

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

ACT ALLIANCE LEBANON FORUM INVITES YOU TO SUBMIT A PROPOSAL FOR AN EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE ACT APPEAL LEB201

Dear Madam/Sir,

The Service is required for an external evaluation of the ACT Appeal LEB201 for the Emergency Response to the Beirut Explosion, an intervention supported by ACT Members. Please find enclosed the following documents which constitute the Request for Proposal:

A – Instructions

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

Annex 2: Proposal Submission Form (to be completed by the Candidate)

Annex 3: General Terms and Conditions for Service Contracts

Annex 4: Code of Conduct for Contractors

General Terms and Conditions for Service Contracts and Code of Conduct for Contractors can be found on the NCA webpage.

<https://www.kirkensnodhjelp.no/en/about-nca/for-contractors/>

If this document is a PDF format, upon request, a complete copy of the above documents can be forwarded in a WORD format for electronic completion. It is forbidden to make alterations to the text.

We should be grateful if you would inform us by email of your intention to submit or not a proposal.

A. INSTRUCTIONS

In submitting a proposal, the Candidate accepts in full and without restriction the special and general conditions including annexes governing this Contract as the sole basis of this procedure, whatever his own conditions of services may be, which the Candidate hereby waives. The Candidates are expected to examine carefully and comply with all instructions, forms, contract provisions and specifications contained in this Request for Proposal.

A.1. Scope of services

The Services required by the Contracting Authority are described in the Terms of Reference in Annex 1.

The Candidate shall offer the totality of the Services described in the Terms of Reference. Candidates offering only part of the required Services will be rejected.

A.2. Cost of proposal

The Candidate shall bear all costs associated with the preparation and submission of his proposal and the Contracting Authority is not responsible or liable for these costs, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the process.

A.3. Eligibility and qualification requirements

Candidates are not eligible to participate in this procedure if they are in one of the situations listed in article 33 of the General Terms and Conditions for Service Contracts.

Candidates shall in the Proposal Submission Form attest that they meet the above eligibility criteria. If required by the Contracting Authority, the Candidate whose proposal is accepted shall further provide evidence satisfactory to the Contracting Authority of its eligibility.

Candidates are also requested to certify that they comply with the Code of Conduct for Contractors.

A.4. Exclusion from award of contracts

Contracts may not be awarded to Candidates who, during this procedure:

- a. are subject to conflict of interest
- b. are guilty of misrepresentation in supplying the information required by the Contracting Authority as a condition of participation in the Contract procedure or fail to supply this information

A.5. Documents comprising the Request for Proposal

The Candidate shall complete and submit the following documents with his proposal:

- a. Proposal Submission Form (Annex 2) duly completed and signed by the Candidate
- b. CV. highlighting the Candidate's experience in the specific field of the Services and his/her specific experience in the country/region where the Services are to be performed
- c. Brief narrative technical proposal (tasks, timeline, methodology, deliverables, outcome of those deliverables etc.) including an understanding of the present terms of reference
- d. Letter of interest, clearly explaining how their experience meets desired qualifications
- e. 1- 2 examples of previous evaluation work
- f. Signed statement of integrity

The proposal and all correspondence and documents related to the Request for Proposal exchanged by the Candidate and the Contracting Authority must be written in the language of the procedure, which is English.

A.6. Financial proposal

The Financial Proposal shall be presented as an amount in USD in the Proposal Submission Form in Annex 2. The remuneration of the Candidate under the Contract shall be determined as follows:

Global price: The Candidate shall indicate in his/her proposal his/her proposed global remuneration for the performance of the Services. The Candidate shall be deemed to have satisfied himself as to the sufficiency of his/her proposed global remuneration, to cover both his/her fee rate, including overhead, profit, all his/her obligations, sick leave, overtime and holiday pay, taxes, social charges, etc. and all expenses (such as transport, accommodation, food, office, etc.) to be incurred for the performance of the Contract. The proposed global remuneration shall cover all obligations of the successful Candidate under the Contract (without

depending on actual time spent on the assignment) and all matters and things necessary for the proper execution and completion of the Services and the remedying of any deficiencies therein.

VAT and/or any sales tax applicable to the purchase of services shall be indicated separately in the proposal.

A.7. Validity

Proposals shall remain valid and open for acceptance for 30 days after the closing date.

A.8. Submission of proposals and closing date

Proposals must be received to the email address mentioned in the TOR not later than 29 January 2021.

A.9. Evaluation of Proposals

The evaluation method will be the quality and cost based selection. A two-stage procedure shall be utilised in evaluating the Proposals; a technical evaluation and a financial evaluation.

Proposals will be ranked according to their combined technical (*St*) and financial (*Sf*) scores using the weights of 75% for the Technical Proposal; and 25% for the offered price. Each proposal's overall score shall therefore be: $St \times 75\% + Sf \times 25\%$.

Technical evaluation

For the evaluation of the technical proposals, the Contracting Authority shall take the following criteria into consideration, with the indicated weights:

Technical evaluation		Maximum Points
1	Candidate's specialised knowledge and experience in the field of assignment	20
2	Candidate's solid knowledge of the context/country/general Beirut response/ACT Alliance	20
3	Candidate's relevant academic qualifications)	10
4	To what degree does the proposal show understanding of the task? Is the work plan adequate in responding to the Terms of Reference	20
5	Evaluation methodology (in line with ACT Alliance Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines, the PME Handbook and as per the OECD/DAC Guidance for emergencies, participatory, quantitative and qualitative data...)	20
6	Is the conceptual framework adopted appropriate for the assignment presenting a logical and realistic implementation plan	10
Total Technical Score		100

Interviews

The Contracting Authority reserves the right to call to interview the Candidates having submitted proposals determined to be substantially responsive.

Financial evaluation

Each proposal shall be given a financial score. The lowest Financial Proposal (*Fm*) will be given a financial score (*Sf*) of 100 points. The formula for determining the financial scores shall be the following:

$Sf = 100 \times Fm/F$, in which

Sf is the financial score

Fm is the lowest price and

F is the price of the proposal under evaluation

Negotiations

The Contracting Authority reserves the right to contact the Candidates having submitted proposals determined to be substantially and technically responsive, in order to propose a negotiation of the terms of such proposals. Negotiations will not entail any substantial deviation to the terms and conditions of the Request for Proposal, but shall have the purpose of obtaining from the Candidates better conditions in terms of technical quality, implementation periods, payment conditions, etc.

Negotiations may however have the purpose of reducing the scope of the services or revising other terms of the Contract to reduce the proposed remuneration when the proposed remunerations exceed the available budget.

A.12. Award criteria

The Contracting Authority will award the Contract to the Candidate whose proposal has been determined to be substantially responsive to the documents of the Request for Proposal and which has obtained the highest overall score.

A.13. Signature and entry into force of the Contract

Prior to the expiration of the period of the validity of the proposal, the Contracting Authority will inform the successful Candidate in writing that its proposal has been accepted and inform the unsuccessful Candidates in writing about the result of the evaluation process.

Within 5 days of receipt of the Contract, not yet signed by the Contracting Authority, the successful Candidate must sign and date the Contract and return it to the Contracting Authority. On signing the Contract, the successful Candidate will become the Contractor and the Contract will enter into force once signed by the Contracting Authority.

If the successful Candidate fails to sign and return the Contract within the days stipulated, the Contracting Authority may consider the acceptance of the proposal to be cancelled without prejudice to the Contracting Authority's right to claim compensation or pursue any other remedy in respect of such failure, and the successful Candidate will have no claim whatsoever on the Contracting Authority.

A.14. Cancellation for convenience

The Contracting Authority may for its own convenience and without charge or liability cancel the procedure at any stage.

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

TERMS OF REFERENCE

(06 January 2021)

External Evaluation of ACT Appeal LEB201 - Emergency Response to the Beirut Explosion

1. BACKGROUND

On August 4, 2020, at around 6:00pm, a warehouse at the Beirut Port containing large quantities of ammonium nitrate exploded. After an initial explosion, a subsequent blast caused widespread damage, with reports of damage more than 20 km from the port area. The explosions and ensuing fires reportedly released toxic materials in the environment. Hundreds of buildings including grain silos storing around 85 percent of the country's grain, and numerous residential places have been damaged or destroyed, including many healthcare facilities and several major hospitals in the Greater Beirut area, due to the blast. UNOCHA estimate that at least 204 people were killed, over 6,500 were injured, and more than 300,000 people left homeless in the Greater Beirut area - out of which 80,000 are children according to UNICEF. Additionally, several expats, migrant workers, refugees, UN and Embassy employees were either injured, killed or missing.

Beyond the destruction of private facilities and goods, UNOCHA reports that at least 15 medical facilities in the Greater Beirut area, including three major hospitals, have sustained damages. Hospitals in Beirut that were already struggling to cope with COVID-19 cases are stretched beyond capacity and some are affected with structural damages which have hindered operations and medical interventions, even for the most critical cases. The destruction of the Port of Beirut furthermore exacerbates Lebanon's already existing economic crisis, that has spiralled in unemployment, where more than 50% of the population is living below the poverty line, and with growing concerns over food supplies as the national wheat silo was destroyed. The government-owned Port of Beirut serves as the main maritime entry point into Lebanon and a vital piece of infrastructure for the importation of scarce goods. The explosion has hence limited the ability to import food and other basic necessary items.

Following the resignation of the government, Lebanon's capacity to respond to the massive humanitarian needs was additionally limited, and NGOs appealed to the international community to assist.

In order to ensure an efficient response, an ad hoc emergency coordination architecture has been launched, under the leadership of the Humanitarian Coordinator, supported by OCHA. The proposed structure, named Emergency Operation Cell (EOC), was agreed by the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) on 8 August and is composed of representatives of humanitarian stakeholders responding to the consequences of the explosion and the sectors prioritized by the HCT (Food Security, Health, Protection, Shelter, WASH and Logistics & Emergency Telecommunications). The EOC is furthermore linked to other critical functions of the emergency response, namely assessment and analysis, urban search and rescue and environmental issues.

Following the explosion, ACT Alliance members in Lebanon directly engaged in emergency and life sustaining activities in addition to distributing ready-to-eat food, facilitating psychological first aid, removing rubble and cleaning damages homes, and providing temporary shelter - targeting all in all around 40,480 people living in the affected area, who lost family members or property (house and business) as the result of the explosions; NFIs to 6000 persons; emergency shelter rehabilitation , refurbishment and restructuring of broken homes for 1,410 persons; livelihoods financial support to 60 institutions and businesses, food package distribution and nutrition awareness to 13,800 persons, MHPSS/Protection services to 3,250 persons; rehabilitation of 3 schools with access to education for 2,350 children, cash and in-kind assistance for 8,500 persons; medical and health support to 3,250 persons; and family water treatment and personal hygiene kits for 22,000 persons. At the same time, ACT Alliance members have engaged in multi-sectoral and inter-agency coordination working groups and efforts necessary for focusing the on-going response both geographically and sector wise, which is reflected in this full appeal.

The magnitude and complexity of the crisis, the scale of the ACT humanitarian response and requirements from back donors, have called for an external evaluation of this appeal LEB201 which will be carried out during between March and May of 2021.

2. ACT EMERGENCY RESPONSE

- **Size of the appeal:**

Originally Requested: US \$ 3,227,526

Actually Received: US \$ 1,662,949

- **Implementation Period:** 17 August 2020 to 28 February 2021

- **Appeal goal:** The appeal aimed to provide life-saving support, reduce vulnerability and alleviate suffering for the most vulnerable and displaced populations affected by the Beirut explosion.

The response to the immediate needs was to ensure that the most vulnerable population has access to adequate shelter, clean water, sanitation, food, medicine, psychological first aid, and other basic needs. The needs were being addressed through a variety of contextually relevant modalities that include in-kind distribution, vouchers, multi-purpose cash assistance, and mobile clinics.

The appeal also supported early recovery activities that include the rehabilitation of damaged homes, schools and health care facilities, rehabilitation services for medium- and long-term injuries, psychosocial support, and support to affected local businesses run by vulnerable individuals.

- **ACT Requesting Members (RM):**

Christian Aid (CA), Diakonia Sweden, DSPR - Joint Christian Committee (DSPR-JCC), Middle East Council of Churches (MECC) and Norwegian Church Aid (NCA)

- **Local and International Implementing Partners Operating under the LEB201 Appeal:**

Arcenciel, Basmeh and Zeitooneh, ABAAD Resource Center for Gender Equality and International Orthodox Christian Charity (IOCC)

- **Sectors of Intervention and Geographic Focus:**

Sectors of Work: Shelter and Non-Food Items (NFIs), Protection and Psychosocial Support, Food Security, WASH, Education, Health and Nutrition, Medical Rehabilitation, Early Recovery, Livelihoods and Unconditional Cash

Areas of Operation: Greater Beirut (areas in Beirut and Mount Lebanon affected directly by the Beirut Blast)

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSIGNMENT

3.1 Objectives

Main Objective

This evaluation is intended to review the operations undergone under the ACT LEB201 Appeal and especially the compliance of ACT members with the ALNAP/SHO Quality Proforma for Humanitarian Assistance, the Red Cross/NGO Code of Conduct, and ACT Alliance Policies. ACT Lebanon Forum (ALF) Members, field staff and headquarters will use the learning from this evaluation to modify the interventions, if appropriate, to increase compliance with international standards and Code of Conduct. The next phase of the response plan: LEB211 Appeal will incorporate lessons from this evaluation.

Specific Objectives

1. To provide an overview of the ACT Alliance response to date with particular emphasis on work that was funded by the ACT LEB201 Appeal; identify gaps, priority areas and unmet needs from a geographic and sectorial perspective.
2. To improve quality and accountability by reviewing ACT members' response to the Beirut Explosion against ALNAP Quality Proforma for Humanitarian assistance which is based on DAC (excluding impact as it is too soon to assess this) but focusing on outcomes (listed below) and outputs.
3. To identify lessons learnt and best practices, including innovations/new systems developed which may benefit communities in their recovery and further build local capacity as well as to generate knowledge for continuous program improvements of the ACT Lebanon Forum and the ACT Alliance as a whole.

3.2 Key Questions

Achievements, Relevance & Impact

- a. How relevant, in terms of relevance, appropriateness and timeliness, are the ACT members' interventions to the needs, expectations and priorities of the affected population and local partners?
- b. Was the response in line with the ACT Alliance and donor priorities/policies for emergency interventions?
- c. Were the interventions and outputs of the program consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives and outcomes?

- d. What was the outcome (both intended & unintended, directly and indirectly, positive & negative) in saving and protecting lives, assisting people towards longer-term recovery and reducing future vulnerability?
- e. What innovations or new systems have organizations developed to enable them to assess needs and monitor the outputs and outcomes of their programs with the Beirut Explosion?
- f. Have there been any joint initiatives by ACT members outside of LEB201 in the Beirut Explosion response? What is the overall impact of such initiatives that complement LEB201? Has the appeal triggered any internal cooperation between requesting members, better coordination, or facilitated support between requesting members?
- g. Has the response alleviated any challenging pre-existing socio-economic difficulties at the community level?
- h. Was the response able to engage higher-level stakeholders, regional entities and government ministries in supporting the victims of the Beirut Explosion?

Quality & Accountability

- a. Did the response comply with the principles of the Code of Conduct of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in Disaster Relief (e.g. in terms of impartiality, non-discrimination, independence, participation) and the Sphere minimum standards. Were accountability² issues (including Core Humanitarian Standard, CHS) given due consideration?
- b. Were the humanitarian activities tailored to local needs? Have all nationalities and communities affected by the Beirut Explosion been equally and equitably reached with services?
- c. To what extent have rights holders been engaged at each stage of the intervention in terms of input and feedback? How have organizations adapted their accountability practices and complaints mechanisms to the context?
- d. How are organizations that work through partners or even direct implementers ensuring that accountability and other standards are being adhered to, particularly where these are relatively new?
- e. Did ACT staff and their partners have sufficient knowledge and training to do their work efficiently and effectively?
- f. How did the duty bearer ensure that the rights holders have access to safe and responsive mechanism to handle complaints?

² Refer to basic aspects of ACT Quality & Accountability Framework

Gender, Protection & Cross-cutting Issues

- a. Have the ACT members and/or partners created and launched contextualized vulnerability assessments with victims on the field? If not, what secondary data have the members relied on to design their emergency activities?
- b. How successfully have ACT members' assessments enabled them to identify the most vulnerable? What processes have they employed for the selection of beneficiaries? Considerations should include specific vulnerable individuals such as elderly; persons with disabilities; female headed households and children. Were procedures used for needs identification and targeting appropriate and transparent?
- c. To what extent did the assistance address different protection needs and priorities of women, men, girls and boys through gender sensitive programming?
- d. How does ACT response support the local structures (state, local NGOs, churches) in such a way that they would be better prepared to respond should a disaster strike again?
- e. What measures did the ACT Forum or ACT organizations put in place to ensure the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse? PSEA? Child Safeguarding?

ACT Policies, Coordination & Capacity

- a. How effective was the ACT Secretariat in facilitating and co-ordinating the response efforts- within RMs and other ACT members working in Lebanon for the Beirut Explosion response?
- b. How did ACT Lebanon response optimize the value of ACT Alliance's joint appeal system to create greater impact? Were appropriate synergies, institutional platforms and existing national strategy used to leverage ACT response?
- c. How are organizations addressing the issue of coordination and what leadership are they demonstrating with regards to the challenges?
- d. Were the needs and priorities of the affected population, ACT donors and policy standards of ACT Alliance met?
- e. What were the strengths, weaknesses and opportunities of ACT visibility in a multi-actor ACT response?
- f. How was the coordination with UN clusters and other external mechanisms? Was it possible to utilize the ACT forum structure to better participate and influence those platforms?

Effectiveness, Efficiency & Sustainability

- a. Was the ACT Members' response built with and around local capacities, including those of refugees, migrants and affected population by the explosion? Has local ownership been established?
- b. How effective was the collaboration/co-ordination and co-ordination mechanisms among ACT members/partners of ACT Alliance as well as with other stakeholders?
- c. Have the members ensured the connectedness of the immediate relief activities to pre-existing and inter-connected contextual problems? Does the provided support ensure socio-economic community sustainability and human rights considerations?
- d. To which extent did the project succeed in initiating working relationships between the private sector, mixed communities and civil society actors around shared values?
- e. What is the probability of long-term benefits? Will the intended benefits continue when the cooperation is terminated?
- f. How have resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) been economically converted to results?

- g. Are the investment and recurrent costs justified? Could the same results have been achieved with fewer resources?

3.3 Evaluation Methodology

- The evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner through a combination of both quantitative and qualitative methods including a document review of key project documentation (appeal, sitreps, reports), interviews with different stakeholders/counterparts, rights holder consultations and site visits to ACT members' project sites as sampled by the evaluation team in co-ordination with the requesting members.
- The sample size should be adequate and representative of all target groups.
- Semi-structured interviews with key informants in selected localities
- Focus group discussions (done separately for males and females) with selected beneficiaries and/or members of the community-based/people's organizations
- Review of the procurement and distribution process
- Physical verification of warehouses
- Interview with secondary stakeholders (e.g. local government unit such as FER, local authorities, local churches...)
- Physical verification and visual documentation of rehabilitated shelters, businesses, health facilities and schools
- Meetings with management of implementing members, project and administrative staff etc.
- Online survey with LEB201 requesting members and staff
- Sharing and reviewing of existing information 2 weeks prior to the field work:
 - (a) Review of published LEB 201 Appeal (along with budget and logframe), sitreps, appeal working group minutes of meeting...
 - (b) Visual evidence (existing collection of pictures and videos, pre and post interventions of the different ACT members, e.g., repaired shelters, WASH facilities, restored livelihood materials, basic assistance distribution, education and protection activities...).
 - (c) Review of case studies of the good practices and lessons learned by the different members.
- The evaluation will be conducted in line with ACT Alliance Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines, the PME Handbook and as per the OECD/DAC Guidance for emergencies.
- The recommendations should be framed according to each evaluation criteria.
- The evaluation team will need to respect COVID-19 guidelines and restrictions set by the country authority as well as by individual requesting members and their implementing partners as applicable. The evaluation methodology should take into consideration the limitation to have large gatherings and challenges with face to face meetings and would need to adapt creative online tools as needed.
- The report should be submitted electronically in an MS – Word document. The consultant is responsible for English editing of the final report which should be well formatted. The report will be credited to the evaluator and potentially placed in the public domain at the decision of the ALF Forum, donor and secretariat.
- All handwritten and electronic transcripts of data collection, lists of participants, hard copies of survey questionnaires and photographs taken during the assessment should be submitted to the ALF. Furthermore, all information generated during the evaluation will be the joint property of the LEB201 Requesting Members.
- The evaluation team should respect the privacy of information; all information collected from beneficiaries and projects should be protected.

3.4 Expected outputs

Based on the understanding of this ToR, the evaluation team shall propose in the **inception report** the approach, design, methods and data collection strategies to be adopted for conducting the evaluation. The inception report should be submitted for approval prior to actual evaluation.

The team should triangulate and validate information, assess and describe data quality in a transparent manner. Data gaps and shortfall in evaluation design should also be highlighted in the **evaluation report**. ACT guidelines for evaluation reports shall be used for reporting.

While the evaluation is intended to promote learning and establish our commitment to accountability, in order to benefit from the many lessons learned and positive experience of the ACT Lebanon Forum in responding to the Beirut Explosion, the evaluator will have the task to specifically identify lessons and good practice for documentation and facilitate a **lessons learnt workshop**. A **briefing meeting** will be organized by the forum on day one of the evaluation and a **debriefing** on the final day or during the ALF's scheduled monthly meeting.

Based on the lessons learnt discussed during the workshop, requesting members will jointly prepare an action plan outlining the actions they will implement in order to put the lessons learnt into practice in the follow-up appeal LEB211, and the time planning thereof. The results, successes and challenges will be presented and discussed in a workshop 1 day after the start of the action plan and/or serve as input to an external evaluation in future.

Overall, the evaluation should refer to the UN and Aid Partners Beirut Blast Appeal and the ALNAP Quality Proforma to ensure coherence with assessment and reporting of humanitarian practice (copy available at ACT Secretariat) and linkages with pre-existing coordination structures related to the COVID-19 response and the Lebanon Crisis Response Plan (LCRP), looking at how collective efforts were streamlined and are still to be made to transition towards recovery and reconstruction during the next LEB211 Appeal.

4. KEY EVALUATION DATES/SCHEDULE

The ACT Lebanon Forum shall generate the draft ToR in consultation with the ACT Secretariat to be shared with the funding members for the appeal and within the month of December 2020 and shall be revised to final ToR on the second week of January 2021. Recruitment of the external evaluation team shall follow immediately upon the approval of the ACT general secretary and donor.

A meeting between ACT Secretariat staff, ACT Forum representatives and the evaluation consultants prior to the field work will enable the team to articulate the ToR and discuss the inception report and lead to a full consensus on how the evaluation will be best executed. The national forum will be responsible for facilitating the administrative, logistics support and related details.

The field mission should take place starting the third week of March 2021. We expect the field mission to be a maximum of 12 working days in the country. A briefing meeting shall be organized by the Forum on the first day of the evaluation and a debriefing on the final day. To note that both overseas and internal travel of either international or national evaluation team recruited is contingent on country-level authority COVID-19 travel restrictions, delays and evaluation costs.

A first draft of the report should be available within 10 days upon completion of the field visits. Follow-on evaluation debriefing and learning workshops with partners and communities shall take place after the 1st draft of the report. ACT stakeholders will have seven days to comment on the report

after which the evaluation report shall be finalized and shared with all relevant stakeholders. A final “lessons and good practice” document shall also be produced together with the final evaluation report.

The team leader will be supported by the ACT Lebanon Forum representatives, staff and a member of the ACT Secretariat staff.

Main Steps for the Assignment & Timeframe

No.	Activities	Accomplished by (Dates/months)
1	Finalising ToR	1st week of January 2021
2	Posting the Tender/Call for Applications online	January 7 th , 2020
3	Deadline for Online Applications	January 29 th , 2020
4	Evaluation team leader identified (national or international) following the assessment of the submitted technical and financial criteria	By Mid-February 2021
5	One team member (national) identified in consultation with team leader	By Beginning March 2021
6	Briefing with evaluation team in ACT Secretariat	½ day by Mid-March 2021
7	Review of appeal documents – appeal LEB201, sitreps, reports and field preparations	2 days during March 2021
8	Briefing and planning with ALF and Partners	1 day during March 2021
9	Field Visits, Meetings and Data Collection (1 Day with each RM Management, Staff and Implementing Partner)	5 days during March and April 2021
10	Analysis and Drafting of Evaluation Report (First draft of the report, including a “lessons learned and good practice” document, should be available within 10 days upon completion of the field visits)	2 days during April 2021
11	Debriefing the ALF through a lessons learned workshop (results, successes, good practices and challenges)	1 day during April 2021
12	Preparing a joint action plan with the RM	½ day during April 2021
13	Full evaluation completed and final report submitted two months from start date	By May 3 rd , 2021

5. EVALUATION CONSULTANT PROFILE

5.1 Qualifications and Expertise

The consultancy is open for individual consultants or teams and companies.

The candidate:

- Preferably holds a postgraduate degree in social sciences, humanitarian and development studies, research studies or a related field and/or has at least three years of experience working with NGOs with familiarity in Emergencies, SDGs and the Social field;
- Preferably has at least 4 years’ experience in conducting similar project evaluations in the Middle East;
- Possesses excellent skills in research, data collection and analysis;
- Ability to work both independently and as part of a team;

- Officially registered as a consultant or company with proof of VAT and Tax payments
- Proficient in Arabic, English and French;
- Has the ability to conduct interviews in Arabic;
- Is definitely knowledgeable about the social, political, economic, cultural refugees' context in Lebanon;
- Is willing and available to travel around Lebanon;
- Has solid knowledge and experience of research and quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods (Interviews, FGDs, Surveys, Desk Study Review, Reflection Sessions etc.);
- Attentive to detail and able to meet tight deadlines.

5.2 Required Application Documents

All interested and qualified candidates are invited to submit the following 7 documents (in separate files) :

- CV (resume and list of previous consultancies);
- Proposal Submission Form
- Brief narrative technical proposal (tasks, timeline, methodology, deliverables, outcome of those deliverables etc.) including an understanding of the present terms of reference;
- Brief financial proposal (tentative budget);
- Letter of interest, clearly explaining how their experience meets desired qualifications;
- 1- 2 examples of previous evaluation work;
- Signed statement of integrity.

The LEB201 Requesting Members and the hired consultant(s) will agree upon a joint set of evaluation standards when negotiating the final contract of agreement. Recruitment results will be shared with the candidates by mid-February 2021.

6. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES THROUGH THIS ASSIGNMENT

- An **Overall Final Evaluation Report** (25 pages maximum) submitted in English, including the points reference in paragraph (main objectives of the mission)
- A **“Lessons Learned and Good Practice”** document
- **Recommendations for further projects/interventions/coordination etc.**
- A **Highlight of the Critical Issues** which may be of interest to the ALF
- A **Joint Action Plan Workshop** with RM
- **Recommendations for the ALF and project partners** to build on their strengths and achievements to overcome their challenges, identifying any continuing gaps or challenges that have not been addressed.

7. TERMS OF PAYMENT

The consultant(s) will be paid in USD. 30% of the payment will be made upon signing the contract and the remaining 70% will be paid upon approval of the final evaluation report.

8. HOW TO APPLY

Applications are open from Thursday January 7th, 2021.

Kindly send your proposals and application documents to Mrs. Eliana Aoun (HR Coordinator – Diakonia Lebanon) at eliana.aoun@diakonia.se & Ms. Zeina Schoucair (ACT Lebanon Forum Coordinator) at actlebanoncoordinator@gmail.com mentioning "Application to ACT LEB201

Appeal External Evaluation Consultant Position" in the email subject.

The deadline for applications is Friday January 29th and start date is expected by a maximum of March 15th, 2021.

ANNEX 2: PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORM

My financial proposal for my services is as follows:

Global price

	Currency	Amount
Global price (fees and expenses)		
VAT or other tax on services		
Total price incl. taxes		

In the financial proposal, please indicate a tentative budget, with the number of working days and hourly/daily rate.

CANDIDATE OR COMPANY INFORMATION	
Company (legal name)	
Street name and no.	
City	
Postal code	
Country	
Phone no.	
Email	
Website	
Director (name)	

GENERAL COMPANY INFORMATION	
Year of establishment	
Number of full-time employees	
Licensing authority	
Licence number (VAT no./TAX id)	
Countries with registered office:	
Registration Certificate – please attach	
Does your company have CSR related policies in place – e.g., Health, Safety, HR, Energy or Climate policy or is a member of Global Compact? Please state which policies.	
Is your company e.g., ISO 26000/50001/14000 certified or SA8000 certified? Please state which.	
Does your company have a Code of Conduct?	

REFERENCES				
Name and country of customer	Type of contract	Value	Contact name	Phone/fax and email

Include details of the experience and past performance on contracts of a similar nature within the past five years and information on other contracts in hand and/or future commitments including details of the actual and effective participation in each of such contracts, description of the Candidate's assignments and periods of engagement. Additional documents can be attached to the above form.

The proposal is valid for a period of 30 days after the closing date in accordance with the article A.7. Validity.

After having read your Request for Proposal no. 2020-001 for External Evaluation of ACT Appeal LEB201 dated 7 January 2021 and after having examined the Request for Proposal, I/we hereby offer to execute and complete the services in conformity with all conditions in the Request for Proposal for the sum indicated in our financial proposal.

Further, I/we hereby:

- Accept, without restrictions, all the provisions in the Request for Proposal including the General Terms and Conditions for Service Contracts
- Provided that a contract is issued by the Contracting Authority I/we hereby commit to perform all services described in the Terms of Reference, Annex 1
- Certify and attest compliance with eligibility criteria of article 33 of the General Terms and Conditions for Service.
- Certify and attest compliance with the Code of Conduct for Contractors in Annex 4.

The above declarations will become an integrated part of the Contract and misrepresentation will be regarded as grounds for termination.

Signature and stamp:

Signed by:

The Candidate

Name of the company

Address

Telephone no.

Email

Name of contact person