

Subject/Mission	Ebola Emergency Response
Review Sponsor	Brice De Le Vigne (OCB Director of Operations)
Review Manager	Sabine Kampmueller- Stockholm Evaluation Unit (SEU)
Review Team Leader	David Curtis- Consultant
Starting Date	01/06/15
Duration	25 days

Terms of Reference: Finance

REASON FOR THE REVIEW

One year after MSF (OCB) launched its response to the Ebola outbreak in Western Africa, and due to the complexity and challenges that have stretched the organisation, MSF OCB requires an **extensive multi-sectorial** review of its intervention.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The overall objective of the review is to provide: a picture of the intervention through a series of timelines identifying important events and milestones, a critical analysis of the intervention and choices taken with a focus on areas which challenged the organisation to change, adapt or develop new ways of working in response to the Ebola outbreak.

The review will look at the time period of 1st March 2014 to 31st March 2015.

The review should focus on the appropriateness of the chosen strategies/approach and provide an analysis of the effectiveness of the intervention. The analysis should identify key learning areas based on examples of good and bad practice as well as make recommendations for possible future best practices which can potentially improve guidelines, departmental strategies and learning.

The reviews scope is limited to all areas of the intervention under the direct operational management of OCB in the three countries most affected.

SPECIFIC EVALUATION TOPICS

1. How successful were the financial projections?

1. What financial processes were in place to manage the allocation of resources for the OCB Ebola response? (Appropriateness)
2. How often were financial projections performed and how did they compare to the eventual reality? (Effectiveness?)
3. What were the main reasons for variations between the projections and the reality? (Effectiveness)

4. How were the financial projections impacted by the change in operational strategy? (Impact)

2. How successfully were the inter-OC agreements designed, established and implemented?

1. What inter-OC agreements (on finance) were made regarding the sharing of resources? (Appropriateness)
2. How were the agreements designed, based on what criteria? (Appropriateness)
3. To what extent were the agreements implemented and monitored? (Effectiveness)
4. What were the main opportunities and constraints which arose for the implementation of the agreements? (Effectiveness)

3. How successfully was the Finance monitoring and reporting implemented during the intervention?

1. What adaptations in the monitoring and reporting process were implemented to match the evolution in the Ebola intervention (urban, rural, transboundary, national, other)? (Appropriateness)
2. What challenges, opportunities and other factors affected the implementation of the monitoring and reporting? (Effectiveness)
3. Where there any consequences or impacts on OCB response activities arising from results of the monitoring and reporting analysis? (Impact)

EXPECTED USES AND OUTPUTS

- Interactive overview of the key milestones/decisions/context of the intervention
- Critical analysis of the strategic choices and decisions
- Critical analysis of the successes at the level of implementation
- Potential areas for learning
- Recommendations for the future best practices where relevant

The review should focus specifically on the areas of the response which challenged OCB to adapt the strategy, develop new solutions or change its way of working. The review is not a classic what was done and what was not done review.

The review will attempt to deliver components of the ToR during the allotted timeframe. The Review will deliver a report per sector and specific transversal questions, which will be synthesised into a final document.

METHODOLOGY PROPOSED

The review should incorporate a mixed methodology (qualitative and quantitative) based on the MSF guideline for evaluation e.g. based on the objectives of the response and DAC criteria¹.

Will include: review and analysis of key project documents, interviews with team members at HQ and field levels, interviews with local authorities and other organizations, Interviews with patients, surveys, natural group discussions, roundtables, focus groups and lessons learned workshops.

¹ OECD DAC Criteria: Criteria for evaluation development assistance

TEAM REQUIREMENTS: Finance

Expected Background and Experience

The evaluators should be experienced independent consultants with the following minimum qualifications and experiences:

Profile

- Minimum 5 years of experience in humanitarian and development assistance
- Degree in Accounting and Financial Management or related field experience,
- Experience and knowledge at the level of support and/or management of financial programs or systems for developing countries, especially in Africa or in a similar context.
- Experience in West Africa a plus.
- Professional experience in conducting Financial and Accounting evaluations or other sector program and project evaluations and / or reviews essential,
- Knowledge of humanitarian and emergency procedures with large international institutions essential, with knowledge and or specific experience with MSF a plus.
- English Essential, French a plus

PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EVALUATION

The number of days identified are for the period between 01/06/15 and 31/10/15. The report writing and triangulation is expected to take place during September and October

Consultant	Finance
Timing of the evaluation	Starting June 2015
• For preparation (Days)	1 week
• For field visits (Days)	N/A
• For interviews (Days)	2 weeks
• Analysis and Triangulation	1 weeks
• For writing up report (Days)	1 weeks
Total time required (Days)	25 days