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EVALUTATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

**“LIVELIHOODS PROMOTION AND ECONOMIC ENGAGEMENT FOR SYRIAN REFUGEES AND HOST POPULATION IN VULNERABLE COMMUNITIES IN BAALBEK-HERMEL, BEKAA, NABATIYEH AND SOUTH GOVERNORATES in LEBANON – Phase II”**

FUNDED BY KFW

### Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country Office Name** | Lebanon |
| **Contract Number** | LBKEAD |
| **Partners (if applicable)** | N/A |
| **Location (country/ies, region/s)** | Bekaa, Baalbeck-Hermel, South, and Nabatieh |
| **Project title** | “LIVELIHOODS PROMOTION AND ECONOMIC ENGAGEMENT FOR SYRIAN REFUGEES AND HOST POPULATION IN VULNERABLE COMMUNITIES IN BAALBEK-HERMEL, BEKAA, NABATIYEH AND SOUTH GOVERNORATES in LEBANON – Phase II” |
| **Sector(s)** | Livelihood |
| **Duration** | 27 months |
| **Starting Date** | 1 February 2022 |
| **Ending Date** | 30 April 2024 |
| **Donor** | KFW |
| **Evaluation Type** | External |
| **Evaluation Dates** | July – September 2024 |

### Acronyms

ACF: Action Against Hunger

CfW: Cash for Work

FCS: Food Consumption Score

FGDs: Focus Group Discussions

ITS: Informal Tented Settlements

KFW: Kreditanstalt Für Wiederaufbau (German Development Bank)

OECD/DAC: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee

PLW: Pregnant and Lactating Women

PPT: Power Point Template

SWM: Solid Waste Management

TORs: Term of References

## project BACKGROUND

### 1.1 project Objectives

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objectives of the project** | Improved living conditions for Syrian refugees and Lebanese host communities due to the provision of temporary job opportunities and a positive contribution to the environmental conditions in the targeted communities. |
| **Expected results and key indicators** | **Objective 1: Improved labour insertion and protection of vulnerable Lebanese Host Community and Refugee Community members**  Outcome 1.1: CfW beneficiary households have an increased capacity to meet their basic needs  *Indicator 1.1: % of CfW beneficiaries that report an improved capacity to cover their basic needs following participation in CfW activities*  *Baseline: n/a*  *Target value: 75%*  Outcome 1.2: CfW beneficiary households decrease utilization of high-risk coping strategies  *Indicator 1.2: % decrease in the proportion of CfW beneficiaries utilizing the most severe coping strategies*  *Baseline: n/a*  *Target value: 10%*  Outcome 1.3: Trust and positive perception of each other among the CfW beneficiaries are attained at the end of each CfW cycle.  *Indicator 1.3: % increase in the proportion of CfW beneficiaries reporting positive relationships between Lebanese and Syrians workers throughout the project activities.*  *Baseline: n/a*  *Target value: 10%*  Outcome 1.4 Increased dietary diversity of beneficiary households (Pro-portion of beneficiaries with 'Acceptable' FCS )  *Indicator 1.4: % increase in the proportion of beneficiary households with an ‘Acceptable’ Food consumption score*  *Baseline: n/a*  *Target Value: 25 %*  Improved environmental conditions and SWM in communities of vulnerable Lebanese Host Communities and Syrian Refugees.  **Outcome 2.1 Environmental conditions are improved in communities of affected populations**  *Indicator 2.1: % of activity implementation sites with improved environmental conditions as a result of CfW activities.*  *Baseline: n/a*  *Target value: 80%*  **Outcome 2.2** CfW beneficiaries and community members adopt SWM behaviours for sustainable change in environmental cleanliness  *Indicator 2.2: % of beneficiaries and community members who report using positive SWM practices (sorting)*  *Baseline: 15%*  *Target value: 60%* |
| **Main activities implemented** | Bekaa:  Cash for Work:   * Sorting and rehabilitation works at sorting facilities * Cleaning of public roads and street shoulders * Cleaning in ITS * Cleaning and small rehabilitation works in public spaces and natural reserves.   Complementary Activities:   * Trainings on work safety and First Aid * Group sessions on nutrition, protection and well-being for all beneficiaries. * Awareness campaigns in the targeted communities about solid waste management   South:  Cash for Work:   * Sorting and rehabilitation works at sorting facilities * Cleaning of public roads, street shoulders and water channels * Cleaning of public gardens and beaches * Cleaning in ITS * Cleaning and small rehabilitation works in public spaces and natural reserves   Complementary Activities:   * Trainings on work safety and First Aid * Group sessions on nutrition, protection and well-being for all beneficiaries * Awareness campaigns in the targeted communities about solid waste management |

The project logframe is attached in Annex I.

### 1.2 project Current Status

The project has been completed at the end of April 2024. All activities are finalized, and all targets and objectives have been fully achieved. A few minor delays were encountered over the course of implementation, mostly related to the hostilities in the South or other security issues, especially at the end of 2023.

## PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluator will deliver the project final evaluation. This comes at a critical moment for the intervention as the project has been completed and the next (third) phase of the intervention – with a similar theory of change and logical framework – is starting.

The evaluation will therefore allow ACF to make decisions and adapt or change some aspects of the intervention during the third phase.

### 2.2 Objectives of the Evaluation

The evaluation's purpose is to contribute to the internal learning efforts, improving program quality and accountability of the third phase of the intervention.

The evaluation will focus on:

* **Project changes**: positive and negative, primary and secondary, long-term and broader effects produced by an intervention. The focus here should be on the indented and unintended outcome of the intervention at micro (household, individual) and macro level (community infrastructure, solid waste management, environment).
* **Project performance**: assess the performance of the project using the OECD/DAC criteria and focusing on relevance, design, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and likelihood of impact, management effectiveness.

**2.3 Use and users of the Evaluation**

The evaluation will be used to improve knowledge and understanding of the intervention/approach, identify lessons learnt, good practices and provide recommendations to improve the third phase of the project.

### 2.4 dissemination plan

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Audience** | **Objective** | **Tools used for dissemination** | **Forum** | | **Who will be in charge?** | **Timeline** |
| Internal - ACF | Share main findings of the evaluation with a specific focus on recommendations for ACF. | Summary PPT presentation of the final evaluation results. | | Technical Monthly Meeting (Programs) | Evaluator and evaluation steering committee (ACF) | After the evaluation |
| External - KFW | Share main findings of the evaluation with a specific focus on recommendations for KFW. | Summary PPT presentation of the final evaluation results. | | Ad-hoc Meeting with KFW | Evaluator and evaluation steering committee (ACF) | After the evaluation |

## EVALUATION SCOPE

### 3.1 Elements to be covered by the evaluation

The evaluation will focus on the whole project and all geographical areas of implementation. The scope includes the household level intervention (cash for work, group and awareness sessions) and the community level intervention (improvement of environmental conditions and adoptions of positive SWM behaviors).

Specifically, the evaluation will assess whether the project has been successful in:

* contributing to the livelihoods of the host population and refugee communities in vulnerable areas in the governorates of Baalbek-Hermel, Bekaa, Nabatiyeh and the South of Lebanon. This will include conducting a basic market assessment of daily wages in the areas of implementation, comparing wages for skilled and non-skilled labour in the sectors relevant to the project.
* offering environmental services, raising environmental and nutritional awareness in the communities in targeted areas and promoting wellbeing and social cohesion.

### 3.2 Cross-cutting issues

ACF has built on the lessons learnt from the first phase of the project to better incorporate gender mainstreaming in the project. Specific measures have been taken to ensure that women have increased access to the project activities.

· Customization of Personal Protective Equipment respectful of social and cultural norms

· Adjusting working hours to align with family needs, cultural and religious events.

· Arranging toilet facilities in the working areas, for instance with installation of gender segregated latrines in ITSs or agreements with shops and restaurants in urban areas.

· Identify a man per group, sensitized on gender equality issues that can offer support and work with the female group to reduce the risk of harassment.

· Sensitize the gender equality and awareness during the induction session

· Arranging regular field visits by organization team members assigned to work directly with the group and organize regular FGDs with women to be able to report challenges, good practices, eventual mis-behavior by staff, CfW colleagues or else and be able to adapt the intervention accordingly to ensure safety and dignity are always respected.

· Tailor activities to create work opportunities for women with lower requirements of physical strength or exposure to hazards, such as aware-ness and mobilization that can be conducted also by Pregnant and Lactating Women (PLW)

· Promote women empowerment with representation of women in decision making roles

As the main cross-cutting issue, gender should be incorporated into the evaluation. Specifically, focus should be given on whether ACF was able to put in practice the above commitments and whether these were successful in achieving gender equality in the project.

## required Application package

The evaluation should be users-oriented (e.g. ACF and KFW) and adopt ACF guiding principles (adapted from the OECD/DAC evaluation principles) of impartiality and independence, credibility, usefulness, transparency and participation and gender equality.

The evaluator should submit – as part of the application package – the following documents:

1. **Narrative description** (1-2 pages) of the evaluation approach, including reference to OECD/DAC criteria, methods that will be used for collecting information, both qualitative and quantitative (focus groups, surveys, interviews, document review, etc.), triangulation methods to be used, and possible methodology limitations.
2. **Evaluation questions matrix** (see Annex II). The evaluator is recommended to avoid too many questions (maximum 5) and sub-questions (maximum 3 per question).
3. **Detailed workplan.**
4. **CVs** of the evaluation team.
5. **Proof of previous experience** relevant to this ToR.
6. **Proof of registration** in Lebanon.
7. **Financial proposal** within budget (25.000 USD) with disaggregated budget lines.

## KEY DELIVERABLES

The following are the evaluation deliverables the evaluator will deliver to ACF:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverables** | **Description** | **Expected timeline** | **Payment (% of contract value)** |
| Desk Review, Inception Report (including the final evaluation questions mapping tool) and updated chronogram | The desk review is an analysis of existing secondary data made by the evaluator to support the inception report design.   During this phase, the evaluator will identify the information that will feed the evaluation and any information gaps that will have to be filled during the data collection phase using the EVALUATION QUESTION MATRIX. | 02/08/24 |  |
| Draft Evaluation Report | The evaluator will share the inception report with the evaluation lead who will be in charge of circulating the report within the steering committee to collect their feedback and share it back with the evaluator.  Then, the evaluator will integrate the feedback and share it again with the evaluation lead who will follow the same pathway until the final validation of the inception report. Once the inception report is validated, the evaluation could start. | 27/09/24 | 40% |
| Final Evaluation Report | The evaluation lead receives the draft of the evaluation report from the evaluator and circulates it for comments to the steering committee.  The evaluation lead share back the report to the evaluator for edits and revision of the report and make the final amendment.  If there are many feedbacks/comments, a meeting could be organized with the evaluator to ease the review process. | 18/10/24 |  |
| Evaluation restitution | The debriefings are designed to provide a summary of the main findings, conclusions, lessons learnt, best practices and recommendations of the evaluation practices and recommendations of the evaluation. It is organized by the steering committee with the evaluator once the final version of the evaluation report has been approved. | 25/10/24 | 60% |

**All outputs must be submitted in English and follow the format shared by ACF.**

The quality of the deliverables will be assessed by, discussed with and approved by the Steering Committee.

## MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS AND WORKPLAN

These evaluation TORs have been developed in a participatory manner, by the steering committee based on input from relevant stakeholders. The evaluator will directly report to the evaluation lead.

The evaluator will submit all the evaluation outputs directly and only to the evaluation lead. The evaluation lead will forward a copy to the steering committee for comments/feedback/review. The evaluation lead will consolidate the comments and send these to the evaluator by date agreed between the steering committee and the evaluator or as soon as the comments are received from the steering committee.

The evaluator will consider all comments to finalize deliverables and will submit it to the evaluation lead for a second review. If the steering committee still has comments/feedback, others back and forth will be done. Then, the evaluation lead will share the final version of the report to the steering committee and relevant stakeholders (according to the dissemination plan).

## Profile of the evaluator

The evaluation will be carried out by an evaluator with the following profile:

* Knowledge of the Lebanon humanitarian context, specifically Livelihoods, Environment, and Social Stability sectors.
* Significant field experience in the evaluation of humanitarian / development projects.
* Relevant degree / equivalent experience related to the evaluation to be undertaken.
* Significant experience in coordination, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programs.
* Good communications skills and experience of workshop facilitation.
* Ability to write clear and useful reports (may be required to produce examples of previous work).
* 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.

## LEGAL AND ETHICAL MATTERS

The ownership of the draft and final documentation belongs to ACF. Action Against Hunger will be the main evaluation addressee, and its results might impact operational and technical strategies. Action Against Hunger is likely to share the results of the evaluation with the following groups:

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

It is important that the consultant does not have any links to project management or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the evaluation's independence.

## ANNEXES

1. Project Logframe
2. Evaluation questions matrix