 7 towns and 7 sub-branches in surrounding areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 87,417 active clients served by 12 MFIs</li> <li>• Two MFIs report FSS more than 100% and nine MFIs report OSS more than 100%.</li> <li>• Three MFIs have nearly achieved international standards.</li> <li>• 1 MFIS has branches in 9 towns and 10 sub branches in surrounding areas. Another MFI has branches in four towns.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Intended Output 2:</u></b> Strategic partnerships are built with other donors and the private sector in joint support of a sustainable pro-poor financial sector.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Strategic partnerships that enable MFIs access to capital (grants, loans and commercial equity are established in 2005, then expanded;</li> <li>□ Coordination amongst donors/investors from the outset as</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 MFI is in the final stages of negotiations with a major international investor</li> <li>• 1 new donor joined the Investment Committee</li> <li>• \$ 3.88 million additional resources mobilized</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 MFI has accessed foreign debt and equity investments. 1 MFI has accessed foreign debt only and another MFI has accessed local debt from two commercial banks.</li> <li>• 1 new donor</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Includes June rather than September figures for Segbwema Community Bank.

Outputs	Consortium Refined Output Targets	Results at Mid Term Evaluation	Results as of March 2009
<p><b><u>Intended Output 3:</u></b>  <b>A professional microfinance unit in the Bank of Sierra Leone is operational and capable of ensuring an optimal enabling environment for the development of the microfinance industry and its eventual integration into the financial system.</b></p>	<p>donors/investors utilize investment committee framework;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Resources mobilized for MFIs as cost-sharing, parallel financing or savings mobilization (an additional \$12 million cumulative during the project life).</li> <li>□ A MF unit in the BoSL established as a professional focal point for the development of the microfinance industry;</li> <li>□ Industry standards developed with MFIs including efficient and transparent information exchange;</li> <li>□ A microfinance sector database developed;</li> <li>□ The support infrastructure for the sector has improved (audit, credit reference bureau);</li> <li>□ A conducive regulatory and supervisory framework for microfinance has been established. This framework stimulates integration of the microfinance sector into the financial system.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BoSL has established a Microfinance Division</li> <li>• All MFIs financed by the project are reporting on standard performance criteria monthly to MITAF, and information is regularly exchanged among them at meetings of the Sierra Leone Association of Microfinance Institutions (SLAMFI)</li> <li>• MITAF has developed a sector database</li> <li>• MITAF has conducted training for local audit firms</li> <li>• Existing regulatory and supervisory framework is relatively conducive for microfinance</li> <li>• MITAF has proposed an NGO-</li> </ul>	<p>joined the investment committee and another donor invested into MFIs though MITAF but is not a member of the IC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 24.67 million additional resources mobilized.</li> <li>• BoSL has established a Microfinance Division</li> <li>• All MFIs financed by the project are reporting on standard performance criteria monthly to MITAF</li> <li>• MITAF has developed a sector database</li> <li>• MITAF has conducted training for local audit firms</li> <li>• Existing regulatory and supervisory framework is relatively conducive for microfinance</li> <li>• MITAF has proposed an</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Intended Output 4:</u></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ MODEP NGO-MFI</li> </ul>		

Outputs	Consortium Refined Output Targets	Results at Mid Term Evaluation	Results as of March 2009
<p><b>Sound microfinance principles have been disseminated</b> and are widely accepted and adopted.</p>	<p>conducive registration and monitoring process established;</p> <p>□ Government, donors, consultants and practitioners have access to and utilize best practices in microfinance.</p>	<p>MFI registration form and process to MODEP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose of and ways to measure this target are unclear. All project activities are designed to introduce best practices to the sector.</li> </ul>	<p>NGO-MFI registration form and process to MODEP</p>

The outputs are intended to be mutually reinforcing and aimed at identifying breakthrough MFIs and supporting them with training, technical assistance, and appropriate capital structures. This involves a variety of donor/investors, capacity building with the Bank of Sierra Leone (BoSL) to establish an enabling policy environment, and strengthening sector knowledge and understanding of microfinance best practice.

#### **FINDINGS FROM MID-TERM EVALUATION**

The mid term evaluation findings indicated that the project was on track with regard to increasing sustainable access to financial services for poor and low-income people, as measured by the indicators cited below. It was too early in the project cycle to assess the impact of these financial services at the client level and the purpose of the mid-term evaluation was not to conduct an impact study.

The project was considered well on the way to achieving its targets, having achieved or surpassed most of its mid-term targets. Specifically, the project had enabled the following results at the micro or retail level as of September 2006:

- 42,768 active clients were being served by 9 MFIs
- 5 MFIs reported more than 100% operational self-sufficiency
- 1 MFI had branches in 7 towns and 7 sub-branches in surrounding areas
- 1 MFI was in the final stages of negotiations with a major international investor
- 1 new donor had joined the Investment Committee
- \$ 3.88 million additional resources had been mobilized for the project

Additionally, progress had been made on establishing and strengthening local structures at the meso (support infrastructure) and macro (policy) levels, particularly through support to the Bank of Sierra Leone and the Sierra Leone Association of Microfinance Institutions (SLAMFI).

The final evaluation team will review the recommendations made by the Final Evaluation and assess progress made in terms of recommendations made at the mid-term stage. ( reference: Annex 8 of the mid term evaluation report)

## 1.4. Project Status

For Output 1: The total number of active loan clients as of the end of March 2009 for the twelve MITAF partners approved for funding is approximately 87,417<sup>2</sup>. During the first quarter of 2009, ARD reports 108.13% FSS, YCB 111.84% and SMT 93.12%. Nine MFIs report OSS above 100%. Finance Salone, ProCredit Bank, and to a lesser extent, Hope Micro, SMT, CEDA and ARD, have adopted international standards of systems and policies. Finance Salone is covering major parts of Sierra Leone with full branches in central Freetown, Lumley, Wellington, Kambia, Lungi, Bo, Kono, Kenema and Kailahun. It also has sub-branches in Waterloo in the Western Area, Lunsar and Port Loko town in Port Loko; Daru and Segbwema in Kailahun; Bamoi and Rokuprr in Kambia and Blama in Kenema. ProCredit has 135 staff between three branches. ARD has branch offices in Freetown, Bo, Makeni and Kenema. CEDA has branch offices in Bo, Moyamba and Pujehun.

The community banks are providing financial services in six major regions of the country: Mile 91, Tonkilili; Lunsar, Port Loko; Segbwema, Kailahun; Matru, Bonthe; Kabala, Koinadugu; and Zimmi, Pujehun.

For Output 2: The accumulated funding amount committed by Cordaid includes the Finance Salone of \$252,000 (€210,000) and \$62,744 (€ 52,287) grant, the \$720,000 (€600,000) approved for investment in loan portfolios of small MFIs, small community banks and Finance Salone, \$180,000 (€150,000) for two RTAs, \$65,500 for loans to Muloma and \$19,650 for subsidies to hire a loan officer and transportation expenses for serving Muloma, the \$272,000 grant approved for GGEM, and the loan of \$350,000 approved for ARD. The total amount is \$1,921,894.

The German Government has formally approved an additional contribution to MITAF of €3 million. Additionally, the German Government approved the amount of €600,000 for capitalization of IPC and €1 million for IPC technical assistance during 2007.

MITAF and the Youth Employment Scheme signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) in the second quarter of 2008. YES has committed to provide \$1,000,000 for funding of MFIs. The project period is from June 2007 through May 2010. The funds are from the UN Peace Building Fund.

ProCredit Bank Sierra Leone received the equivalent of \$6,327,119 in paid up capital.

The European Union approved \$377,256 during 2007 for a “Strategic survey of the micro-finance sector in Sierra Leone.” This is to update the report conducted by UNCDF in June 2003, and should provide important demand information for potential investors in the market.

\$1,765,656 in savings has been mobilized by the community banks. ProCredit mobilized \$2,895,018 in savings from their opening date on August 6, 2007 through the end of the quarter. CARE VS&LAs mobilized \$35,145. The total savings mobilized are \$4,695, 819.

MITAF assisted with an official valuation of Finance Salone during 2006 to determine a fair market value of equity shares. The estimated value of this transaction will be \$830,745.

Rokel Commercial Bank and Ecobank have to date provided Hope Micro with \$235,593 and \$37,288 respectively through overdraft facilities. SMT has to date received a total amount of \$528,325 in loans from Kiva. Incofin approved a loan of \$500,000 in early 2008 for Finance Salone. The release of the loan is subject to finalization of the sale of ARC shares to UTB and Africap.

---

<sup>2</sup> MFI reports to MITAF are due on the 15<sup>th</sup> of each month.

For Output 3: MFIs report monthly to MITAF. Eight MITAF partners are currently reporting to the Mix Market. ARD, CEDA, Finance Salone, Hope Micro and SMT have undergone external audits using CGAP guidelines. Training has been conducted on transparency, standards and benchmarks; regulation and supervision; and the transition of MFIs into regulated financial intermediaries. The Bank of Sierra Leone unit staff has participated in the Microfinance Training in Turin, Italy and SAM, Mombasa and have been sponsored on a study tour to the central bank of Uganda.

For Output 4: The MITAF reporting format is designed to steer MFIs in employing best practices. Ongoing technical assistance is provided to the MITAF partners with lower technical capacity. MITAF has conducted MFI trainings on delinquency management, human resource management, internal controls, business planning, group lending methodology, product development, individual lending, governance, marketing, branch management, accounting and financial management. The Microfinance Programme (MFP) has conducted best practices and delinquency management trainings. MITAF also conducted Training of Trainers courses in accounting, financial management, internal controls, business planning, product development, delinquency management and risk management. The MFP publishes a microfinance specific newsletter. The government has received training on transparency, standards and benchmarks; regulation and supervision; and the transition of MFIs into regulated financial intermediaries. The BoSL microfinance unit manager went on an exposure visit to the Bank of Uganda. Other BoSL staff have participated in trainings in Turin, Italy and the SAM in Mombasa, Kenya.

## **1.0. Purpose of the Evaluation**

The Project Document calls for an independent final evaluation of the MITAF project. The general objectives of the Final Evaluation are: to assess its overall performance in terms of contribution to a sustainable financial sector development, the outputs and outcomes produced against its initial/revised targets, the impact it has brought for poverty alleviation, its relevance to the national context, management efficiency, project formulation, appraisal and implementation phases; and the level of accountability for results to the project's financial backers, stakeholders and beneficiaries.

The primary purpose of the final evaluation is to assess results achieved and identify lessons learned (both positive and negative). The evaluation will also include recommendations to improve programme performance for the extension period of 6-12 months and to provide guidance for the design of the upcoming new programme.

The expected outcome of this Final Evaluation is a strategic review of project performance to date, in order to:

- Determine the extent to which the findings and recommendations of the mid-term evaluation have been addressed.
- Help project management and stakeholders identify and understand (a) factors of success and (b) areas of major challenges that need to be addressed.
- Provide stakeholders with an external, objective view on the project status, its relevance, how effectively it is being managed and implemented, and whether the project is likely to achieve its developmental and structural objectives, and whether UNCDF and the donors involved are effectively positioned and partnered to achieve maximum impact.
- Provide project management and stakeholders with lessons learnt and recommendations to be applied for a successor model of MITAF that is currently being developed.
- Help project management and stakeholders assess the extent to which the broader policy environment remains conducive to replication of the lessons being learnt from project implementation and/or identify exit strategies.
- Help project management and stakeholders to draw lessons about project design, implementation and management.

- Comply with the requirement of the Project Document/Funding Agreement as well as UNCDF Evaluation Policy.

The findings of this Final Evaluation will be reported to the Government and relevant stakeholders, and presented to the Investment Committee to help its decision-making process.

### 3.0. Contents and Scope of the Evaluation

Taking into account the implementation status of the programme and the resource disbursements made to date, evaluate the following questions:

#### 3.1. Results Achievement

3.1.1. Has the project made satisfactory progress in timely achievement of project outputs (as per log frame), and related delivery of inputs and activities? Are the partners able to achieve the results? In doing so, address, among other things:

- With relation to Output 1, assess progress of MFIs towards achieving self-sustainability and increasing outreach.
- With relation to Output 1, should MFIs be formalized and transformed into for profit businesses?
  - What is the rationale?
  - On whose behalf are they transforming (clients, owners)?
- Have the necessary consultations taken place with key stakeholders (owners, employees, clients).
- With relation to output 2, has the programme developed strategic partnerships that enable MFIs capital (grants, loans, and commercial equity)? Have donors and investors utilized the investment committee effectively? Has the program facilitated resource mobilization (target of an additional \$12 million) to leverage donor resources?
- With relation to output 3, has a microfinance unit in the BoSL been established as a professional focal point for the development of the microfinance industry? Have industry standards been developed with MFIs, including efficient and transparent information exchange? Has a microfinance database been developed and utilized? Has the support infrastructure for the sector (audit firms, credit reference bureau) improved?
- With relation to Output 4, is the programme disseminating good practices in the country?
  - To which audiences?
  - Through what media?
  - Which actors are currently/should be responsible for which messages/media?
  - Who is currently paying for what and in the opinion of the evaluation team, who **should** pay for what, i.e., what should the programme budget cover, and what should the government cover and take responsibility for disseminating?

3.1.2. Given output achievement and related delivery of inputs and activities to date, is the project likely to attain its Immediate and Development Objectives?

Specifically:

- What are the evidence-based indications that the project is likely to make a tangible contribution to addressing the overall development objective of “achieving the Millennium Development Goals, in specific the goal of cutting absolute poverty by half by 2015 by increasing sustainable access to financial services for poor and low-income people in Sierra Leone” and the immediate objective of a competitive and sustainable inclusive financial sector that provides access to financial services to poor and low-income people in general and micro and small businesses in particular?

3.1.3. Evaluate any other critical issues relating to results achievement. Among others:

- Are the project deliverables relevant in meeting the short and long term objectives of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP)?
- Is the project effectively capitalizing on lessons learnt from piloting best practice models to influence policy and practice? Have “downstream”, pilot activities led to development of “operational policies” (rules, regulations, guidelines, etc) with broader relevance and influenced policy formation and implementation?

### 3.2. Factors Affecting Successful Implementation and Results Achievement

Has project implementation and results achievement gone according to plan, or are there any obstacles/bottlenecks/outstanding issues on the partner or government side that are limiting the successful implementation and results achievement of the project?

#### 3.2.1. External Factors:

- To what extent does the broader *policy environment* remain conducive to achieving intended results, including adherence to policy and policy impact and replication of the lessons being learnt from project implementation? Specifically in this regard, to what extent do critical assumptions (refer to log frame) on which project success depends still hold?
- Are there *any other factors external to the project* that are affecting successful implementation and results achievement?

#### 3.2.3. Project-related Factors:

##### *Project design (relevance and quality)*

- Is the project rooted in and effectively integrated with national strategies (e.g., poverty reduction strategy) and UN planning and results frameworks (CCA, UNDAF) at country level?
- Was the project concept/logic and design optimal to achieve the desired project objectives/outputs?
- Was the project concept conducive to also address the needs for rural finance?
- In assessing design consider, among other issues:
  - Are the partners credible? Are the checks and balances sufficient in the framework?
  - Were relevant gender issues adequately addressed in project design?
- Was the project preparation process (formulation, inception) and its products (log frame, Project Operations Plan, Annual Work plans) of high quality?
- Did the project document include adequate guidelines for implementation of the project?
- Overall, do the project’s objectives remain valid and relevant? Will they result in strategic value added if they are achieved? Does the project design and document need to be reviewed and updated?

*Institutional and implementation arrangements.* Are the project’s institutional and implementation arrangements suitable for the successful achievement of the project’s objectives or are there any institutional obstacles that are hindering the implementation or operations of the project, or which could benefit from adjustment? Among other issues, assess:

##### MITAF:

- Assess and evaluate the strategy, structure, performance and utilization of financial resources of MITAF as the financing tool of the project.
- Define options for the role and structure of MITAF in Sierra Leone after the end of the project (2009) and measures to be taken in order to reach these structures.
- Propose options for a possible structure for a successor model of MITAF which overcomes the identified deficiencies taking into consideration UN guidelines for virtual and non-virtual funds.

- In this context, identify options for the integration of local TSPs into MITAF and identify steps needed for this integration.
- TSP Enterprising Solutions Global Consulting team:
  - Assess and evaluate adequacy of the objectives, activities, outputs/indicators and outcomes, and intended results of the TSP Enterprising Solutions Global Consulting team in relation to the sector, as per its TOR.
  - Assess and evaluate the strategy, technical capacity; and performance of the TSP team in reaching the defined milestones and goals of the project.
  - Evaluate the utilization of technical assistance with regard to improving governance, performance and portfolio quality of beneficiary MFI, specifically the assistance provided by each of
    - National technical advisors
    - International technical advisors
  - Evaluate the utilization of grants for fixed assets purchases for MFI
    - Assess the appropriateness of the applied needs assessment analysis to capture material deficiencies of MFIs and tailor technical assistance packages to the MFI needs.
    - Assess the appropriateness of the control and monitoring mechanisms to ensure proper use of funds
- Government of Sierra Leone, namely the Bank of Sierra Leone and the Ministry of Development and Economic Planning:
  - Evaluate the Government of Sierra Leone's technical capacity to:
    - assume full ownership through technical and financial control of MITAF's sector development role.
    - assess technical capacity of the BoSL and MoFED, their past performance and ability to successfully fulfill their respective ToR from the Project Document.
    - ensure an optimal enabling environment for the development of the microfinance industry.
    - supervise a sustainable microfinance sector in Sierra Leone.
    - assess and evaluate the technical assistance foreseen within the project with respect to reaching these capacities.
  - Evaluate the capacity of the implementing partners (BoSL, Ministries) to meet their respective responsibilities in the programme. Are they the most appropriate implementing partners? Is it the role of these partners to assume full ownership through technical and financial control of MITAF's sector development role? What capacities are the responsibility of the programme to strengthen, and what capacities are the responsibility of the Government to provide? What is the optimal use of programme resources?
- Investment Committee:
  - Assess and evaluate whether the Investment Committee serves its purpose of ensuring donor coordination within the Government's microfinance policy.
  - Evaluate whether the investments approved by the Investment Committee are likely to contribute to an Inclusive Financial Sector in Sierra Leone? If not, what is missing?
  - Assess whether the Investment Committee is taking sufficient risk in its investments.
  - Evaluate whether the right balance of grants, soft loans and commercial sources of funding being provided such that the MFIs will not be dependent on donor funding.
  - Assess whether the investments approved so far represent a potentially solid return on investment?
  - Evaluate whether the results are being achieved in an efficient manner with limited donor funds?

- Provide an objective assessment and evaluation of the designated roles, functions and tasks of the different parties involved in the project (as named above) within the project, within MITAF, within the Investment Committee as well as within the microfinance sector of Sierra Leone in general as well as the distribution between them.
- Assess the coordinating mechanism and its timeliness of approving and disbursing investments, and effectiveness of enhancing project performance.

*Project management:*

- Are the management arrangements for the programme adequate and appropriate?
- How effectively is the project managed at all levels? Is project management results-based and innovative?
- Do management systems, including M&E, reporting and financial systems function as effective management tools, facilitate effective implementation of the project, and provide a sufficient basis for evaluating performance of the programme?
  - Regarding financial systems: assess any bottlenecks in the system of financial disbursement between the project partners and beneficiaries.
  - Regarding M&E, does the project monitoring system include:
    - a. A baseline that enables a good understanding of the target populations and market for financial services.
    - b. Appropriate and cost-effective indicators and related targets linked to the baseline that will enable monitoring of process, output and outcome level performance.

*Technical backstopping:* Is technical assistance and back-stopping from programme partners appropriate, adequate and timely to support the project in achieving its objectives?

*Other:* Are there any other project-related factors that are affecting successful implementation and results achievement?

### **3.3. Strategic Positioning and Partnerships**

3.3.1. Are the programme partners, through this project and any other engagement in the country, optimally positioned strategically, with respect to:

- UN/donor/government efforts in the same sector in Sierra Leone?
- Implementing national priorities, as reflected in national development strategies?
- Corporate priorities, and leveraging its comparative advantages to maximum effect?

3.3.2. Are the partners leveraging their actual/potential partnerships to maximum effect?

3.3.3. What level of value added and consequence can be attached to the partners' intervention in the area of microfinance in Sierra Leone?

### **3.4. Sustainability of Results and Transition Strategy/Post Project Planning**

3.4.1. What is the likelihood that the project results will be sustainable, in terms of systems, institutions, financing and in terms of anticipated poverty reduction impact?

3.4.2. Are planned transition/handover strategies appropriate and timely?

3.4.3. Ownership: Is sufficient capacity being built so that local actors will be able to manage the process by the end of the programme without continued dependence on international expertise? Are the necessary steps owned and driven by the people?

3.4.3. Is there an added value role for programme partners to play beyond project completion?

In addition to assessing the evaluation questions above, the team should analyze any other pertinent issues that need addressing or which may or should influence future project direction and partners' engagement in the country.

#### **4.0. Organization of the Evaluation**

##### **4.1. Consultant profiles and responsibilities**

The Final Evaluation is to be conducted by a team of three consultants, with the profiles outlined below.

##### **International External Lead: Microfinance Specialist – 35 working days**

###### Profile

- Minimum of a Masters Degree in Economics, Finance or MBA.
- Minimum of ten years accumulated experience in microfinance
- A minimum of five years of microfinance management and/or consulting experience
- Must have evaluation experience in microfinance
- Extensive microfinance training and technical assistance experience
- Comprehensive knowledge of CGAP benchmarks and industry best practices
- Advanced report writing skills
- Experience at the country-wide sector-level/understanding of building inclusive financial sectors, preferably in Africa

###### Responsibilities

- Documentation review
- Leading the evaluation team in planning, conducting and reporting on the evaluation.
- Deciding on division of labour within the evaluation team
- Use of best practice evaluation methodologies in conducting the evaluation
- Leading presentation of the draft evaluation findings and recommendations in-country
- Conducting the debriefing for UNCDF HQ and regional staff
- Leading the drafting and finalization of the evaluation report and completion of relevant sections of the Management Response template

##### **International Consultant: Socio-Economist – 30 working days**

###### Profile

- Minimum of a Masters Degree in Economics, Sociology, with specialization in assessing pro-poor programmes and gender dimensions of development
- Minimum of seven years accumulated experience in micro-finance
- A minimum of five years of consulting experience
- Must have evaluation experience in evaluation social impacts of microfinance
- Familiarity with microfinance training and technical assistance experience would be an asset
- Comprehensive knowledge of CGAP benchmarks and industry best practices
- Advanced report writing skills
- Experience at the country-wide, sector-level/understanding of building inclusive financial sectors, preferably in Africa

###### Responsibilities

- Assessing results/achievements in relation to the project's immediate objective of setting up a competitive and sustainable inclusive financial sector that provides access to financial services to poor and low-income people, in general and micro and small businesses, in particular. The consultant will also assess the project's prospects for making a tangible contribution to the overall development objective of "achieving the Millennium Development Goals, in specific the goal of cutting absolute poverty by half by 2015 by increasing sustainable access to financial

services for poor and low-income people in Sierra Leone”

- Assessing the gender dimensions of the project (It is recognized that no gender-targets were set as part of the original design of the project. Nevertheless, since gender is expected to be of relevance to successor programmes, the final evaluation will benefit from a closer look at this aspect. As noted in the mid-term review, 54-90% active clients of MITAF programmes were reported to be women)
- Documentation review
- Use of best practice evaluation methodologies in conducting the evaluation
- Support the presentation of the draft evaluation findings and recommendations in-country
- Participate in the debriefing at in-country, UNDF HQ and regional staff levels
- Responsible for drafting specific sections of the evaluation report as decided in conjunction with the team leader and national consultant.

### **Local Consultant: Microfinance Specialist – 28 working days**

#### Profile

- A minimum of three years of management experience with a Sierra Leonean MFI
- Microfinance training and technical experience
- Knowledge of CGAP benchmarks and industry best practices

#### Responsibilities

- Documentation review
- Contributing to the development of the evaluation plan and methodology
- Conducting those elements of the evaluation determined by the lead consultant
- Contributing to presentation of the evaluation findings and recommendations at the evaluation wrap-up meeting in-country
- Contributing to the drafting and finalization of the evaluation report.

## **4.2 Evaluation methodology and process**

In terms of process, the evaluation will adopt a four-phase approach to the Evaluation Process:

(1) **Documentation Review/ Inception report phase** during which the evaluation team leader will review documentation at home base in the framework of the TOR, liaise with team members. The team leader is expected to set out the Key Issues and outline the evaluation approach, (including qualitative and quantitative tools that the evaluation mission expects to use) in a brief inception report (5-10 pages) which s/he will share with the Evaluation Adviser and the UNCDF managers of the country project. (The inception report should, inter alia, flag any missing information and data that should be provided to mission upon arrival in-country);

(2) **Field Phase** – including team hypothesis session (1 day), Kick-Off Session and National Level and Global Debriefing and stakeholder feedback;

(3) **Report finalization**; and

(4) **Management Response** compilation.

The evaluator will determine the methodology for the evaluation, using best practice evaluation planning and methodologies, which will include, among other things, surveys, key informant interviews, focus group discussions with clients, questionnaires, documentation review, as appropriate. As far as possible the Evaluation Team will triangulate evaluation findings, using multiple sources/methodologies. Wherever possible, all evaluation data should be disaggregated by gender. The evaluation should include all key stakeholders. It is guided by but not limited to the list of interviewees in Annex 2.

The evaluators will interview the MFI program directors, senior management and clients of all thirteen MITAF financially supported MFIs. Time is scheduled for a review of a representative sample of financial

statements and MIS reports. Time has been allotted to interview four MFIs in Freetown and the provinces that have not received funding through MITAF. Two of the four rural community banks will be visited, for the other two, time is allotted for meeting with Board members in Freetown.

MITAF donors are currently funding the following institutions:

1. Finance Salone (Limited Liability Company, with an international affiliate)
2. Hope Micro (Indigenous NGO, with an international affiliate)
3. ARD (Indigenous NGO)
4. CEDA (Indigenous NGO)
5. LAPO<sup>3</sup>
6. CCF/SMT (In process of registering as an indigenous NGO, with an international affiliate)
7. Marampa Masimera Community Bank (Community bank, operating under Other Finance Services Act/Banking Act)
8. Mattru Community Bank (Community bank, operating under Other Finance Services Act/Banking Act)
9. Segbwema Community Bank (Community bank, operating under Other Finance Services Act/Banking Act)
10. Yoni Community Bank (Community bank, operating under Other Finance Services Act/Banking Act)
11. ProCredit Holding/IPC (applying for commercial banking license)
12. GGEM (Indigenous NGO)
13. CARE Sierra Leone

### 4.3. Evaluation Plan

An indicative work plan detailing the schedule and number of workdays for the evaluation can be found in **Annex 1**. The work plan is based on a six-day workweek.

Specifically the evaluation will comprise the following stages:

#### Documentation Review/Inception Report Phase

- Review of relevant documentation: A list of key reference documents and people to be interviewed is provided in **Annex 2**.
- Partners' consultations and briefing In home-base with consultations with UNCDF Adviser, Project Staff and team members leading to drafting of inception report (5-10 pages) which will be shared with all relevant stakeholders and commented on by the Evaluation Adviser

#### Field Phase

- Finalization of evaluation work plan: On the first day of the evaluation mission in-country, the Evaluation Team will review the draft evaluation work plan (**Annex 1**), and make any adjustments they see fit, taking into account practical and logistical considerations.
- In-country briefing: The Evaluation Team will be briefed on the first day of the evaluation mission by programme stakeholders. All relevant documentation not already sent in advance to the Evaluation Team will be provided by MITAF.
- Hypothesis session with evaluation team to review logframe, define key evaluation questions, finalize evaluation plan and techniques that will be used and agree on division of responsibilities and expectations in terms of how the evaluation report will be drafted and finalized.

---

<sup>3</sup> Currently receives training and technical support only.

- Evaluation fieldwork: Conducted in Freetown, and locations where sampled MFIs are based. The Evaluation Team should discuss its findings with beneficiaries and stakeholders at key stages of the evaluation process in-country and obtain their feedback.
- Preparation of Aide Memoire and Power point : On the basis of its findings, the Evaluation Team will prepare an aide mémoire, which will be shared, through the in-country evaluation focal point, with all key stakeholders and with the UNCDF Evaluation Unit prior to the in-country evaluation wrap-up meeting. The aide mémoire becomes the basis of discussions at the evaluation wrap-up meeting.
- Evaluation consultation meeting: At the meeting, the Evaluation Team will present their key findings and recommendations to key stakeholders for discussion. The minutes of the meeting will be done by the UNCDF Programme Officer and submitted promptly to the UNCDF Evaluation Advisor, UNCDF Regional Office and all key stakeholders, and to the Evaluation Team, for their consideration in drafting the evaluation report.
- Draft evaluation report and Evaluation Summary: The lead consultant will submit a Draft Evaluation Report and Evaluation Summary to the UNCDF Evaluation Adviser, which will be circulated to all key stakeholders for comment.
- Global Debriefing - A phone evaluation debriefing by the team leader will be organized by the UNCDF Microfinance. Co-funders (KFW, Cordaid) government representatives, the UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa and FIPA management staff will be invited to participate in this debriefing which will be chaired by the Executive Secretary of UNCDF. The Evaluation Unit will take minutes of the debriefing, which will be submitted promptly to the lead consultant, for his/her consideration in finalizing the evaluation report and summary.
- The Final Evaluation Report and Evaluation Summary and the draft Management Response template will be submitted by the lead consultant to the UNCDF Evaluation Adviser, who will disseminate it to all key stakeholders.

## 5.0. Deliverables

The lead consultant is responsible for preparing and submitting the following deliverables:

- Inception Report: brief 5-10 page report summarizing team leaders analysis of the key evaluation questions, approach to the evaluation and highlighting any data and information required
- Aide Memoire and Power Point : A summary of key evaluation findings and recommendations prepared towards the end of the evaluation and submitted to MITAF and the UNCDF Evaluation Unit before the Evaluation Consultation Meeting.
- Draft Evaluation Report and Evaluation Summary: The lead consultant is responsible for consolidating the inputs of team members, and taking into consideration comments received at the in-country evaluation wrap-up meeting, to produce a coherent Draft Evaluation Report and Evaluation Summary, according to the format in **Annex 3**. The Draft Report and Summary is to be submitted electronically to the UNCDF Evaluation Advisor.
- Final Evaluation Report, Evaluation Summary and Management Response: Based on comments received on the Draft Evaluation Report, and at the UNCDF evaluation debriefing, the lead consultant will finalise the evaluation and summary, with input from other evaluation team members, as required, and submit the Final Evaluation Report and Summary to the UNCDF Evaluation Advisor within five days of the receipt of the minutes of the UNCDF evaluation debriefing, or by the agreed date.

The Evaluation Team's contractual obligations are complete once the UNCDF Evaluation Advisor has reviewed and approved the Final Evaluation Report for quality and completeness as per the TOR.

## 6.0. Management, Reporting Arrangements, and Administrative/logistical support of the Evaluation

## **6.1. Management Arrangements**

To ensure full independence and that the evaluation meets U.N. standards, the Evaluation Unit of UNCDF has the responsibility for managing the evaluation. The Evaluation Unit of UNCDF reports directly to the Executive Secretary of UNCDF, a key criteria for independence of U.N. evaluations.

## **6.2. Reporting Arrangements**

Overall, the Evaluation Team reports to the UNCDF Evaluation Advisor in New York. The UNCDF Programme Officer, in conjunction with MITAF will act as the in-country evaluation focal point and will ensure that the evaluation team is provided with all necessary administrative and logistical support to arrange and carry out the evaluation.

## Annex 1: Draft Evaluation Work plan (To be Revised on selection of team)

Dates	Time	Activity
July 1 – 10, 2009		Documentation review, telephone interviews with UNCDF, KfW, Cordaid and Enterprising Solutions staff, preparation of evaluation tools and captured in Inception Report
July 13-15, 2009		Team leader travels to Freetown, Sierra Leone.
July 16, 2009	09.00-11.45	Briefing for Consultants by MITAF Chief of Party
	12.00-13.30	UNDP Briefing
	14.30-15.30	Briefing by MoFED
	16.00-17.30	Briefing by BoSL
July 17, 2009	10.45-15.45	ARD Freetown HQ and Branch: meetings with management, and clients interviews.
July 18, 2009	09.00- 17.00	Travel to ARD Makeni branch and interview staff and clients
Sunday, July 19, 2009	09.00-12.30	Return to Freetown and Rest
July 20, 2009	10.00-13.00	BoSL interviews: Governor, Banking Supervision Director, Financial Markets Directors, Microfinance unit head.
	14.30-17.00	GGEM Executive Director
July 21, 2009	10.30 -11.30	Ecobank, Managing Director
	12.00-13.30	Union Trust Bank, Chief Executive Officer
	14.30-17.00	ProCredit Bank, CEO
July 22, 2009	10.00-11.00	MITAF Deputy Director
	11.30-12.30	MITAF Technical Advisor I
	14.00-15.00	MITAF Accountant
	15.30-16.30	MITAF Technical Advisor II
July 23, 2009	10.00-16.00	Hope Micro HQ and Central Freetown Branch: Interviews with management, staff and clients.
July 24, 2009	10.00-16.00	Finance Salone HQ and Freetown Branch: Interviews with management, staff and clients
July 25, 2009	11.00-15.00	LAPO HQ and Freetown Branch: Interviews with management, staff and clients.
Sunday July 26, 2009		Rest
July 27, 2009	8.30-11.45	Travel to Mile 91
	11.45-14.00	YCB, meeting staff
	14.00-16.30	Travel to Bo
July 28, 2009	09.00-12.30	CEDA, meeting with staff and clients
	12.30-16.00	Travel to Makeni
July 29, 2009	09.00-15.00	SMT, meeting with staff and clients
	15.30-17.30	CARE VS&LAs Manager in Makeni
July 30, 2009	08.00-10.30	Travel to Lunsar
	10.30-14.30	MMCB, meeting staff and clients
	14.30-17.00	Travel to Freetown
July 31, 2009	10.00-11.30	MoFED, Principal Planning Officer
	12.00-13.30	BoSL, Microfinance Focal Person, Davidson Kormoi
	14.30-15.30	MCB Board Director
	16.00-17.00	SCB Board Director
August 1, 2009		Preparation of Aide Memoire
August 3, 2009	14.30-17.00	Evaluation Consultation meeting
August 4, 2009		Team leader returns home
August 6-21, 2009		Drafting of the evaluation report, submission of comments, UNCDF evaluation debriefing, preparation of Final evaluation report.

## Annex 2: List of Key Documents and People to be Interviewed

### *Preparation in home country*

- Thoroughly review the following documents:
  - Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between UNDP and UNCDF
  - MoU between the UNDP, UNCDF, the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoFED), and the Bank of Sierra Leone (BoSL);
  - Separate Agreement between the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoFED), and the Bank of Sierra Leone (BoSL) and KfW;
  - Government of Sierra Leone National Micro-Finance Policy
  - Mid-Term Evaluation Report
  - 2003 Assessment of Microfinance Sector Development in Sierra Leone
  - Microfinance Policy Review, Sierra Leone, CGAP/World Bank, June 2002
  - The Role of Governments in Microfinance, CGAP June 2004
  - Microfinance, Grants and Non-Financial Responses to Poverty Reduction: Where Does Microcredit Fit? CGAP
  - Building Inclusive Financial Systems, (primarily section III) CGAP 2004
  - Promoting Linkages for Livelihood Security and Economic Development – The LINKS Program Performance Report
  - Conflict and Post- Conflict Environments: Ten Short Lessons To Make Microfinance Work, SEEP Network, 2004
  - Enterprising Solutions Global Consulting and Micro Service Consult proposal to UNCDF/ UNDP/ KfW and the GoSL
  - Government of the Republic of Sierra Leone and United Nations Capital Development Fund “PRODOC” with special emphases on attached terms of references for the TSP, Investment Committee, MoFED and BoSL
  - PRODOC Amendments
  - UNDP microfinance policy
  - UNDP Microfinance Portfolio Review (CGAP)
  - Sierra Leone PRSP
  - Evaluation of Microfinance Guichet
  - MITAF budget, work plan, financial reports and quarterly reports from July 16 – December 31, 2004; January 1 – March 31, April 1 – June 30, July 1 – September 30, October 1 – December 31 2005; January 1 – March 31, April 1- June 30, July 1 to September 1, October 1 - December 31 2006; January 1 – March 31, April 1- June 30, July 1- September 30, October 1 - December 31 2007; January 1 – March 31, April 1- June 30, July 1-September 30, October 1 - December 31 2008; and the Annual Reports.
  - MITAF Investment Committee summaries of MFIs
  - Minutes to Investment Committee and Technical Committee meetings
  - Written reports, letters, correspondence from MITAF and government stakeholders including:
    - Document entitled “Government Position on the Implementation of the Micro-Finance Programme in Sierra Leone.”
    - MITAF response to “Government Position on the Implementation of the Micro-Finance Programme in Sierra Leone.”
    - Document entitled “Request for Assistance to Develop the Capacity of the Microfinance Unit in the Ministry of Development and Economic Planning”
    - Meeting of the Microfinance Coordinating Committee and MITAF’s response.
    - Funding proposals submitted by MODEP and the BoSL
  - MFI monthly reports to MITAF
  - Summaries of Investment Committee applications presented to IC members
  - Enterprising Solutions CVs (Lillian Pozzo, Tonia de Sousa-Shields, Craig Feinberg)

- MITAF CVs (Pearson Kalungulungu, Alphonso Campbell, Angela Leslie Jones)
- 
- Telephone interviews with:
  - UNCDF Deputy Director John Tucker
  - UNCDF West Africa Regional Technical Manager Issa Barro
  - KfW Head of Division Financial Sector Sub-Sahara Africa, Karl-Heinz Fleischhacker
  - KfW Project Manager, Bodo Schmülling
  - Cordaid Resident Representative Finance Business Unit
  - Cordaid Advisor, Jos van de Sterren
  - ES Managing Partner Tonia de Sousa-Shields
  - MITAF Task Manager, Liliana Pozzo, Craig Feinberg
  - American Refugee Committee Technical Advisor
  - Christian Children’s Fund Regional Technical Advisor Lloyd McCormick

*Personal interviews in Sierra Leone*

- BoSL Governor Dr. Samura Kamara
- BoSL Deputy Governor, Ms. Andrina R Coker
- BoSL Director Banking Supervision Department, Yeabu Kamara
- BoSL Director Development Coordination Department, Dr. Sesay
- BoSL Microfinance Unit Manager Davidson Kormoi
- BoSL Community Bank Coordinator Edmund Kanaju
- MoFEP Development Secretary
- MoFED Principal Planning Officer James Koroma
- MITAF Chief of Party Pearson Kalungulungu
- MITAF Deputy Director Alphonso Campbell
- MITAF Technical Advisors, Sunil Khanal, Lorisa, Francis
- MITAF Finance Manager Angella Leslie Jones
- UNDP Country Director Bernard Mokam
- UNDP Deputy Country Director, Sam Harbor
- UNDP Microfinance Program Coordinator
- YES/UNDP External Relations Expert, Elisa Glasgow
- Microfinance Program (MFP) Director
- Senior staff from the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
- Senior staff from the Ministry of Trade & Industry
- CEDA Program Director Mohamed Jalloh
- ARD Executive Director Alie Forna
- ARD Operations Manager David Kamara
- Hope Micro Executive Director S.D. Kanu
- Hope Micro Head of Operations George Younge
- Finance Salone Finance Manager
- Finance Salone Executive Director Ben Nobala
- CCF/SMT Executive Director Regina Sulla
- GGEM Executive Director
- GGEM Resident Technical Advisor, Sunil Khanal
- Bank Managers and board members of the community banks in Yoni, Lunsar, Segbwema and Matru Jong.
- Directors of non funded MFIs such as FICLES, MAPCO and ReMFI in Bo, KENDDRA in Kenema and PRIMED, CES, LUMA, and NOW in Freetown.

## **Annex 3: Format for Final Evaluation Report**

**Length:** To better support use of the evaluation, the report should not exceed 40 pages, plus annexes.

### **1. Executive summary**

### **2. Purpose of the evaluation**

- Restate the purpose of the mid-term project evaluation
- How this evaluation fits into project cycle and project planning/review activities

### **3. Evaluation methodology**

- Methods used
- Work plan
- Team composition

### **4. Background**

- Country context (policy, institutional environment with relevance to UNCDF programme intervention)
- Project rationale (local demand, market niche, partners' comparative advantage, expected added value of project, partnerships, etc – as foreseen in project document)
- Project status (implementation, financial)

### **5. Evaluation**

This section of the report to be structured as per the scope of the evaluation outlined in TOR (Section 3).

#### **5.1 Results achievement**

- Include table listing development and immediate objectives, outputs and indicators. Include end-of-project targets and latest data on target achievements to date.
- Output achievements (with reference to Annual work plan, and evaluative evidence)
- Likelihood of outcome/immediate objective and development objective achievement
- Other critical issues related to results achievement

#### **5.2 Factors affecting successful implementation and results achievement**

- External factors
- Project-related factors

#### **5.3 Strategic positioning and partnerships**

#### **5.4 Sustainability of results and exit strategy/post project planning**

#### **5.5 Lessons**

Extract critical lessons at two levels:

- Project-level lessons
- Partner-specific lessons

#### **5.6 Recommendations**

Make recommendations to improve the project based on the evaluation and lessons.

Structure according to sections 4.1-4.4, plus any additional recommendations.

## **Annexes**

To include, at minimum:

- Management Response (template to be provided)
- TOR
- List of people interviewed/focus group discussions, etc
- References

## **Format for the Evaluation Summary**

This is a 4-5-page summary of the Evaluation Report. This is distinct from the Executive Summary, and should serve as a self-contained summary that may be read without reference to the main report. The Evaluation Summary should follow this outline:

1. Project data sheet
2. Background to the project
3. Description of the project
4. Purpose of the evaluation
5. Key findings of the evaluation mission
6. Lessons learned
7. Recommendations of the mission
8. Evaluation team composition