

TERMS OF REFERENCE

For the Independent Final Evaluation of Action Against Hunger

“Improving Efficiency, Availability, and Management of Water Resources in South Lebanon”

Programme Funded by

Delegation of the European Union to Lebanon

Contract Reference
ENI/2015/365-153

July 2018

Summary Table

Intervention Name	Improving Efficiency, Availability, and Management of Water Resources in South Lebanon
Intervention Code	A4AB
Contract Number	ENI/2015/365-153
Partners	South Lebanon Water Establishment (SLWE), Municipalities (Bent Jbeil, Khirbet Silm, Baraachite, Qalawy, Ain Ebel, Remish and Aytaroun) and Litani River Authority (LRA)
Location (country/ies, region/s)	Lebanon, Bint Jbeil and Marjaaoun Districts
Duration	30 months
Starting Date	1st January 2016
Ending Date	30th June 2018
Intervention/Country Office	South Lebanon, Bint Jbeil and Marjaaoun Districts
Language	English
Donor & Contribution/s	European Union
Country Office administering the Programme/Project	Action Against Hunger Tyre Office in coordination with Beirut Coordination Office
Evaluation Type	Performance Evaluation (Project/Programme Evaluation based on Development Assistance Committee Criteria)
Evaluation Dates	July 2018 - September 2018

- c) Poor financial sustainability of the water sector and Water Establishments: limited financial resources directed to the water stakeholders for capital investment, institutional strengthening, capacity building and technology transfer; limited cost-recovery due to inefficient supply chain leading to mistrust of the subscribers, and poor monitoring capacity; reduced Non-Revenue Water monitoring and management; competition of illegal private sector supply; poor asset management; lack of adequate recovery plan with concrete priority actions; lack of metering of production and supply for adequate variable tariff definition;
- d) Short supply capacity from public service: Scarce public production coupled with illegal competition over the exploitation of groundwater sources; very low storage capacity (estimated at 6%) harming the regularity of the service; poor condition of the water network leading to a high percentage of wastage in the transmission mains and distribution network; unreliable energy supply, interfering in the water flow and regularity; damaged or unused water sources with potential supply (damaged wells); influx of refugees and overall population growth; illegal connection on main water lines; undersized pipe diameter that is not enough for supply to all households; altered regulators by households driving uneven distribution of water; non-existing public networks in new neighborhood subdivisions.
- e) Poor Water Quality: Groundwater Contamination and surface water pollution (UNICEF Report indicates 60% to 70% of sources contaminated); lack of monitoring, hazards and risk controls; inefficient operation and management of water treatment facilities; old infrastructure (especially storage and networks) not ensuring adequate quality throughout the network; lack of resources for the implementation of adequate quality improvement plans; lack of knowledge from the stakeholders involved in the monitoring; poor practices at the household level for water conservation;
- f) Household Expenditure for Water Provision: irregular supply of public service leading to extra costs for alternative supply such as water trucking and bottled water; energy costs for private production; lack of metering for actual household water consumption; inefficient water distribution to the villages due to substandard water mains; unequal distribution of water amongst HHs due to altering of regulators.

1.3. Project Objectives

Action Against Hunger response in Lebanon, including this project, is contextually relevant and takes into consideration the needs of the most vulnerable populations, the national level mandates and priorities and the internationally agreed and developed response plans for the country (Lebanon Crisis Response Plan – LCRP 2018, Regional Response Plan – RRP). Furthermore, Action Against Hunger conducts all operations within Lebanon in alignment with the Government of Lebanon, World Bank, and UN's "*Lebanon Roadmap of Priority Interventions for Stabilization from Syrian Conflict*" – 2013, and the "*Action Plan for EU-Lebanon Partnership and Cooperation 2013 – 2015*", finally, Action Against Hunger Lebanon has an agreement with the South Lebanon Water Establishment (SLWE) for the proposed project.

The project "*Improving Efficiency, Availability, and Management of Water Resources in South Lebanon*" aimed to contribute to the efficiency of water distribution systems, while promoting the expansion of clean water supplies for vulnerable populations, both host and refugee

community in Bent Jbeil and Marjaayoun districts, in South Lebanon. The project was funded by European Union (EU) and was conducted in partnership with the South Lebanon Water Establishment (SLWE), municipalities in the corresponding districts and the Litani River Authority (LRA).

This 2 years intervention that started in January 2016, undertook: (i) the improvement of Water Infrastructure and Supply Networks, (ii) the provision of an efficient management of resources to targeted communities and localities and (iii) the strengthening of local municipalities, community governance structures, rural cooperatives, and household capacities in assessment, planning, management/use, and advocacy for water resources and water needs. The geographic scope of this specific project was defined in coordination with SLWE and it is based on the initial assessment and recommendations received from 40 municipalities that are part of the Union of Municipalities (UoM) of Bent Jbeil and Marjayoun districts. Although the project was indirectly benefitting both Syrian and Lebanese populations in the 40 municipalities, the project was mainly implemented in seven municipalities: Bent Jbeil, Khirbet Silm, Baraachite, Qalawy, Ain Ebel, Remish and Aytaroun.

The table below details the distribution of Lebanese and Syrian population over the targeted municipalities.

Location	Type of activity	Lebanese Beneficiaries Summer (Individual)	Lebanese Beneficiaries Winter (Individual)	Syrian Beneficiaries (Individual)
Bent Jbeil	Construction of reservoir and Awareness sessions	20523	3848	1190
Aytaroun	Awareness sessions	7739	2428	230
Khirbet Silm	Transmission Line and Awareness sessions	4694	2933	493
Ain Ebel	Awareness sessions	6759	2253	176
Remish	Awareness sessions	5950	2550	230
Qalawy	Transmission Line and Awareness sessions	1214	568	
Baraachite	Transmission Line and Awareness sessions	5241	1497	246
Grand Total		52120	16077	2603

The table below details the general and specific objectives addressed in the project:

General Objective	Contribute to improving the access to basic services for the populations of Bent Jbeil and Marjayoun districts
Specific Objective 1	To improve the efficiency of water distribution networks, while promoting the expansion of clean water supplies for vulnerable populations of Bent Jbeil and Marjayoun districts
Specific Objective 2	To enhance the adequate use of water for economic development by promoting linkages between Municipalities, Local Civil Society as well as local residents (local communities and displaced populations)

The activities of the project were divided into two parts: (i) the hard component; the construction (ii) the soft component were the awareness sessions. The construction part included the establishment of transmission pipelines, construction of 2000-m³ reservoir in Bent Jbeil, and rehabilitation of Taybeh Pumping Station. The awareness sessions aimed at raising the beneficiaries and stakeholder's awareness on the importance of water conservation, water storage and prevention of water borne diseases. The sessions were implemented in the seven municipalities mentioned above, targeting 1000 households corresponding to 5400 individuals.

The Intervention logframe is attached in Annex I.

1.3. Intervention Current Status

All project activities were completed at the end of December 2017, as per the work plan. However, a 6 months Non Cost Extension was needed and approved by EU, to cover the whole guarantee period of the infrastructural works (one year by the end of June 2018) allowing, upon its expiry, the handing over of the completed works to the South Lebanon Water Establishment (SLWE).

The following updates were carried out, on the construction activities, based on the needs identified and in close coordination with SLWE:

- *Equipping of 3 wells, including pumping stations, energy grid connection, and other necessary materials in Majadel, Kirbit Silim and Braashit were cancelled.*
- *Rehabilitation and cleaning of 8 Water Tanks in Houla, Kalawi, Braashit, Kounine, Hanine, Majadel and Al Taybe and the renovation were cancelled.*
- *Extension of 20km of Water Distribution Networks in Qalaway, Majadel, Houla, Al Taybeh, Hanine and Braashit was limited to the rehabilitation of 7 Km transmission lines in Braashit, Qalaway and Khirbit Silim.*

Similarly, the scope of activity 2.1.1 (*Development of Sustainable Water Integrated Management Plan for the SLWE (Cost-Recovery, Non-Revenue Water, Water for the Vulnerable, Energy Efficiency and Asset Management)*) was modified to include a more comprehensive package, based on the following: assessment, analysis, strategy preparation, advocacy and structured responses to problems, as compared to that initially proposed, following the direct cooperation with SLWE and the external coordination with other stakeholders active in the capacity building sector in South Lebanon. The capacity building

package and the expected plans were elaborated at the level of the targeted water system for the construction activity, instead of being elaborated at regional level. WHY The overall objective of the activity was to support the SLWE in the management of the water supply system and its components, through a deep assessment of Bent Jbeil and Marjaayoun Water

Service with the elaboration of the Water Management Plan for Bint Jbeil Water Service Area. Alongside activity 2.1.1, Activity 2.1.2 (*Water Safety Improvement and Monitoring Training Planning for Domestic and Irrigation Water*) was also modified. The modification of this activity was in the scope of the comprehensive package of assessment, analysis, strategy preparation, advocacy, and structured responses to problems, as initially foreseen in the formulation, following the direct cooperation with SLWE and LRA, whereby the capacity building package and the expected plans have been elaborated at the level of the target water system for the construction activity, instead of at regional level. Water Safety Plan was elaborated for Bint Jbeil Water Service Area.

2. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

2.1 Rational for the Evaluation

As a joint requirement of Action Against Hunger and the European Union, the end line performance evaluation needs to be conducted. Initially, the evaluation was planned to be completed on October 2017. However, this was not feasible due to a set of activities still running. Therefore, the process was delayed until the end of the Non Cost Extension Period. As a result, Action Against Hunger will be able to evaluate the performance of all objectives and activities, from July to September 2018.

2.2 Objectives of the Evaluation

The objective of this final project evaluation is to assess the project performance focusing on the relevance, design, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, likelihood of impact and management effectiveness (DAC Criteria) of the action. The project final evaluation focuses on evaluating the activities carried out as part of the project's objectives. The evaluation addresses the following:

- Answer the evaluation questions related to estimate the project based on DAC Criteria (Annex V)
- Assess the overall impact of the intervention on the target communities and provide recommendations on the identified gaps.
- Identify key project challenges and risks that caused a delay or caused a change in the planning and implementation
- Assess the level of participation of the target community, beneficiaries and partners in the different phases of the project
- Evaluate the performance and participation of the consultancy firm, in terms of engagement, interaction and technical capacity
- Defining good practices to be capitalized
- Defining recommendations and lessons learnt

2.2. Users of the Evaluation

- Direct users:
 - Field Teams: Country Director, Deputy Country Director, WASH Coordinator, WASH Program Managers, MEAL Coordinator, Head of Base and Managers.
 - Stakeholders: European Union, South Lebanon Water Establishment, Litany River Authority
- Indirect users: Action Against Hunger International Network, International NGOs with a focus on implementing WASH intervention in Lebanon.

2.3. Use of the Evaluation

The final evaluation aims at collecting evidence concerning the performance of Action Against Hunger in achieving planned objectives upon implementation of this intervention. Additionally, it will provide ways of learning from the experience acquired through 30 months of work. Through capitalizing lessons learnt and good practices, this evaluation allows for the development of new strategies/interventions while optimizing Action Against Hunger internal performances in implementing projects in the WaSH sector.

3. EVALUATION SCOPE

3.1. Elements covered by the evaluation

The scope of the evaluation is to assess the impact of WaSH interventions on conserving and managing the water resources in Bint Jbeil and Marjaayoun districts in particular in the seven targeted villages: Khirbet Selem, Baraashit, Qalaway, Bint Jbeil, Ein Ebel, Aytaroun and Rmeish. This includes an assessment of how different activities of construction of infrastructure (Transmission lines, Bint Jbeil Reservoir, and Taybeh Pumping Station), capacity building of SLWE staff and awareness raising activities at municipal level contributed to achieving project goals. It aims at reviewing the impact of the actions on both community and institutional levels.

3.2. Cross-cutting issues

The evaluation aims at assessing the level of gender mainstreaming and community participation in the action.

4. EVALUATION APPROACH AND QUESTIONS

As per Action Against Hunger Evaluation Policy and Guidelines, Action Against Hunger adheres to the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria for evaluating its interventions and country offices. Specifically, Action Against Hunger uses the following adapted criteria: Design, Coherence, Coverage, Relevance/ Appropriateness, Effectiveness, Efficiency, management effectiveness Sustainability and Likelihood of Impact.

The evaluation questionnaire has been developed to support the evaluator to assess the intervention described against the criteria (Ref. to annex V). The evaluator may adapt the evaluation criteria and questions, but any fundamental changes should be agreed between the evaluation manager and the evaluator and reflected in the inception report.

All independent evaluations are expected to use the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)/DAC criteria in data analysis and reporting. In particular, the evaluator must complete the DAC criteria-rating table (Refer to Annex V) and include it as part of the final evaluation report.

5. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

This section outlines the suggested methodological approach for the evaluator to collect quantitative and qualitative data. The evaluator will develop data gathering instruments and methods that need to be shared and validated by the evaluation manager, prior to their use.

5.1. Evaluation Briefing

Prior to the evaluation taking place, the evaluator is expected to attend a briefing at HQ level, and at field level with the Head of Mission and/or the relevant technical focal point. Briefings by telephone must be agreed in advance.

5.2. Desk review

The evaluator will undertake a desk review of the materials created during the intervention including the project documents and proposals, progress reports, outputs of the intervention (such as publications, communication materials, videos, recording etc.). For instance, the reports (water management plan, water safety plan, capacity building materials and construction final report) of the two consultancies for the hard and the soft components of the project will be shared with the evaluator together with the baseline and end line assessment carried out by the Action Against Hunger MEAL department.

5.3. Inception Report

At the end of the desk review period and before the field mission, the evaluator will prepare a brief inception report based on the format provided by evaluation manager of Action Against Hunger. The report will be written in English and will include the following sections:

- Key elements of the Terms of Reference (ToRs) to demonstrate that the evaluator will adhere to the ToRs.
- The methodological approach to the evaluation include an evaluation matrix to specify how the evaluator will collect data to answer the evaluation questions, pointing out the limitations to the methodology, if any, and the choice of sites per field visit
- A detailed evaluation work plan
- Statement of adherence to Action Against Hunger Evaluation Policy and outline the evaluation report format

The inception report will be discussed and approved by the evaluation manager, prior to its use.

5.5. Field Mission

Primary data collection techniques

As part of the evaluation, the evaluator will interview key project stakeholders (expatriate/national project staff, local/national representatives, local authorities, SLWE and municipalities, beneficiaries, local NGO, humanitarian agencies), as per the list in Annex IV. The evaluator will use a suitable format for the interviews, as detailed in the inception report. The evaluator is also expected to collect information directly from beneficiaries. In the table, recommendations of minimum requirements:

Subject to be assessed	Data collection Tools
Construction activities	Key informant interviews

Capacity building for SLWE and LRA	Key Informant Interviews
Awareness Session for beneficiaries	Focus Group Discussion in the two villages that have most participants. The sample should include Syrian and Lebanese.

Prior to conducting the interviews and data collection, the evaluator must share the data collection tools with the evaluation manager for validation. In addition, the evaluator is required to triangulate data with the baseline and endline assessments carried out by the Action Against Hunger MEAL Team during the project implementation.

Field visits

The evaluator will visit the project sites according to the selected methods described in the inception report. Action Against Hunger MEAL field officers will support the visits with the evaluator when is requested to identify beneficiaries, inspect infrastructure, conduct primary data collection

Secondary data collection techniques: Desk review

The evaluator will further review complementary documents and collect project monitoring data and any other relevant statistical data.

Debriefing and stakeholders workshop

The evaluator is expected to facilitate an in-country learning workshop in Tyre to present preliminary findings of the evaluation to Action Against Hunger and key stakeholders (including Local, National actors and implementing partners actors); to gather feedback on the findings and build consensus on recommendations; to develop action-oriented workshop statements on lessons learned and proposed improvements for the future.

5.6. Evaluation Report

The evaluation report shall follow the following format and be written in English:

- Cover Page;
- Summary Table following the template that will be provided by the evaluation manager
- Table of Contents
- Executive Summary will be a summary, describing the intervention, main findings of the evaluation and conclusions and recommendations, of no more than 2 pages in length
- Background Information
- Methodology describe the methodology used, provide evidence of triangulation of data and presents limitations to the methodology
- Findings includes overall assessment of the project against the evaluation criteria, responds to the evaluation questions; findings need to be backed up by evidence, cross-cutting issues are mainstreamed and unintended and unexpected outcomes are discussed and detailed
- Conclusions are formulated by synthesizing the main findings into statements of merit and worth; judgments are fair, impartial and consistent with the findings
- Lessons Learnt and Good Practices presents lessons that can be applied elsewhere to improve intervention performance, outcome, or impact and; identify good practices:

successful practices from those lessons which are worthy of replication; further develop on set of specific good practices to be showcased in the template provided in Annex VI

- Recommendations should be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible; it needs take careful account of the circumstances currently prevailing in the context of the action and the resources available to implement it both locally. Recommendation should follow logically from the conclusions, lessons learned and good practices. The report must specify the person in charge of taking what action and when. Recommendations need to be presented by order of priority
- Annexes should be listed and numbered and must include the following: logical framework provided in Annex I, Good practices template provided in Annex VI, Evaluation Criteria Rating Table provided in Annex V, list of documents for the desk review, list of persons interviewed, data collection instrument, evaluation TORs

The whole report shall not be longer than 30 pages, 50 pages including annexes. The draft report should be submitted no later than 10 calendar days after the departure from the field. The final report will be submitted no later than the end date of the consultancy contract. Annexes to the report will be accepted in the working language of the country and intervention/country office subject to the evaluation.

6. KEY DELIVERABLES

The following are the evaluation outputs the evaluator will deliver to the evaluation manager:

Outputs	Deadlines
Inception Report	4 th of August 2018
Stakeholders workshop	30 th of August 2018
Draft Evaluation Report	9 th of September 2018
Final Evaluation Report	18 th of September 2018

All outputs must be submitted in English and in a Word Document format.

The quality of the inception report and the evaluation report will be assessed by the evaluation manager. The evaluator is expected to follow the format, structure and length as defined under section 5.4 and 5.6 above.

7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS AND WORKPLAN

The evaluation TOR have been developed in a participatory manner, by the evaluation manager based on inputs from WaSH PM and MEAL Manager.

The evaluator will directly report to the evaluation manager. The evaluator will submit all the evaluation outputs directly and only to the evaluation manager. The evaluation manager will do a quality check (ensure required elements are there) and decide whether the report is ready to be shared. The evaluation manager will forward a copy to the key stakeholders for comments on factual issues and for clarifications, if any needed. The evaluation manager will consolidate the comments and send them to the evaluator by the date agreed between the evaluation manager and the evaluator or as soon as the comments are received from stakeholders. The evaluator will consider all the comments prior to the finalization of the report

and will submit it to the evaluation manager who will then officially forward it to relevant stakeholders.

Once the evaluation is completed, the evaluation manager will prepare the management response follow-up form to track the implementation of the recommendations outlined in the evaluation report. A review of the follow-up process will be undertaken six months after the publication of the evaluation report.

7.1. Tentative Workplan

NOTE: Consultants are expected to work 6 days a week (either Sundays/Fridays or whatever day the field office has off will not be paid) during their consultancy contract. Travel days are not paid as they are not working days as such.

Activities	Evaluator Working days	Dates
Evaluation briefing with the evaluation manager	0.5	27 th July 2018
Desk review, preparation of field work and prepare Inception Report	7	From 27 th July to 4 th August
Validation of inception report by Action Against Hunger	0.5	6 th of August
Meeting with Action Against Hunger WASH team	0.5	6 th of August
Field work, collection and analysis of secondary data & meeting with stakeholders	16	From 6 th to 27 th August 2018
Preparation for Stakeholders workshop	2	28 th and 29 th of August
Stakeholders Workshop in country	1	30 th of August 2018
Evaluation debriefing with the evaluation manager	0.5	2 nd of September 2018
Draft Report	6	From 3 rd to 9 th of September 2018
Quality check and initial review by the evaluation manager, circulate draft report to key stakeholders, consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to evaluator		12 th of September
Final report based on stakeholders and evaluation manager comments	4	18 th of September 2018
Total	38	

7.2. Profile of the evaluator

The evaluation will be carried out by a national evaluation consultant or company with the following profile:

- Familiar with the following: WASH intervention, construction of WASH infrastructure, capacity building at institutional level and awareness raising campaign at community level;
- Relevant degree / equivalent experience related to the program evaluation such as civil

and/or infrastructure engineering or any related disciplines with sociology science background is desirable;

- Significant experience in coordination, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes;
- Significant field experience in the evaluation of humanitarian and /or development projects in particular WASH;
- Knowledge of the area of intervention South Lebanon, districts of Marajaaoun and Bint Jbeil;
- Good communications skills and experience of workshop facilitation;
- Ability to write clear and detailed reports (may be required to present examples of previous work);
- Previous working experience with SLWE;
- Fluent in English and Arabic;
- Understanding of donor requirements;
- Ability to manage the available time and resources and to work to tight deadlines;
- Independence from the parties involved.

7.3 Requirements

- The applicant should be registered and accredited in an official body for the purpose of this work.
- The firm shall have proven experience working with Action Against Hunger International in similar project.
- The firm shall be registered in the Ministry of Finance and have proven record of financial solvability;
- The firm shall not have any pending judicial lawsuit that can endanger the objectives of the proposed consultancy.

7.4 Selection criteria of the evaluator

The selection of the consultancy firm will have in consideration the following points:

- Cost/financial proposal: 40%
- Technical proposal: 40%
- Evaluation team profile: 20%

7.5 Selection process

A Consultant Selection Committee (CSC) will evaluate the technical proposals according to the requirements and criteria defined above. The Consultant Selection Committee will, initially, independently assess whether the technical proposals comply with the submission requirements and will then evaluate each proposal. The CSC will be composed of 3 Action Against Hunger staff. An assessment table will be filled and will be made available for consultation.

8. LEGAL AND ETHICAL MATTERS

The ownership of the draft and final documentation belongs to Action Against Hunger and the funding donor, exclusively. The document, or publication related to it, will not be shared except with Action Against Hunger, before the delivery by Action Against Hunger of the final document to the donor.

Action Against Hunger is to be the main addressee of the evaluation and it is up to Action Against Hunger to share the results of the evaluation with the following:

- Donor(s)
- Governmental partners
- Various co-ordination bodies

To ensure an independent evaluation, the consultant must not have any links to the project management, or any other conflict of interest that could interfere with the independence of the evaluation.

8.1. Intellectual Property Rights

All documentation related to the assignment (whether or not in the course of your duties) shall remain the sole and exclusive property of Action Against Hunger.

9. Payment

- 10% upon contract signature
- 20% upon delivery of Inception report
- 30% upon conducting the stakeholders workshop
- 40% upon delivery of final evaluation

All payments will be made wire transfer in USD, under the name of the contracting parties. The offer and payments are subject to the fiscal regulations applicable in Lebanon, at the responsibility of each party.

10. Submission of offers

Should be submitted by July 16th, 4.00pm. Offers received after this date will not be considered. Offers should be sent to the following address: Action Against Hunger, 9th Floor- Kalea Building, Sassine Area. Elias Baaklini Street. Acharafieh- Beirut

Offers can potentially be submitted by email. In such case, the same reference shall be used as the email title. Offers should be sent to: maridi@lb.acfspain.org. If sent by email it should be within the same deadline as offers submitted in hard (paper) copies

A reception note should be provided to the courier or the person in charge of delivery. The offer dossier should be sealed and contain all items listed in section 7.2 and 7.3. If the dossier is not completed it will not be considered.

11. Selection of consultant

The final selection will be communicated no later than July 27th, 2018.

ANNEXES TO THE TORs

- I. Intervention Logframe
- II. Evaluation Criteria and Detailed Evaluation Questions
- III. List of **Intervention documents** for the desk review
- IV. List of people to be interviewed
- V. Evaluation Criteria Table
- VI. Good Practice Template

Annex I: Intervention/Country Office Logframe

	Intervention logic	Indicators	Baseline	Current value	Targets	Sources and means of verification	Indicator detail if needed	Tool (if different from proposal)	
			(incl. reference year)	Reference date	(incl. reference year)				Target beneficiary
Overall objective: Impact	Contribute to Improved Efficiency, Availability, and Management of Water Resources in South Lebanon	IOO1. Overall HH Public Water Supply increases in South Lebanon;	Taybe pumping station is now closed from Dec-Feb		Dec-Feb2017 plant is working	Water establishment	Increased # working days/ year of Taybe pumping station		
		IOO2. Overall Water Quality Increases in the Long Term;	Pending Turbidity initial value for Dec16		Pending to decide the target we want	Quality water data in water treatment plant Taybeh	Water turbidity decreases in the Water treatment plant in Taybeh .		Water treatment plant in Taybeh.

Specific objective(s):	Specific Objective 1 :To improve the efficiency of water distribution networks, while promoting the expansion of clean water supplies for vulnerable populations of Bent Jbeil and Marjayoun districts;	ISO1.1 Public Water Supply increased in the targeted HHs;	HH with main source of water from Tayebbeh plant are not receiving water during Dec16-Feb17 months, disaggregate by municipality		HH with main source of water from Tayebbeh plant are receiving water during Dec17-Feb18 months				HH with main source of water from Tayebbeh plant
		ISO1.2. The HH perception of regularity of Public Water Supply increase	Initial perception of regularity: pending analysis of FGD reports				Average of hours received weekly in the hh from public network:	FGD + KII	Targeted HH

	Specific Objective 2 : To enhance the adequate use of water for economic development by promoting linkages between authorities, Municipalities , Local Civil Society as well as local residents (local communities and displaced populations);	ISO2.1 HHs have improved their awareness/knowledge on use of water				Satisfaction Survey for awareness sessions + Endline FGD		Satisfaction Survey + Endline FGD	Targeted HH
	Output 1.1: Essential Water Infrastructure and Supply Networks are improved in the targeted areas;	IO1.1.1 Water Reservoir Built;	m3 of water reservoir built;	0	2000	Technical Specifications; Tender Dossiers;			
		IO1.1.2 Water Network Rehabilitated;	# of Km of Water Network Renovated ;	0	7	Photo Report;			
		IO1.1.3 NEW: Reduced turbidity in Taybe pumping station	Turbidity Test			Water establishment and taybeh station	Plus New sedimentation pond added to decrease turbidity		

	Output 2.1: Efficient management of resources, is provided to targeted communities and localities;	IO2.1.1 SLWE Staff Trained in Non-Revenue Water Management (field operators) and they are using		0	80 in 4 groups	Training Manuals; Training Certificates; Test Results, Satisfaction Survey	SLWE Staff Trained in Non-Revenue Water Management disaggregated by sex, and % who have improved knowledge on Water Management	Participant list, Training Manuals. Pretest post test, Postmonitoring reports	SLWE Staff
		IO2.1.2 MWFP Trained in Non-Revenue Water Management and they are using;		0	40 in 2 groups (at least 10% women MORE IF POSSIBLE!)	Training Manuals; Training Certificates; Test Results; Mitigation plan, Satisfaction Survey		Participant list, Training Manuals. Pretest post test, Postmonitoring reports	MWFP participants
		IO2.1.3 Mitigation plan for Taybe plant closure have been developed and communicated to SLWE staff	0	0	1	Mitigation plan report			
		IO2.1.4 Safety Plan Programmes Developed and disseminated (1 for SLWE and Litani Authority)		0	1	Reports. Programme Action Plan Report;			

		IO2.1.5 SLWE Staff Trained on Safety plan	0	0	10 (at least 10% women)	Training Manuals, Training Certificates; Test Results;		Participant list, Training Manuals Pretest Posttest, Postmonitoring reports	SLWE staff (middle/top level)
		IO2.1.6 Litany River Authority Staff Trained on Safety plan;	0	0	5 (at least 1 woman)	Training Manuals Training Certificates; Test Results; Satisfaction Survey	# of Litany River Authority Staff Trained on Plan Elaboration and who have improved knowledge (%F, %M);	Participant list, Training Manuals Pretest Posttest, Postmonitoring reports	Litany River Authority Staff
		IO2.1.7 Farmers trained on Safety plan	0	0	30	Training Manuals Training Certificates; Test Results;	# of Farmers trained on water quality monitoring (%F, %M) and who have improved knowledge		Farmers trained
		IO2.1.8 % Water critical points identified in Water safety plan monitored (target area)	Percentage of Water Sources Monitored;	0%	100%	Safety Plan, Monthly reports	% Water Sources defined in the Water Safety Plan Monitored (quality) with x frequency		Water sources defined in Water Safety Plan +Monitoring register or Quality register

	IO2.2.1 MWFP Volunteers Trained and improved knowledge in WASH related issues;	0	0	32 (at least 50% women) 30 (check % of women)		# of volunteers trained (%F, %M) and with improved knowledge	Participant list, Training Manuals Pretest Posttest, satisfaction survey	Volunteers
	IO2.2.2 CBO Staff Trained in WASH related issues;	0	0	100 (at least 10% women)		# of CBO staff trained (%F, %M)	Participant list, Training Manuals	CBO Staff
	IO2.2.31.000 HH check if we can change to individual Informed about Water Management Solutions and Best Practices.	# of individuals participate in awareness session	0	1.000 HH (corresponding to 5.400 individuals; 2.846 women and 2.554 men)	participant lists, satisfaction surveys	# of hh individuals who participate in awareness session(%F, %M)	Monitoring sheets used by MWFP volunteers	Targeted hh

Annex II: Evaluation Criteria and Detailed Questions

To assess the project against each evaluation criteria, the evaluator will respond to the following evaluation questions:

Design: A measure of whether the design is logical allows for Result Based Management and include a sustainability strategy involving local partners and beneficiaries

- *To what extent were local stakeholders (beneficiaries, municipalities, local NGOs, SLWE, LRA) incorporated in needs identification?*
- *To what extent was data collected from needs assessment reliable and reflecting the reality?*
- *Were the objectives and targets identified realistic (results, outputs, outcomes, impact)?*
- *To what extent were the indicators identified Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time bound (SMART)?*
- *To what extent the duration of the project was appropriate with respect to the objectives and activities identified?*
- *To what extent was team structure and budget appropriate to achieve the identified objectives and activities?*
- *Does the design phase address efficient communication plan?*

Relevance/Appropriateness: A measure of whether interventions are in line with local needs and priorities (as well as donor policies, thus increasing ownership, accountability, and cost-effectiveness)

- *Was the intervention and chosen target population likely to ameliorate the problem significantly, i.e. was the intervention model sound?*
- *To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid?*
- *Are the activities and outputs of the project plausibly linked with the intended impacts and effects?*

Coherence: A measure of whether interventions are consistent with existing interventions, global and national policies and strategies to ensure consistency, maximize synergies and minimize duplication

- *To what extent the project is aligned with Lebanon Crisis Response plan.*
- *To what extent the project is aligned with SLWE Plan.*
- *Were any similar projects conducted previously in the area of intervention?*

- *How SLWE and LRA perceive and deal with the project?*

Coverage: A measure of whether interventions meet the need to reach major population groups facing life-threatening suffering wherever they are

- *What are the real number of villages benefiting from this project? Is it actually as theory (around 40 villages)?*
- *Does the impact of this project cover major population in the corresponding villages or restricted on few of them?*
- *The project was targeting both Lebanese and refugee Population. Do we want to know if the coverage of refugee Population was adequate and as planned?*

Efficiency: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results, includes value for money analysis

- *Were activities cost-efficient?*
- *Were objectives achieved on time?*
- *Were the resources (human, logistic, technical) allocated to achieve activities appropriate?*
- *Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to other available implementation methodologies?*

Effectiveness: A measure of the extent to which the interventions' objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance and illustrating the effectiveness of Action Against Hunger approach.

- *To what extent were the objectives achieved / are likely to be achieved?*
- *What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?*
- *Are services available?*
- *Are they accessible?*
- *Is quality good?*
- *Are services used?*
- *Is the project moving satisfactorily toward its stated objectives?*

Sustainability and likelihood of impact: A measure of whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn and project activities officially cease. Early signs of positive and negative, primary and secondary, short, mid and long-term

effects produced by an intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended

- *To what extent did the benefits of a project continue after donor funding ceased?*
- *What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project*
- *If the project had not been implemented, how would the situation be?*
- *What has happened because of the project?*
- *What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?*
- *How many people have been affected/targeted or benefitted with the project?*

Effectiveness of management set up: A measure of whether the management capacities and arrangements put in place to deliver the intervention support the achievement of results

- *To what extent was communication and Coordination with local stakeholders efficient and effective?*
- *To what extent was management of the team fruitful?*
- *To what extent was the capacities within the team appropriate to achieve corresponding activities?*
- *To what extent was selection of suppliers, consultants, and contractors appropriate?*
- *Were there any gaps/challenges in management of this project?*

Annex III: List of Intervention/Country Office documents for the desk review

The following documents will be reviewed by the evaluator during the desk review phase:

Intervention Proposal and Budget and amendments
Designing Good Indicators
MoU with SLWE
Logical framework
Interim Report
Water management and safety plans
Capacity building materials and final report
Baseline and endline assessment
Consultant final report for construction activities
MEAL Plan
Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines
Action Against Hunger Evaluation Policy
Activity Progress Reports

Annex IV: List of people to be interviewed

The evaluator will interview the following stakeholders:

Internal

Subject	Name	Position and Organization	Contact
Evaluate the monitoring and evaluation of the project	AbdAllah Sannan	MEAL manager, Action Agaisnt Hunger	70802846
Evaluate the coordination and implementation of activities	Alaa Moussa	Wash supervisor, Action Agaisnt Hunger	70606105
Evaluate the coordination and implementation of activities	Ali Hachem	Community Mobilizer, Action Agaisnt Hunger	71250801
External			
Subject	Name	Position and Organization	Contact
Evaluate the construction activities	Ramzi Ramadan	Head of studies department,SLWE	03904100
Evaluate the capacity building	Amal Chidiac	Head of laboratories department,SLWE	70679742
Evaluate the capacity building	Pierre Najem	Head of production department,SLWE	
Evaluate the construction activities in Taybeh pumping station	Hassan Mestrah	Head of Taybeh Pumping Station,SLWE	03631502
Evaluate the construction activities in Qalaway	Kassem Olayan	Water Operator in Qalaway,SLWE	03315155
Evaluate the construction activities in Khirbet selem	Khalil Cherri	Water Operator in Khirbet Selem,SLWE	70151495
Evaluate the construction activities in bint Jbeil	Afif Bazzi	Mayor of Bint Jbeil municipality	03869244

Evaluate the capacity building for LRA	Ibrahim Hoteit	Litani River Authority(LRA)	03488608
Evaluate the awareness campaign at municipal level	Ali Bazzi	Manager at Sanabel NGO, Bint Jbeil	70021070
Evaluate the awareness campaign at municipal level	Rima Bazzi	Volunteer, Sanabel NGO, Bint Jbeil	70021070

Annex V: Evaluation Criteria Table

The evaluator will be expected to use the following table to rank the performance of the overall intervention using the DAC criteria. The table should be included in annex of the evaluation report.

Criteria	Rating (1 low, 5 high)					Rationale
	1	2	3	4	5	
Design						
Relevance/Appropriateness						
Coherence						
Coverage						
Efficiency						
Effectiveness						
Sustainability and Likelihood of Impact						
Effectiveness of management set up						

Guidance for rating the evaluation criteria:

Rating	Definition
1. Unsatisfactory	Performance was consistently below expectations in most areas of enquiry related to the evaluation criteria. Overall performance in relation to the evaluation criteria is not satisfactory due to serious gaps in some of the areas. Significant improvement is needed. Recommendations to improve performance are outlined in the evaluation report and ACF will monitor progress in

	these areas.
2. Improvement Needed	Performance did not consistently meet expectations in some areas of enquiry- performance failed to meet expectations in one or more essential areas of enquiry. Some improvements are needed in one or more of these. Recommendations to improve performance are outlined in the evaluation report and ACF will monitor progress in these key areas.
3. On average Meets expectations	On average, performance met expectations in all essential areas of enquiry and the quality of work overall was acceptable. Eventual recommendations over potential areas for improvement are outlined in the evaluation report. A major part of the most critical expectations were met.
4. Meets expectations	Performance consistently met expectations in all essential areas of enquiry, and the quality of work overall was fairly good. The most critical expectations were met.
5. Exceptional	Performance consistently met expectations due to high quality of work performed in all essential areas of enquiry, resulting in an overall quality of work that was remarkable.

Annex VI: Good Practice Template

The evaluation is expected to provide one/set of key examples of Good Practices from the intervention/country office. These examples should relate to the technical area of intervention, either in terms of processes or in terms of systems, and should be potentially applicable to other contexts where Action Against Hunger operates. These examples of Good Practices should be presented in the Executive Summary and the Main Body of the report.

Title of Good Practice
<i>(Max. 30 words)</i>
Innovative Features & Key Characteristics
<i>(What makes the selected practice different?)</i>
Background of Good Practice
<i>(What was the rationale behind the good practice? What factors/ideas/developments/events lead to this particular practice being adopted? Why and how was it preferable to other alternatives?)</i>
Further explanation of chosen Good Practice
<i>(Elaborate on the features of the good practice chosen. How did the practice work in reality? What did it entail? How was it received by the local communities? What were some of its more important/relevant features? What made it unique?)</i>
Practical/Specific Recommendations for Roll Out
<i>(How can the selected practice be replicated more widely? Can this practice be replicated (in part or in full) by other ACF programmes? What would it take at practical level? What would it take at policy level?)</i>
How could the Good Practice be developed further?
<i>(Outline what steps should be taken for the practice to be improved and for the country office to further capitalise on this good practice)</i>