Terms of Reference

Independent Final Evaluation of the project "Towards National Reconciliation in Libya" Phase one

Title	International Consultant (Evaluator)
Location	Homebased with mission to Tunis
Type of Contract	Individual Contract
Languages Required	English, Arabic is and Asset
Duration of Initial Contract	21 working days over 2 months
Application Deadline:	11 October 2019

A. Background

Despite some progress, Libyans have so far been unable to translate early revolutionary successes into a meaningful, stable and inclusive transition process. Post-revolutionary divisions and political polarization escalated into open armed confrontation in July 2014, leading to two rival governance: the internationally recognized House of Representatives (HoR) and interim Government in Tobruk and Baida, and the General National Congress (GNC) and the so called "Government of National Salvation" in Tripoli. The United Nations launched a political dialogue process in 2014, which led to the signing of the Libyan Political Agreement (LPA) in Skhirat, Morocco, in December 2015. A nine-member Presidency Council (PC) was tasked with nominating the Government of National Accord (GNA), restarting the country's transition process. The LPA provides a supportive political framework for national reconciliation, including by creating a fact-finding commission, a commission on missing persons, various accountability mechanisms, local governance measures, DDR programmes and other institutional reforms. However, these measures have yet to be implemented.

Since its establishment in Tripoli in March 2016, the GNA has attempted to gradually consolidate its authority and, despite many challenges, it has been able to operate from key government buildings in the capital. The HoR however remained unable to meet and amend the constitutional amendment, to constitutionalize the institutions emanating from the Libyan Political Agreement. Opposition to the LPA continued and Article 8 of the Agreement's Additional provisions remained a key controversial issue, concerning the appointment of military leadership positions and the structure of the armed forces. The challenges in the endorsement of the GNA and the implementation of the LPA reflect deeper regional, social and political divisions, legacies of the Qaddafi era and the civil war ranging from the east/west and the Islamist/non-Islamist divides to rivalries between towns, tribes, or marginalized communities.

National reconciliation is thus an intrinsic dimension of the peacebuilding process: peacebuilding strategies geared to create a national reconciliation process can indeed strengthen the on-going political dialogue, and ultimately underpin the LPA framework and institutions.

The UNDP response to this situation was the implementation in 2017 of the projects Towards National Reconciliation in Libya phase one to promote complementarity, synergies, sequencing and linkages between local and national, top-down and bottom-up projects, thereby building more trust and safe spaces for Libyan reconciliation processes to take place in the future.

The project was designed to have a catalytic effect at three levels:

i. From a funding perspective, the project aimed to launch targeted reconciliation activities with key national stakeholders. It aimed to prepare the ground for future processes once government functions are fully restored and key institutions (including the Ministry of National Reconciliation and possibly a future Reconciliation Commission, as well as a Missing Persons and a Truth Commissions planned for in the LPA) are engaged. UNSMIL and UNDP, would provide support to start engaging on national reconciliation, including through a consultative approach, outreach campaign, and bridging the gap between local and national initiatives.

ii. From a programmatic perspective, for many planned activities, the catalytic effect of this project was of great importance, as the dialogue process itself is a form of reconciliation. Consideration were not only focused exclusively on the contents of a reconciliation programme for Libya, but rather on creating an inclusive and participatory framework in which stakeholders will be able to identify together the themes and issues that will need to be addressed for reconciliation to be possible. Moreover, local initiatives should be sustained and linked to the national level. The project aimed at creating momentum for what will be a long-term process of awareness-raising, advocacy, and ultimately reform and reconciliation in Libya

iii. While reconciliation must not be confused with political dialogue, which relates more to strict mediation efforts, the two are mutually reinforcing. The reconciliation project phase one sought to deepen the UN's understanding of local dynamics of conflict and actors in reconciliation, which could in turn inform long-term strategies for both UNSMIL's political support and UN agencies' programmatic choices. The national reconciliation project sought to strengthen the United Nations facilitated peace process, as an additional "track" that could potentially reinforce other on-going engagements such as the political and security tracks. It is an intrinsic dimension of the restoration of lasting peace in Libya.

Project Outcomes:

Outcome 1.
National reconciliation strategy developed through a consultative and inclusive process, allowing for the meaningful and effective participation of youth, women, and groups from across the Libyan society.

Outcome 2.
Bottom-up reconciliation processes strengthened and relevant civil society actors, youth and women, capacitated

Project Scope:
The activities of the project covered all three regions of Libya. Civil society organizations partnerships as well as the result of the mapping exercises ensured that key localities were covered.

The target groups included "key people" in the national reconciliation process, i.e. leaders at different levels and in different groups whose buy-in is often necessary to influence the process and reach a broader audience. This included political, religious and tribal leaders. This project also recognized the importance of engaging and capacitating a broader civil society and new groups, women, youth, and minority groups, to overcome divisions inherited from the past throughout the Libyan society.

B. Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the Evaluation is to learn from the experience of this project first phase. The Evaluation is expected to clarify underlying factors affecting the situation, highlight unintended consequences (positive and negative) and better design UNDP-supported interventions at the next stage. The Country Office accordingly plans to make use of the evaluative exercise as a learning opportunity not only for the office but also for key partners and stakeholders, as inclusively and as practically possible.

The TOR is designed to support a consultant conducting an independent final evaluation (FE) for the phase one of the project, including project performance vis a via Project Document outcomes, institutional arrangements, financing (disbursements and co-financing), impacts, and opportunities for interventions to inform the second stage of the project. This TOR follows the formative seeks to strengthen and improve the project's intervention by examining, amongst other things, the delivery of the program, the quality of its implementation and the organizational context, personnel, structures and procedure; and examines the project theory of change by testing the relationship between goals, activities, outcomes and wider context.

The overall objectives of the evaluation are the following:
1. Review the performance of the Project in achieving the outputs as per the Project Document and their contributions to outcome level goals. By providing an objective assessment of the intervention achievements, constraints, performance, results, impact, relevance and sustainability
2. Generate lessons for the period **January 2017 to December 2018** to inform current and future programming at the country level. Identify factors, which facilitated or hindered the results achievement, both in terms of the external environment and those related to internal factors. Document ad record the lessons learned at various implementation stages. This should include but not be limited to assessing the strengths and weaknesses in different stages of the project, design, management, coordination, human resource, and financial resources;
3. Assess the appropriateness of the Project strategy to reach the intended outputs and outcomes;
4. Define the extent to which the Project addressed cross cutting issues including gender, conflict sensitivity;
5. Identify and assess the project's response mechanisms and adaptability to unforeseen external and internal factors.
6. Identify whether past results represent enough foundation for future progress
7. Provide clear, focused and forward-looking recommendations to suggest effective and realistic new and adaptative strategies by UNDP and partners.

C. Scope of the Evaluation
In assessing the Project, the evaluation will take into consideration:

i. **The validity of the Design and Relevance:** the extent to which the Project activities matched the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor. The key questions will include:
- Did the Project respond to the needs of the beneficiaries? Were the planned project objectives and intended results (i.e. outputs and outcomes) relevant and realistic to the situation and needs on the ground? Were the problems and needs adequately analysed. The evaluators will be provided with thematic and situation analyses and corresponding working plans.
- Were the objectives of the Project clear, realistic and likely to be achieved within the established time schedule and with the allocated resources (including human resources)?

- Was the Project design logical and coherent in terms of the roles, capacities and commitment of stakeholders to realistically achieve the planned outcomes?
- To what extent were external factors and assumptions identified at the time of design?
- Was the Project designed in a flexible way to respond to changes / needs that could occur during the implementation? Was the Project able to respond to changes in the political, security and general operating environment?
- Was the strategy for sustainability of impact clearly defined at the design stage of the Project? If yes, was the methodology / approach taken appropriate to the context?
- Recommend specific objectives that should be addressed in future phases regarding Achievements and Implementation and Development Effectiveness defined as "the extent to which the Project activities have attained its objectives".
- What were the development results (i.e. against planned outputs and outcomes) of interventions, considering the changes made and support provided to the national partners?
- Which aspects of the Project had the greatest achievements? What were the supporting factors? What are the main lessons learned from the partnership strategies and what are the possibilities of replication and scaling-up? How can the Project build or expand on achievements?
- In which areas does the Project have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they be overcome?
- How effective was the collaboration between the participating organizations and what has been the added value of this collaboration?
- How have stakeholders been involved in Project implementation? How effective has the Project been in establishing ownership especially with reference to the three components of the Project.

ii. **Effectiveness of management arrangements and efficiency of resource use: Efficiency will measure the Project outputs -- qualitative and quantitative -- in relation to the inputs. Key questions will include:**
- Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc) been allocated strategically to achieve the relevant outputs and outcomes? Have resources been used efficiently?
- Were Project funds and activities delivered in a timely manner?
- Were management capacities adequate?
- Assess the criteria and governance aspects related to the selection of beneficiaries and partners' institutions, including NGOs.
- Did the Project receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from its local and national partners?
- How has the role of UNDP added value to the project? If found relevant, how and in what areas should it be improved?
- Did the project strengthen or built the capacity of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) under Micro capital grants scheme?
- Are the gender issues correctly identified and highlighted?
- What has been the quality of documentation and dissemination of knowledge within the Project?
- Were the work plans timely delivered? If delays are identified, was the project able to adapt accordingly?

iii. **Impact and Sustainability of the Project:**
In assessing the impact and sustainability of the Project, the evaluation will look at the positive and negative changes produced by the Project's development interventions, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. It

will also include the positive and negative impact of external factors, such as changes in terms of peacebuilding and reconciliation conditions.

On sustainability, the evaluation will measure the likeliness of project's results continuity after donor funding has been withdrawn. Some of the key questions will include:

- To what extent did the Project contribute to the advance on reconciliation and dialogue among the community leaders in Libya?
- To what extent was sustainability consider in the execution and conduct of the Project's activities?
- Can the Project approach and results be replicated and scaled up by national partners?

D. Proposed Methodology

Based on UNDP guidelines for evaluations (*UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results* and the *UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators*), and in consultation with UNDP Libya CO, the evaluation will be inclusive and participatory, involving all principal stakeholders into the analysis. The evaluation will consider the social, political, security and economic context which affects the overall performance of the outcome achievements. During this evaluative exercise, the evaluation team is expected to apply the following approaches for data collection and analysis.

- Desk review of relevant documents (project documents with amendments made, review reports - midterm/final, donor-specific, etc.);
- Discussions with the Senior Management and programme staff of UNDP Country Office;
- Briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP.
- Interviews with partners and stakeholders (including gathering the information on what the partners have achieved on the outcome and what strategies they have used)
- Field visits to selected project sites and discussions with project teams, project partners, representatives of involved ministries etc.

E. Composition and qualification of the evaluation team

Members of the mission must be independent to the project's formulation, implementation or monitoring phases. It is proposed that the evaluation team be composed of a senior team leader (international), assisted by a national consultant.

The international team leader will perform the following tasks:
- Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
- Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis) for the report;
- Decide the division of labor within the evaluation team;
- Provide UNDP with data collection tools in advance for UNDP feedback to ensure realistic application in the field.
- Ensure full responsibility for the drafting and finalization of the report
- Ensure UNDP feedback on inception and final report is considered in final versions, always under the basis of an independent evaluation.
- Finalize the whole evaluation report and engage in debriefing with UNDP.

The international team leader will work with a national consultant in the ground.

F. Duration of Work

It is expected that the outcome evaluation will be conducted over two months periods August - September 2019, with no more than 21 working days; 16 days home-based and 5 days mission based in Tunis with one round flight from home to Tunis

Activity Timeframe and Payment Schedule*

Activities	Expected duration	Payment
Inception report on proposed evaluation methodology, work plan and proposed structure of the report.	One work day, by the evaluation team (home based)	
Briefing to UNDP on inception report for agreeing methodology	One work day, by evaluation team (via skype)	
Desk review of existing documents	5 work days, by the evaluation team (home based)	30%
Compile reports of the field visits, interviews with partners, and key stakeholders conducted by the national consultant in Libya	5 work days, by the evaluation team	
Drafting of the final evaluation reports	5 work days, by the evaluation team (home based)	30%
Debriefing with UNDP	One work day, by the evaluation team	
Elaboration of the final report (incorporating comments received on first drafts) and the set of recommendations	3 work days by the evaluation team (home based)	40%

* Up to 5 workdays of field mission in Tunis. **Payments will be made upon submission and approval of relevant deliverables to the Project Manager.**

G. Expected deliverables
The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following outputs:
1. Submit Inception report on proposed evaluation methodology, work plan and proposed structure of the report.
2. Based on agreed work plan timeline, the consultant is expected to draft evaluation report.
3. Final report, including a 2-3-page executive summary, and with evidence-based conclusions on each of the evaluation objectives, as outlined above, lessons learned and key recommendations to inform future interventions in national reconciliation.
4. The consultant shall present the findings to UNDP and submit a draft evaluation report in a debriefing meeting to UNDP and its donors and project board members.
5. The consultant shall finalize the final report after incorporating the comments/input of the debriefing meeting.

6. Set of recommendations based on evaluation findings.

The Structure of the Evaluation Report should include at minimum:
1. Executive summary;
2. Introduction;
3. Description of the evaluation methodology;
4. Analysis of the situation regarding the outcome, the outputs and the partnership strategy;
5. Analysis of opportunities to provide guidance for the future programming;
6. Key findings (including best practices and lessons learned)
7. Conclusions and recommendations
8. Annexes: ToRs, data collection tools, field visits, profile of people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.[1]

H. Institutional Arrangements

The consultant will report to the UNDP Project Manager for all reports and other outputs.

UNDP will be responsible for reviewing and addressing consultancy service requests for information on a timely basis. Designated UNDP Project staff will be available to provide guidance to the consultant during the course of the assignment. UNDP Project Manager and/or his/her designated official shall be responsible for monitoring of consultant's performance.

I. Qualification requirements /selection criteria

International Consultant/Team Leader
- Minimum of a master's degree or equivalent in Management, Development Studies, International Affairs or any other relevant field
- At least 8 years of work experience in evaluating programs related to democratic governance, policy dialogue and advisory work, research and analysis and relationship with governments, promotion of stakeholder/community awareness of and participation in democratic governance, and fragile context
- At least 2 years of work experience in conducting results-oriented monitoring and evaluation and participatory methods.
- Outstanding analytical and writing skills in English.
- Knowledge of Arabic will be an advantage.
- Experience within the MENA region will be a strong advantage.

---

[1] See the **UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators** for a detailed guidance on the preparation of an outcome evaluation report.

J. Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Weight
Education	**20**
Minimum of a master's degree or equivalent in Management, Development Studies, International Affairs or any other relevant field	20
Experiences	**40**
At least 8 years of work experience in evaluating programs related to democratic governance, policy dialogue and advisory work, research and analysis and relationship with governments, promotion of stakeholder/community awareness of and participation in democratic governance, and fragile context	30
At least 2 years of work experience in conducting results-oriented monitoring and evaluation and in participatory methods	10
Language	**10**
Fluency in English	10
Overall	70