Annex -1-

Terms of Reference (TOR)

**Project Name:** MDG-F Conflict Prevention and Peace Building in North Lebanon

**Reference Number:** Project ID: 00063469

**Subject:** Terms of reference of the final evaluation

1. **Background**

**General Context: the MDG-F**

In December 2006, the UNDP and the Government of Spain signed a major partnership agreement for the amount of €528 million with the aim of contributing to progress on the MDGs and other development goals through the United Nations System. In addition, on 24 September 2008 Spain pledged €90 million towards the launch of a thematic window on Childhood and Nutrition. The MDG-F supports joint programmes that seek replication of successful pilot experiences and impact in shaping public policies and improving peoples’ life in 49 countries by accelerating progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and other key development goals.

The MDG-F operates through the UN teams in each country, promoting increased coherence and effectiveness in development interventions through collaboration among UN agencies. The Fund uses a joint programme mode of intervention and has currently approved 128 joint programmes in 49 countries. These reflect eight thematic windows that contribute in various ways towards progress on the MDGs, National Ownership and UN reform.

**The MDG-F M&E Strategy**

A result oriented monitoring and evaluation strategy is under implementation in order to track and measure the overall impact of this historic contribution to the MDGs and to multilateralism. The MDG-F M&E strategy is based on the principles and standards of UNEG and OECD/DAC regarding evaluation quality and independence. The strategy builds on the information needs and interests of the different stakeholders while pursuing a balance between their accountability and learning purposes.

The strategy’s main objectives are:

1. To support joint programmes to attain development results;
2. To determine the worth and merit of joint programmes and measure their contribution to
the 3 MDG-F objectives, MDGS, Paris Declaration and Delivering as one; and

3. To obtain and compile evidence based knowledge and lessons learned to scale up and replicate successful development interventions.

Under the MDG-F M&E strategy and Programme Implementation Guidelines, each programme team is responsible for designing an M&E system, establishing baselines for (quantitative and qualitative) indicators and conducting a final evaluation with a summative focus.

The MDG-F Secretariat also commissioned mid-term evaluations for all joint programmes with a formative focus. Additionally, a total of nine-focus country evaluations (Ethiopia, Mauritania, Morocco, Timor-Leste, Philippines, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Brazil, Honduras and Ecuador) are planned to study more in depth the effects of joint programmes in a country context.

Country context
Lebanon is on-track to achieve many of its MDG Goals by 2015, and has made much progress since the end of the Civil War in 1990. However, the country witnessed many events that affected its stability and consequently its development efforts:

- Nine senior political figures have been assassinated (including former Prime Minister, Rafic Hariri).
- The 2006 July war with Israel killed more than 1,000 and displaced 25% of the country’s population, causing GDP to drop to -5%.
- May – August 2007: armed conflict took place between Lebanese Army and the armed insurgent “Fatah al-Islam” in the Nahr el Bared Palestinian Refugee camp in North Lebanon. 500 persons were killed and 40,000 were internally displaced.
- Between November 2007 and May 2008, the election of a new President was postponed 19 times and the Parliament did not meet in over one year, blocking progress on economic, social, and political reforms.
- On May 7th 2008, tensions between the two main political factions renewed and erupted into armed hostilities, with around 60 persons killed in Beirut and the countryside.
- Between May and August 2008 armed clashes took place between Sunni and Alawite communities (neighborhoods of Jabal Mohsen and Bab Tabbaneh) in Tripoli, North Lebanon.
- In addition, there are lingering, unresolved issues with Syria, with whom Lebanon has no commonly recognized borders and recently reestablished diplomatic relations.
- The situation at the southern borders is still unstable since border violations are still taking place.

On May 2008 the Arab League brokered an agreement between the opposition and the majority, known as the Doha Agreement. This paved the way for ending the political stalemate and a new president was elected in June 2008. A new Government was formed on July 11th 2008. While these developments and the middle-income status of Lebanon augur well for the future, these gains could easily be compromised overnight if further conflict erupted. Lebanon may be
resilient but its social fabric is fragile, and the hard-won national development gains are not equally distributed demographically or geographically.

Programme context
In May 2007, whilst most of Lebanon was still struggling to recover from the destruction caused by the July 2006 conflict with Israel, the infiltration of armed insurgents of Fatah al-Islam into Nahr el Bared (NBC) Palestinian Refugee Camp, located between Akkar and Tripoli area, culminated in armed conflict between the Lebanese Army and the insurgents. Fatah al-Islam was heavily shelled. 169 soldiers, 287 combatants and 42 civilians were killed, and 31,000 Palestinians refugees were forced to leave their homes behind becoming internally displaced and seeking temporary shelter in mainly the neighboring Palestinian refugee camp of Bedlawi.
This was the most serious case of internal fighting in Lebanon since the end of the Civil War in 1990. The recovery and reconstruction efforts are estimated at US $440m, and it is expected to take more than five years before there will be any new homes to return to.
Before the fighting, Nahr el Bared Refugee camp was a well known and well established centre of commerce and an important service provider in North Lebanon. Since Palestinians are excluded from paying sales tax, they could offer cheaper products, and camp merchants had used the sizable Palestinian diaspora in neighboring Arab states as a de facto trading network. Palestinian stores had been a safety valve for surrounding marginalized villages in North Lebanon. The destruction of the Nahr al –bared camp harmed the commercial sector of Palestinians and poorer households in surrounding areas.
In addition to NBC war, and due to the political polarization in the country, the North is witnessing a significant increase in tension between Sunni and Alawit communities. This tension turns frequently into armed clashes in Tripoli jabal Mohsen area.
On the other hand, and due to the Syrian uprising in 2011, Lebanon witnessed an influx of some 6,000 Syrian refugees into northern Lebanon. Many subsequently returned to Syria, while others relocated in Akkar, North Lebanon. Those who remain are unwilling to return until stability and security is restored in their Syrian villages. Many individuals and families have been deeply affected by the events that caused them to flee and are reluctant return home until the situation stabilizes.

Strategic objectives
The UN implementing agencies of the Conflict Prevention and Peace Building programme are: UNDP, ILO, UNFPA, UNESCO, UNICEF, and UNRWA. The total budget is: USD 5,000,000.
The main objective of the Programme is to mitigate the risk of relapse into violent conflict through promotion of socio-economic development and peace building in particularly conflict sensitive communities in North Lebanon. The logic of intervention of the JP is related to one of the UNDAF outcomes and articulated in two main expected outcomes and 9 expected outputs as per the following:
UNDAF OUTCOME: 1.1 National reconciliation and peace building promoted through increased inclusive participation
Outcome 1: Conflict resolution and mediation mechanisms developed and sustained in order to facilitate the resolution of inter- and intra-communal tensions between Palestinians and
Lebanese.

Outcome 2: Conflict risk in North Lebanon communities reduced through the design and implementation of inclusive socio-economic initiatives.

**Geographic scope**
The targeted areas of intervention include: i) Selected Palestinian refugee camps of Nahr el Bared and Beddawi and surrounding Lebanese municipalities; ii) Marginalised border communities in Akkar area; iii) Neighbourhoods Jabal Mohsen and Bab Tabbaneh in Tripoli.

**Main partners**
The programme has several governmental partners at the local and national levels. The National Steering Committee is co-chaired by the Council for Development and Reconstruction (CDR) and the Programme Management Committee includes the Ministry of Labour, the Ministry of Education and Higher Education, the Reconstruction and Recovery Cell in the Prime Minister Office, and the Lebanese Palestinian Dialogue Committee.

At the local level, Municipalities participate in monitoring the programme's activities through “Regional Working Groups” (RWGs) that include civil society organization along with local authorities. The RWGs are responsible of the following functions:

- To provide advice on the expected results and the activities laid out in the Work Plan.
- To discuss and support the Programme Advocacy and Communication Plan in collaboration with the Joint Programme Coordinator and key partners from the government and civil society.
- To support the establishment of programme baselines to enable sound monitoring and evaluation.
- To review the summary of the monitoring and evaluation reports of the joint programme.
- To address implementation problems.

In addition to governmental partners, the programme has built partnership with seven civil society organizations in order to facilitate the implementation of field activities.

**Timeline**
The initial programme duration was from September 2009 to March 2012. In December 2011, a no-cost six month extension was approved by the MDG-F Secretariat and accordingly the end date of the programme is now 31 August 2012. The timeline below shows the main steps and milestones during the implementation of the programme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 April 2009</td>
<td>Signature of JP Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 September 2009</td>
<td>Official start date (funds transfer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 December 2009</td>
<td>Recruitment of UNRWA Field Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2009</td>
<td>First MDG-F Secretariat monitoring mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 February 2010</td>
<td>Inception workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 April 2010</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator on board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 April 2010</td>
<td>Recruitment of UNFPA Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April-November 2010</td>
<td>Institutional mapping &amp; socio-economic desk review for the border areas of the Akkar region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 May 2010</td>
<td>Recruitment of ILO Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 May 2010</td>
<td>Municipal Elections in North Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July-September 2010</td>
<td>Conflict analysis for the border areas of Akkar region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 August 2010</td>
<td>Recruitment of UNDP Tebbaneh-Jabal Mohsen Field Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 November 2010</td>
<td>Final identification of Olives and Vegetables sectors for the Dreib and Sahel regions, in consultation with the Regional Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 November 2010</td>
<td>Second MDG-F Secretariat monitoring mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2010</td>
<td>Study on interfaces between Lebanese and Palestinians completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 January 2011</td>
<td>Resignation of Lebanese Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>Violent clashes in Bab el Tebbaneh-Jabal Mohsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January—July 2011</td>
<td>Caretaker government in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>Eruption of events in Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2011</td>
<td>Case Study on NBC relations disseminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2011</td>
<td>New Lebanese Government formed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24 June 2011 | Violent clashes in Bab el Tebbaneh-Jabal Mohsen
---|---
18-26 July 2011 | Mid term Evaluation Mission
28 September 2011 | Midterm evaluation final report
6 December 2011 | Official submission of no-cost extension request
12 December 2011 | Approval of no-cost extension
February 2012 | Official registration of the two established cooperatives in Akkar

2. Scope of Work, Responsibilities and Description of the Proposed Analytical Work

1. Task 1: Desk review
2. Task 2: Inception report
3. Task 3: Field mission in Lebanon
4. Task 4: Draft final report
5. Task 5: Revise the draft report and submit the final evaluation report based on comments provided by the evaluation reference group

1. OVERALL GOAL OF THE EVALUATION
One of the roles of the Secretariat is to monitor and evaluate the MDG-F. This role is fulfilled in line with the instructions contained in the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and the Implementation Guide for Joint Programmes under the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund. These documents stipulate that **all joint programmes will commission and finance a final independent evaluation**. The commissioner of the evaluation is seeking high-qualified consultants to conduct the final evaluation of this joint programme. Final evaluations are **summative** in nature and seek to:

1. Measure to what extent the joint programme has fully implemented their activities, delivered outputs and attained outcomes and specifically measuring development results.
2. Measure to what extent the implementation of the joint programme has affected the targeted population, especially the most marginalized one.
3. Generate substantive evidence based knowledge, on one or more of the MDG-F thematic windows by identifying best practices and lessons learned that could be useful to other development interventions at national (scale up) and international level (replicability).

As a result, the findings, conclusions and recommendations generated by these evaluations will be part of the thematic window Meta evaluation, the Secretariat is undertaking to synthesize the
overall impact of the fund at national and international level.

2. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES
The final evaluation will focus on measuring development results and potential impacts generated by the joint programme, based on the scope and criteria included in the terms of reference. This will enable conclusions and recommendations for the joint programme to be formed within a period between four and six months.

The unit of analysis or object of study for this evaluation is the joint programme, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the joint programme document and in associated modifications made during implementation.

This final evaluation has the following specific objectives:
1. Measure to what extent the joint programme has contributed to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase and solve the problems of the most marginalized groups in the targeted population.
2. To measure joint programme’s degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes, against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised. This needs to cover development of local capabilities as pre-requisite for national ownership and sustainability of the interventions.
3. Measure to what extent the joint programme has attained development results to the targeted population, beneficiaries, participants and the most marginalized whether individuals, communities, institutions, etc. This needs to measure the extent to which the JP contributed to the attainment of Government priorities.
4. To measure the joint programme’s contribution to the objectives set in their respective specific thematic windows as well as the overall MDG fund objectives at local and national level. (MDGs, Paris Declaration and Accra Principles and UN reform).
5. To identify and document substantive lessons learned and good and bad practices on the specific topics of the thematic window, MDGs, Paris Declaration, Accra Principles and UN reform with the aim to support the sustainability of the joint programme or some of its components.

3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS, LEVELS OF ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA
The evaluation questions define the information that must be generated as a result of the evaluation process. The questions are grouped according to the criteria to be used in assessing and answering them. These criteria are, in turn, grouped according to the three levels of the programme.
Design level:
- **Relevance**: The extent to which the objectives of the conflict prevention and peace building intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country and the Millennium Development Goals.

  a) How much and in what ways did the joint programme contributed to minimize the conflict problems identified in the design phase?

  b) To what extent this programme was designed, implemented, monitored and evaluated jointly? (See MDG-F joint programme guidelines.)

  c) To what extent joint programming was the best option to respond to development and conflict challenges stated in the programme document?

  d) To what extent the implementing partners participating in the joint programme had an added value to overcome the development and conflict challenges stated in the programme document?

  e) To what extent did the joint programme have a useful, functional and reliable M&E strategy that contributed to measure development results? To what extent the indicators were relevant and the baselines/targets were adequate?

  f) To what extent did the joint programme have a useful and reliable C&A strategy?

  g) If the programme was revised, did it reflect the changes that were needed? Why changes were done?

  h) What is the relevance in relation to the equity approach, as well as foundation strategies such as the Human Rights-based Approach to Programming and Gender Mainstreaming?

  i) What does the literature and current experience suggest about the appropriateness of the proposed strategy? How did this strategy address the key issues affecting worst-off groups?

**Process level**
- **Efficiency**: Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into equitable results

  a) To what extent did the joint programme’s management model (i.e. instruments; economic, human and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision-making in management) was efficient in comparison to the results attained?

  b) To what extent was the implementation of a joint programme intervention (group of agencies) more efficient in comparison to what could have been through a single agency’s intervention?
c) To what extent the governance of the fund at programme level (PMC) and at national level (NSC), as well as within the framework of the Regional Working Groups, contributed to efficiency and effectiveness of the joint programme? To what extent these governance structures were useful for development purposes, ownership, for working together as one? Did they enable management and delivery of outputs and results?

d) To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme increase or reduce efficiency in delivering outputs and attaining outcomes, especially for the most marginalized?

e) What type of work methodologies, financial instruments, coordination mechanisms and business practices have the implementing partners used to increase efficiency in delivering as one?

f) What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the joint programme face and to what extent have this affected its efficiency?

g) To what extent and in what ways did the mid-term evaluation have an impact on the joint programme? Was it useful? Did the joint programme implement the improvement plan? If not what were the bottlenecks?

- Ownership in the process: Effective exercise of leadership by the country’s national/local partners in development interventions

  a) To what extent did the targeted population, civil society, local and national authorities made the programme their own, taking an active role in it? What modes of participation (leadership) and inclusion aspect of the most marginalized have driven the process?

  b) To what extent and in what ways has ownership or the lack of it, impacted in the efficiency and effectiveness of the joint programme?

  c) To what extent did the joint program contribute to the understanding by the local and national partners of the principles of the Paris Declaration & Accra Agenda for Action?

  d) To what extent has the programme been effective in putting in place mechanisms for fostering the participation of local partners, including social partners and beneficiaries?

Results level

- Effectiveness: Extent to which the objectives of the peace building and conflict prevention intervention have been achieved.

  a) To what extent did the joint programme contribute to the attainment of the peace building and conflict prevention outputs and outcomes initially expected /stipulated in the programme document?

    1. To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to peace building and conflict prevention at the local and national levels?

    2. To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to the goals set in the thematic window?

    3. To what extent (policy, budgets, design, and implementation) and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to improve the implementation of
the principles of the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action?

4. To what extent and in what ways did the joint programme contribute to the goals of delivering as one at country level?

   b) To what extent were joint programme’s outputs and outcomes synergistic and coherent to produce development results? What kinds of results were reached?
   c) To what extent did the joint programme had an impact on the targeted marginalized communities?
   d) Have any good practices, success stories, lessons learned or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them.
   e) What types of differentiated effects are resulting from the joint programme in accordance with the sex, race, ethnic group, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population, and to what extent?
   f) To what extent has the joint programme contributed to the advancement and the progress of fostering national ownership processes and outcomes (the design and implementation of National Development Plans, Public Policies, UNDAF, etc)
   g) To what extent did the joint programme help to increase stakeholder/citizen dialogue and or engagement on conflict prevention and management issues and policies?
   h) To what extent has the communication strategy contributed to maximizing the visibility of the project’s objectives at national and local levels?
   i) How do outputs and outcomes of the programme contribute to gender equality and human rights?
   j) How do outputs and outcomes of the programme contribute to the strengthening of the social partners and social dialogue?
   k) How do outputs and outcomes of the programme contribute to strengthening the influence of labour standards and other human rights?
   l) To what extent did the programme helped create decent employment to men and women?

Sustainability: Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term and on the most marginalized groups.

   a) To what extent the joint programme decision making bodies and implementing partners have undertaken the necessary decisions and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the joint programme and the impact on worst-off groups likely to continue when support is withdrawn?
      At local and national level:
      i. To what extent did national and/or local institutions support the joint programme?
      ii. To what extent have national and local institutions mainstreamed the joint programme’s results into existing national and local policies and programmes?
iii. Did these institutions show technical capacity, and leadership commitment to keep working with the programme or to scale it up?
iv. Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national and local partners?
v. Did the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the programme?
vi. Were joint mechanisms and frameworks established, which local and national counterparts will continue to use to address new conflict issues?

b) To what extent will the joint programme (in full or partial) be replicable or scaled up at national or local levels? What alterations would be required to scale it up?
c) To what extent did the joint programme align itself with the National Development Strategies/frameworks and/or the UNDAF?

4. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH
This final evaluation will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the TOR and the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. In all cases, consultants are expected to analyse all relevant information sources, such as reports, programme documents, internal review reports, programme files, strategic country development documents, mid-term evaluations and any other documents that may provide evidence on which to form judgements. Consultants are also expected to use interviews, focus groups and surveys or any other relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tool as a means to collect relevant data for the final evaluation. Consultants will make sure that the voices, opinions and information of targeted citizens/participants of the joint programme are taken into account.

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in detail in the desk study report and the final evaluation report, and should contain, at minimum, information on the instruments used for gender disaggregated data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory techniques.

5. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES
The consultants are responsible for submitting the following deliverables to the commissioner and the manager of the evaluation:

**Inception Report** (to be submitted within 15 days of the submission of all programme documentation to the evaluation team)

This report will be 10 to 15 pages in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for data collection. It will also include a proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. The inception report will propose initial lines of inquiry about the joint programme. This report will be used as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the consultant and the evaluation managers. The report will follow the outline stated in Annex 1.
Draft Final Report (to be submitted within 20 days after the completion of the field visit, to be sent to the MDG-F Secretariat as well)

The draft final report will contain the same sections as the final report (described in the next paragraph) and will be 20 to 30 pages in length. This report will be shared among the evaluation reference group. It will also contain an executive report of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The draft final report will be shared with the evaluation reference group to seek their comments and suggestions. This report will contain the same sections as the final report, described below.

Final Evaluation Report (to be submitted within 10 days after reception of the draft final report with comments, please send also to MDG-F Secretariat).

The final report will be 20 to 30 pages in length. It will also contain an executive summary of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be sent to the evaluation reference group. This report will contain the sections establish in Annex 2.

6. KEY ROLES AND RESPONSABILITIES IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

There will be 3 main actors involved in the implementation of MDG-F final evaluations:

1. The Resident Coordinator Office (RCO) as commissioner of the final evaluation will have the following functions:

   - Lead the evaluation process throughout the 3 main phases of a final evaluation (design, implementation and dissemination)
   - Convene the evaluation reference group
   - Lead the finalization of the evaluation ToR, based on the feedback received by the evaluation reference group
   - Coordinate the selection and recruitment of the evaluation team by making sure the lead agency undertakes the necessary procurement processes and contractual arrangements required to hire the evaluation team
   - Ensure the evaluation products meet quality standards (in collaboration with the MDG-F Secretariat)
   - Provide clear specific advice and support to the evaluation manager and the evaluation team throughout the whole evaluation process
   - Connect the evaluation team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation
   - Take responsibility for disseminating and learning across evaluations on the various joint programme areas as well as the liaison with the National Steering Committee
   - Safeguard the independence of the exercise, including the selection of the evaluation team
2. The **programme coordinator/RCO as evaluation manager** will have the following functions:
   - Contribute to the finalization of the evaluation TOR
   - Provide executive and coordination support to the reference group
   - Provide the evaluators with administrative support and required data
   - Liaise with and respond to the commissioners of evaluation
   - Connect the evaluation team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation
   - Review the inception report and the draft evaluation report(s);
   - Ensure that adequate funding and human resources are allocated for the evaluation

3. **The Programme Management Committee** that will function as the **evaluation reference group**, this group will comprise the representatives of the major stakeholders in the joint programme
   - Participate in preparatory meetings prior to the evaluation
   - Review the inception report and draft evaluation report, provide comments and ensure final draft meets the required quality standards.
   - Facilitate the participation of those involved in the programme implementation and evaluation design
   - Identify information needs, define objectives and delimit the scope of the evaluation.
   - Provide input and participate in finalizing the evaluation Terms of Reference
   - Facilitate the evaluation team’s access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods
   - Oversee progress and conduct of the evaluation the quality of the process and the products
   - Participate in debriefing on findings, conclusions and recommendations of the final evaluation
   - Disseminate the results of the evaluation

4. **The MDG-F Secretariat** that will function as a **quality assurance member** of the evaluation in cooperation with the commissioner of the evaluation
   - Review and provide advice on the quality the evaluation process as well as on the evaluation products (comments and suggestions on the adapted TOR, draft reports, final report of the evaluation) and options for improvement.

5. **The evaluation team** will conduct the evaluation study by:
   Fulfilling the contractual arrangements in line with the TOR, UNEG/OECD norms and standards and ethical guidelines; this includes developing an evaluation matrix as part of the inception report, drafting reports, and briefing the commissioner and stakeholders on
the progress and key findings and recommendations, as needed.
The evaluation team will be formed by two consultants, one international and one national. The international consultant will be leading the assignment. However, the lead consultant should consider all comments and inputs of the national consultant and a consensus needs to be reached when submitting the main evaluation deliverables (inception report, draft final report, and final evaluation report). Any disagreements between the two consultants should be communicated to the Evaluation Manager. The table below describes the distribution of tasks between both consultants.

### Distribution of tasks between consultants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Role of Lead Consultant</th>
<th># of working days</th>
<th>Role of national consultant</th>
<th># of working days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk review</td>
<td>Read available documentation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Read available documentation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report</td>
<td>Draft the report</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provide comments on the report to Lead Consultant</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field mission in Lebanon</td>
<td>Conduct field visits to have interviews, focus groups, meetings, etc (includes travel)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Conduct field visits to have interviews, focus groups, meetings, etc</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participate in a working session between consultants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Participate in a working session between consultants</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft final report</td>
<td>Draft the report</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Provide comments on the report to Lead Consultant</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise the draft report and submit the final evaluation report based on comments provided by the evaluation reference group</td>
<td>Review and finalize the report</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide final revision of final evaluation report and provide comments to Lead Consultant</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of working days</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Total # of working days</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6. **EVALUATION PROCESS: TIMELINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Phase</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Establish the evaluation reference group</td>
<td>CE*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>General final evaluation TOR adapted</td>
<td>ERG**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Procurement and hiring the evaluation team</td>
<td>EM***</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Provide the evaluation team with inputs (documents, access to reports and archives); Briefing on joint programme</td>
<td>EM, ERG</td>
<td>7 days-first week of April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Delivery of inception report to the commissioner, the evaluation manager and the evaluation reference group</td>
<td>ET****</td>
<td>15 days-mid May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Feedback of evaluation stakeholders to the evaluation team. Agenda drafted and agreed with evaluation team</td>
<td>CE, EM, ERG</td>
<td>10 days-end of May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>In country mission</td>
<td>ET, EM, CE, ERG</td>
<td>10 days-last week of June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Delivery of the draft report</td>
<td>ET</td>
<td>20 days-last week of July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Review of the evaluation draft report, feedback to evaluation team. Fact-checking revision by MDG-FS, to be done at the same time as the ERG</td>
<td>EM, CE, ERG MDG-FS*****</td>
<td>15 days-first week of August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Delivery of the final report</td>
<td>EM, CE, ERG, MDG-FS, ^NSC</td>
<td>10 days-mid-August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination/ Improvement</td>
<td>Dissemination and use plan for the evaluation report designed and under implementation</td>
<td>EM, CE, ERG, NSC</td>
<td>10 days-last week of August</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Commissioner of the evaluation (CE)  
**Evaluation Reference group (ERG)  
***Evaluation manager (EM)  
****Evaluation team (ET) *****MDG-F Secretariat (MDGF-S) ^National Steering Committee
8. USE AND UTILITY OF THE EVALUATION

Final evaluations are summative exercises that are oriented to gather data and information to measure to what extent development results were attained. However, the utility of the evaluation process and the products goes far beyond what was said during the field visit by programme stakeholders or what the evaluation team wrote in the evaluation report. The momentum created by the evaluations process (meetings with government, donors, beneficiaries, civil society, etc) is an ideal opportunity to set an agenda on the future of the programme or some of their components (sustainability). It is also an excellent platform to communicate lessons learnt and to convey key messages on good practices, share products that can be replicated or scale up in the country as well as at international level.

The commissioner of the evaluation, the evaluation reference group, the evaluation manager and any other stakeholders relevant for the joint programme will jointly design and implement a complete plan of dissemination of the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations with the aim to advocate for sustainability, replicability, scaling up or to share good practices and lessons learnt at local, national or/and international level.

3. Qualifications Required

Title: International Lead Consultant

ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION

The final evaluation of the joint programme is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

- **Anonymity and confidentiality.** The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.

- **Responsibility.** The report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen among the consultants or between the consultant and the heads of the Joint Programme in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The team must corroborate all assertions, or disagreement with them noted.

- **Integrity.** The evaluator will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the TOR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.

- **Independence.** The consultants should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and they must not be associated with its management or any element thereof.

- **Incidents.** If problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they...
must be reported immediately to the Secretariat of the MDGF. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by the Secretariat of the MDGF in these terms of reference.

- **Validation of information.** The consultants will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.

- **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the consultants shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review.

- **Delivery of reports.** If delivery of the reports is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is clearly lower than what was agreed, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable.

The Individual Consultant should possess the following minimum qualifications:

---

**I- Academic Qualifications:**

Advanced University degree in development, evaluation, social sciences, conflict prevention, or any other related field.

---

**II- Years of Experience:**

a. A minimum of 10 years of professional experience specifically in the area of evaluation of international development and peace building initiatives;
b. Substantial international track record of conducting evaluations, including process, outcome and impact evaluations;

---

**III- Competencies:**

a- Proven expertise in conflict prevention and experience in peace building programming in crisis and post-crisis contexts;
c. Knowledge of Lebanon an asset.
d. Knowledge and experience of the UN System is desirable;
e. Understanding of the working context of the MDG-F.
4. **Duration of Contract**

35 Working Days

5. **Schedule of Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Task Name</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Task 1:</td>
<td>Desk review</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Approval of Task 1</td>
<td>Read available documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Task 2:</td>
<td>Inception report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Approval of Task 2</td>
<td>Draft the report Conduct field visits to have interviews, focus groups, meetings, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Task 3:</td>
<td>Field mission in Lebanon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Approval of Task 3</td>
<td>Conduct field visits to have interviews, focus groups, meetings, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Task 4:</td>
<td>Draft final report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Approval of Task 4</td>
<td>Draft the report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Task 5:</td>
<td>Revise the draft report and submit the final evaluation report based on comments provided by the evaluation reference group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Approval of Task 5</td>
<td>Review and finalize the report comments to Lead Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Reporting

I. Outline of the inception report

0. Introduction

1. Background to the evaluation: objectives and overall approach

2. Identification of main units and dimensions for analysis and possible areas for research

3. Main substantive and financial achievements of the joint programme

4. Methodology for the compilation and analysis of the information

5. Criteria to define the mission agenda, including “field visits”

II. Outline of the draft and final evaluation reports

1. Cover Page

2. Executive Summary (include also Glossary page)

3. Introduction
   - Background, goal and methodological approach
   - Purpose of the evaluation
   - Methodologies used in the evaluation
   - Constraints and limitations on the study conducted

4. Description of the development interventions carried out
   - Detailed description of the development intervention undertaken: description and judgement on implementation of outputs delivered (or not) and outcomes attained as well as how the programme worked in comparison to the theory of change developed for the programme.

5. Levels of Analysis: Evaluation criteria and questions (all questions included in the TOR must be addressed and answered)

6. Conclusions and lessons learned (prioritized, structured and clear)

7. Recommendations
8. Annexes

III. Documents to be reviewed

- MDG-F Revised Joint Work Plan, July 2011
- MDG-F Communication and Advocacy Plan, April 2011
- “Conflict Prevention and Peace Building in Northern Lebanon” Mid Term Evaluation Final Report, Sergio Lenci, September 2011
- Non-Cost Extension Request for the MDG-F Conflict Prevention and Peace Building in North Lebanon Programme
- Final Report of the Capacity building program for CBOs/NGOs “Working with youth in the North of Lebanon”, UNDP, January 2012
- MDG-F CPPB Biannual Report, January- June 2011
- MDG-F CPPB Biannual Report, June-December 2011
- MDG-F CPPB Joint Programme Monitoring Report, February 2010
- MDG-F CPPB Joint Programme Monitoring Report, July 2010
- MDG-F CPPB Joint Programme Monitoring Report, December 2010
- MDG-F CPPB Lebanon Improvement Plan, November 2011
- MDG-F CPPB Exit and Sustainability Strategy, November 2011
- Minutes of UNICEF MDG-F CPPB Coordination Meeting, 27 June 2011
- “Participatory Value Chain Analysis”, ILO, 2011
- “Socio-Economic Situation in Akkar in Light of the Crisis in Syria”, United Nations Resident Coordinator Sub-Office, North Lebanon, July 2011
- “Socio-Economic Survey of Palestinian Refugees in Lebanon”, American University of Beirut, December 2010
- “Building Dialogue and Communication Skills”, Naba’a in partnership with UNESCO, November 2010
- “Capacity Building for Popular Committees in Naher el-Bared and Beddawi camps Project” Background Document, UNRWA, January 2012
- “Conflict Analysis Border Area – North Lebanon”, World Vision Lebanon and UNDP, July-September 2010
• “Institutional Mapping of Northern Akkar”, UNRCO, January 2012
• “Report of the Lebanon Independent Border Assessment Team”, Now Lebanon, August 2008
• “Implementation Guidelines for MDG Achievement Fund Joint Programmes”, MDG Achievement Fund Secretariat, February 2011
• “Regarding the formation of a Lebanese Mission to handle the Palestinian Refugees Issue in Lebanon”, Official LPDC Decree, 2005
• LPDC letter for the justification of the extension, 19 October 2011
• “Socio-Economic Assessment of Northern Akkar”, ILO, August 2010
• Speech of the Chairperson of the Lebanese - Palestinian Dialogue Committee, Maya Majzoub, during a meeting on the "Lebanese-Palestinian Relations: Achievements, Vision and future", 29 of June 2010
• “Lebanon Update: Situation in North Lebanon”, UNHCR, 21-27 January 2012
• Government’s statement
• Evaluation report of ILO on Akkar area/component
• Situation analysis of women and girls in North Lebanon, ZACA and UNFPA, 2010