



## Terms of Reference (TOR)

### INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT

#### International Consultant – Independent Project Evaluation

DATE: 19 November 2021

---

<b>Project title / Post Title:</b>	<b>Peace Building Fund Project: BUILDING PEACE WITHIN AND WITH YOUNG WOMEN AND MEN IN SIRTE / Independent Project Evaluator, International Consultant</b>
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Home based</b>
<b>Type of Appointment:</b>	<b>Individual Contract (IC)</b>
<b>Starting date of assignment:</b>	<b>15 December 2021</b>
<b>Duration of the contract:</b>	<b>Up to 50 working days</b>
<b>Payment arrangement:</b>	<b>Lump Sum (payments linked to deliverables)</b>

---

#### A. BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

After the post-revolution violence and the occupation of the Islamic State, young people in Sirte have the opportunity to contribute to the development of a culture of peace and social cohesion. Sirte continues to play a strategic political and social role in Libya, with oil exploitation nearby. It was the capital of Libya as Tripoli's successor after the Fall of Tripoli from 1 September 2011 to 20 October 2011; and was considered to have been subjected to the most damage of any Libyan city during the civil war. Recalling the continued proliferation of armed groups and human trafficking in Sirte, there is a critical and timely need to support youth and adolescents at this juncture with skills and opportunities to positively contribute to their community. This project focuses on the vulnerability and resilience of young people by addressing some of the key sources of vulnerability and promoting the participation of young people in peacebuilding.

Although youth and adolescents are all victims of the civil war and the atrocities taking place in Sirte, this project aims to reach out to the most vulnerable youth and adolescents. This is a very difficult and challenging task that can only be achieved through close local partnership and collaboration with community organizations, and innovative tools and methods such as using media (TV, radio, and social media). The project uses a social network approach and builds on existing local structures and initiatives that have proved effective in accessing youth and adolescents and selecting the participants for the project. The project also aims empowering youth with new life-skills and mind-sets that allow them to engage constructively in the community and society, and enable them to gain an employment or start their own small scale businesses. It was expected that project will also contribute to a transformation from marginalization to collaboration with others in developing youth-led projects that will benefit the broader community and society in Sirte, working through local partnerships with local knowledge of the social landscape, actors and relations in Sirte, and reaching out a significant number of individuals participating in a range of activities, and thus contribute to peace and social cohesion in Sirte.

Based on detailed assessments of the current context and capabilities, and in consultation with Libyan stakeholders, the project aims to achieve two outcomes:



**Outcome 1:** Young men and women, and adolescents are able to manage psychosocial stress factors and their vulnerability, and to peacefully participate and collaborate in resolving socio-economic challenges with other members of the community in Sirte.

**Outcome 2:** Young people are empowered through the activities and services at the Youth Friendly Safe Space to represent his and her community or constituency, and to actively participate in political forums and meetings with decision makers to ensure that the voices of young people and adolescents are recognized and reflected in local political processes.

Since September 2018, extensive consultations have been held between UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF and WFP, under the close oversight by the RCO, to jointly design the project and ensure a collective development and implementation of the project. The project was implemented between December 2019 to December 2021 with a total budget US\$ 2,950,705. The main local partners are Ministry of Planning; Ministry of Education; Ministry of Social Affairs and The Municipality (Mayor and municipal council members) and others.

In this context, UNDP Libya is hiring international consultant (team leader) to undertake the independent evaluation of the joint project. Under the direct supervision of UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF and WFP, the consultant will be tasked with the project evaluation.

## **B. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**

Purpose:

This project evaluation presents an opportunity to assess the achievements of the project in Sirte in an inclusive way and to determine its overall added value to peacebuilding in Libya, in the areas of (i) individuals who have been engaged in armed violence; (ii) individuals who are considered at-risk and vulnerable to be recruited by the armed groups and smugglers; and (iii) young women and girls who are subjected to gender-based violence (GBV) and suffer from trauma from the brutalities of armed violence and the occupation of the IS. In assessing the degree to which the project met its intended peacebuilding objective(s) and results, the evaluation will provide key lessons about successful peacebuilding approaches and operational practices, as well as highlight areas where the project performed less effectively than anticipated. In that sense, this project evaluation is equally about accountability as well as learning.

Objectives of the evaluation:

- Assess the relevance and appropriateness of the project in terms of: 1) addressing key drivers of conflict (including external parties influence over oil fields, regional powers, national level competition over political influence, local level inter-communal tensions, fears of marginalization) and the most relevant peacebuilding issues; 2) whether the project capitalized on the UN's added value in Sirte, Libya and 3) the degree to which the project contributed to the conflict prevention in Libya;
- Assess to what extent the PBF project has made a concrete contribution to reducing a conflict factor in Libya, namely conflict prevention and management. With respect to PBF's contribution, the evaluation will also evaluate whether the project helped to advance achievement of the SDGs, namely SDG 11 and SDG 16;
- Evaluate the project's efficiency, including its implementation strategy, institutional arrangements as well as its management and operational systems and value for money;



Assess whether the support provided by the PBF has promoted the Women, Peace and Security agenda (WPS), allowed a specific focus on women's participation in peacebuilding processes, and whether it was accountable to gender equality;

Assess the impact for youth; recalling the continued proliferation of armed groups and human trafficking in Sirte, project aimed to support youth and adolescents with skills and opportunities to positively contribute to the communities.

- Assess whether the project has been implemented through a conflict-sensitive approach;
- Document good practices, innovations and lessons emerging from the project;
- Provide actionable recommendations for future programming.

### **C. SCOPE OF THE PROJECT EVALUATION**

This evaluation will examine the project's implementation process and peacebuilding results, drawing upon the project's results framework as well as other monitoring data collected on the project outputs and outcomes as well as context.

Evaluators should take care to ensure that evaluation of the peacebuilding result is the main line of inquiry. Peacebuilding projects frequently employ approaches that work through thematic areas that overlap with development or humanitarian goals. An evaluation of peacebuilding projects, however, must include not only reflection on progress within the thematic area but the degree to which such progress may or may not have contributed to addressing a relevant conflict factor.

The broad questions to be answered are based on the OECD DAC evaluation criteria and the UN Evaluation Group standards (including those on gender mainstreaming), which have been adapted to the context at hand as follows:

#### *Relevance:*

- Was the project relevant in addressing conflict drivers and factors for peace identified in a conflict analysis? With Covid-19 implications and movement restrictions that impacted in-class trainings, supply chain logistics, did the project goals and approach remain relevant?
- Evaluate contribution of this project to the UNDAF outcome: Democratic Governance; and Sustainable Development Goals: SDG 5 (Gender Equality), SDG 11 (Sustainable and resilience cities and communities) and SDG 16 (Peace, justice and strong institutions)
- Was the project relevant to the needs and priorities of the target groups/beneficiaries?

#### *Efficiency:*

- How efficient was the overall staffing, planning and coordination within the project (including between the implementing agencies and with stakeholders)?
- How efficient and successful was the project's implementation approach, including procurement, number of implementing partners and other activities?

#### *Effectiveness:*



- To what extent did the PBF project achieve its intended objectives and contribute to the project's strategic vision?
- To what extent did the PBF project substantively mainstream a gender and support gender-responsive peacebuilding?

*Sustainability & Ownership:*

- How strong is the commitment of the Government and other stakeholders to sustaining the results of PBF support and continuing initiatives, especially support to youth and adolescents at the time of peace fragility, conflict and violence, women's participation in decision making processes, supported under PBF Project?

*Coherence:*

- To what extent did the PBF project complement work among different entities, especially with other UN actors?
- How were stakeholders involved in the project's design and implementation?

*Conflict-sensitivity:*

- Were RUNOs and NUNOs' internal capacities adequate for ensuring an ongoing conflict-sensitive approach?

**In addition to the above standard OECD/DAC criteria, the following additional PBF specific evaluation criteria should also be assessed by the evaluation:**

*Catalytic:*

- Was the project financially and/or programmatically catalytic?
- Has PBF funding been used to scale-up other peacebuilding work and/or has it helped to create broader platforms for peacebuilding?

*Gender-responsive/gender-sensitive:*

- Did the project consider the different challenges, opportunities, constraints and capacities of women, men, girls and boys in project design (including within the conflict analysis, outcome statements and results frameworks) and implementation?

*Risk-tolerance and innovation:*

- How novel or innovative was the project approach? Can lessons be drawn to inform similar approaches elsewhere?
- What types of implementation issues have emerged, and how can they be addressed in the future?
- What new ideas are emerging that can be tried out and tested with other projects?

## **D. METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH**

The evaluation will be summative, and will employ, to the greatest extent possible, a participatory approach whereby discussions with and surveys of key stakeholders provide/ verify the substance of the findings. Proposals should outline a strong mixed method approach to data collection and analysis, clearly noting how various forms of evidence will be employed vis-à-vis each other to triangulate gathered information.



Evaluators should review any theories of change that either explicitly or implicitly framed the programming logic of the Priority Plan and its projects. Proposals should be clear on the specific role each of the various methodological approaches plays in helping to address each of the evaluation questions.

The methodologies for data collection may include but not necessarily be limited to:

- Desk review of key documents (such as project document, annual reports, updates from Agencies)
- Key informant interviews and focus group discussions facilitated by consultant through virtual Microsoft Team/Zoom on-line meetings, as appropriate, with all major stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries in Libya (including UN agencies, implementing agencies, the Government, beneficiary institutions). Beneficiaries will represent diverse groups, including women from different ethnic groups.
- The international evaluator would be supported by a local evaluator on the ground
- Survey of key stakeholders, if relevant.
- Systematic review of monitoring data from the Recipient UN Organizations or other key sources of data;

#### E. DELIVERABLES

**1. Inception Report:** The expert(s) will prepare an Inception Report to further refine the evaluation questions and detail the methodological approach, including data collection instruments, in consultation with the PBF technical team. The Inception report must be approved by both the evaluation manager and the PBF prior to commencement of data collection in the field. The inception report should include the following key elements:

- Overall approach and methodology
- Key lines of inquiry, linking refined evaluation questions to data collection instruments
- Data collection instruments and mechanisms
- Proposed list of interviewees
- A work plan and timelines to be agreed with relevant PBF focal points

**2. Presentation/validation of preliminary findings to relevant in-country stakeholders and PBF HQ**

**3. Final evaluation report:** The expert(s) will prepare the final evaluation report based on PBF’s evaluation report template. The first draft of the final report will be shared with an Evaluation Reference Group, composed of representatives of all direct fund recipients and the PBF (at a minimum), for their comments. The final accepted version of the report will reflect ERG’s comments. The Final Report must be approved by both the evaluation manager and the PBF.

#### F. TIMEFRAME AND PAYMENT SCHEDULE

Deliverable:	Content:	Number of Working Days:	Percentage of Payment
Inception Report	The inception report will have a maximum of 20 pages, including annexes and include:  - the evaluation team’s understanding of the TORs and any data or other concerns arising from the provided materials and initial	13 days	

	<p>meetings/ interviews and strategies for how to address perceived shortcomings;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- key evaluation questions and methodological tools for answering each question;</li> <li>- list of key risks and risk management strategies for the evaluation;</li> <li>- stakeholder analysis</li> </ul>		
Data collection	Report on the collected data	Up to 20 days	
Draft Report	The draft report will have a maximum of 40 pages, inclusive of an Executive Summary and annexes. The draft report will be reviewed by the PBSO and the Reference Group. PBSO will provide a consolidated matrix of comments which should be formally addressed in the final report	12 days	
Validation and integrating comments into the Final Report	<p>The Team Leader will be responsible for ensuring that comments from the PBSO and the Reference Group and formally addressed. The final report will include all the annexes, including project evaluation summaries. It will also have a five-page Executive Summary outlining key findings on successes and ‘challenges of PBF support, and recommendations, which can be used as a stand-alone document. The final report will be evidence based and will respond to all the questions in the Inception Report with clear and succinct lessons learned and targeted recommendations.</p> <p>The PBSO will approve the final report, following consultation with the Reference Group.</p> <p>Following acceptance of the final report, PBSO will coordinate a management response to the evaluation report as a separate document.</p>	5 days	

## G. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS



#### **i. Responsibilities of evaluators**

##### **• The International Consultant will**

- Lead the entire evaluation process, including communicating all required information with the Evaluation Manager
- Finalize the research design and questions based on the feedback and complete inception report
- Conduct of data gathering activities: desk review, Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions etc. No travel by consultant is involved due to security considerations, on-going travel restrictions and time-limits, to be done by consultant remotely with support of in-country counterpart and a local evaluator
- Data analysis, draft and final report preparation, consolidation and submission, and presenting the findings
- Submit draft evaluation report
- Address PBF HQ and UNDP feedback and adjust first final report draft
- Submit final evaluation report revised
- Have/bring their laptops, and other relevant software/equipment
- Use their own mobile and personal email address during the consultancy period

##### **ii. The National Consultant will:**

- Be primarily responsible for data gathering in Libya that is requested by the Team Leader, to fully support administrative matters of international consultant.
- Support the Team Leader in coordinating, planning and ensuring implementation of FGDs, Key Informant Interviews (KII), and contacts with key stakeholders (national and local level).
- Contribute to the preparation of the evaluation draft, presentations and final submission under the direct guidance of the Team Leader.
- Have/bring personal laptop, and other relevant software/equipment
- Use own mobile and personal email address during the consultancy period, including when in-country

##### **iii. Responsibilities of UNDP**

The project Evaluation is commissioned by the UNDP Libya Deputy Resident Representative. The International Consultant will work with the project team for conducting the evaluation, who will be responsible for the provision of documents and data as requested and support the overall evaluation.

#### **H. Evaluation ethics.**

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'.



This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners. A code of conduct must be signed by the evaluator (s).

### I. Evaluation Criteria / Qualification requirements for International Consultant/Team Leader

#### Education:

- Advanced university degree (Master’s degree or equivalent) in sociology, development studies, political science, statistics or a related field.

#### Experience:

- At least 7 years of demonstrated relevant work experience with designing and conducting evaluations of peacebuilding interventions and development activities is required.

- Extensive experience in mixed methods research and participatory gender-sensitive approaches is required.

- Knowledge of and experience with social cohesion, youth empowerment, gender equality, is required.

- Demonstrated experience with report writing is required.

- Familiarity with the country/region and previous work experience in/with similar geopolitical settings is an asset.

- Familiarity with the UN system is a strong asset.

- Experience in conducting remote evaluations is an asset.

#### Language skills:

- Fluency in oral and written English is required.

Criteria	Score
<b>Education</b>	<b>15</b>
Advanced university degree (Master’s degree or equivalent) in sociology, development studies, political science, statistics or a related field.	15
<b>Technical Competencies</b>	<b>50</b>
At least 7 years of demonstrated relevant work experience with designing and conducting evaluations of development and evaluation of peacebuilding interventions	20
Extensive experience in mixed methods research and participatory gender-sensitive approaches	10
Knowledge of and experience with social cohesion, youth empowerment, gender equality, conflict prevention	15
Knowledge of the evaluation and RBM approach	5



<b>Language</b>	<b>5</b>
Fluency in English	5
<b>Overall Technical Score:</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Financial Evaluation</b>	<b>30</b>
<p>Candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points over 70 points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation - 30 points</p> <p>Lowest Price will be qualified with the maximum of 30 points. Higher prices will be qualified according the following calculation:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; width: fit-content; margin: 10px auto;"> <math display="block">FE = \frac{LFP}{FPI} \times 30</math> </div> <p>FE= Financial Evaluation            LFP = Lowest Financial Proposal            FPI= Financial Proposal of bidder i</p>	
<b>FINAL EVALUATION: TECHNICAL + FINANCIAL</b>	<b>100</b>

#### J. Risks and challenges

There are several risks which are envisaged. Foremost is the COVID-19 pandemic and response, and the restrictions that go along with it. With the current limitations in movement, travel, meetings, face-to-face interviews or site visits are not possible due security reasons. The urgency and severity of the pandemic within this constrained context also means many of the stakeholders and potential users of the evaluation will have as their principle responsibility the response to the pandemic and its effects. This in turn means the conducting primary data collection, even using remote methods, runs the risk of low response rates, if at all possible.