Call for Expression of Interest on
Final Independent Evaluation for "Transforming national dialogue for the development of an
inclusive national SP system for Lebanon"

Countries Covered	Lebanon
Application Deadline	31 May 2022
Expected Duration	June - September 2022

On behalf of project participating UN agencies, ILO Regional Office for Arab States is seeking Expressions of Interest from an individual evaluator to conduct an independent cluster evaluation for Employment Intensive Infrastructure Programme in Lebanon and Jordan or from individual consultants to take part in the team.

Required Information/Documents to submit as an Expression of Interest:
- CV, highlighting relevant experiences
- Daily professional fee in US$ based on the number of payable working days scope of work indicated in this ToR
- Two past evaluation reports written and conducted by the bidder as the sole evaluator or the team lead (but not as a team member)
- The names of two referees (including phone number and email address) who can be contacted.

Query from potential bidders on any section of this ToR are welcome. Please send an application and relevant questions via email to the following contacts of ILO ROAS.

Please submit required information by the deadline above via email to the Regional Monitoring & Evaluation Officer, Mr. Hideyuki Tsuruoka, tsuruoka@ilo.org, copying Ms. Hiba Al Rifai, alrifai@ilo.org.

1

Terms of Reference
for Final Independent Evaluation for "Transforming national dialogue for the development of an inclusive national SP system for Lebanon"

KEY FACTS	
Countries:	Lebanon
Project title:	Transforming national dialogue for the development of an inclusive national SP system for Lebanon
Project Duration:	32 months
Start Date:	20th January 2020
End Date:	30th September 2022
Donor:	Joint SDG Fund
Budget:	US$ 2,700,000

I. Background

1. Unprecedented economic crisis and eleven years into the Syrian refugee crisis, socioeconomic conditions have in many cases deteriorated in Lebanon. Having the highest refugee per capita in the world (almost 1:3), both refugees and local populations continue to be negatively impacted by the crises. Income vulnerability is estimated at 74% of the Lebanese population (ILO and CAS, 2021), unemployment rates have increased, and Lebanon ranks 140th of 149 countries in the 2018 World Economic Forum (WEF) gender equality index in 2018.

2. Lebanon spending on national social assistance remains at 0.44% of GDP (excluding fee waivers), significantly below the regional average of 1% (WB, The State of Safety Nets 2018). In addition, there is a lack of strategic vision and policy, lack of coordination and oversight and limited capacity for implementation. As such, national SP programs in Lebanon suffer from major coverage gaps alongside a parallel provision to refugees that is central to social stability and cohesion. While the social assistance program, the National Poverty Targeting Program (NPTP) is being gradually scaled up from the original 15,000 beneficiary households (1.5% of the population), most of the vulnerable population continue to face income insecurity without any access to social assistance benefits. The Government has been depending on existing structures used by development partners in delivering this assistance to the poorest Lebanese. A large share of workers, including migrant workers, also operate in the informal economy and are excluded from coverage of either the National Social Security Fund (NSSF), main social insurance schemes, or existing social assistance programs.

3. Women are particularly marginalized when it comes to social protection, as they are underrepresented in the formal labor market in Lebanon (at 23%, compared to 71% of men). The low labor participation rate limits women's ability to directly access contributory schemes as well as employer-provided benefits. Key gendered issues within SP, such as gender discrimination within the NSSF, gender-sensitive public works and social assistance programmes are neglected by institutions, law, policies, and programmes in Lebanon.

4. Overall, this lack of an integrated national SP system in Lebanon coupled with significant Government underinvestment has led to fragmentation and duplication of assistance as well as increased vulnerabilities of the population not covered by social protection. The business-as-usual approach would come with a substantial risk for the country and in particular for the most vulnerable – and greater socio-economic pressures could also lead to wider repercussions, such as further escalation of social tension brought about by the protracted refugee crisis and unrest associated with the escalation of the economic and financial crisis and the continuous delay in devising an appropriate response plan. Furthermore, opportunities for participation and inclusion of marginalized groups are an important challenge – women, those in rural areas, those in informal sectors, older people and people living with disabilities are particularly excluded from national discussions and debate on the social contract and rights.

II.   Programme Background

5. The overarching strategy of Lebanon's SDG Fund programme is to support Government and a wide range of key stakeholders to develop the evidence, dialogue and operational reform necessary to establish a clear, strategic national vision for social protection in the country. The Lebanon SDG Fund is to enable UN agencies to support this historical shift in priorities, to address fragmentation and quality of the social protection system, and to call for the inclusion of marginalized groups.

6. The strategy varies from the usual approaches for two reasons, first that it shifts the focus of the UN's engagement in social protection from delivery of humanitarian cash transfers toward a broader national conversation on social protection systems, while at the same time learning important lessons from the humanitarian context and opening dialogue on linkages. Secondly, because it takes a clear position in promoting the Government in a leadership position on social protection, and in support of system-strengthening, which had not always been the case following more than 8 years of protracted humanitarian crisis.

7. The Lebanon SDG Fund programme serves as an SDG accelerator by supporting the creation of a currently absent national SP policy, mobilising increasingly coordinated UN efforts to strengthen the two main national programmes in place, NPTP and NSSF, and enhancing their gender and disability responsiveness. The development of a comprehensive social protection policy, if nationally owned and situated within evidence-based reforms, has the potential to bolster any potential national reform agenda and mitigate the impact of the protracted economic crisis, while promoting progress towards Agenda 2030 with a focus on leaving no one behind, through catalysing action on poverty, vulnerability and unemployment.

8. Key to the programme has been to ensure a focus on groups that are commonly left behind in Lebanon, with a broad emphasis on promoting an inclusive national development model. The programme aims to operationalize the Leaving No One Behind agenda, specifically focusing on gender, youth and those with disabilities. Individuals with disabilities face particular discrimination in Lebanon and national dialogue and programme reform has been to include a focus on this issue.

9. Upon completion of the programme, the social protection sector has been expected to be transformed through the leveraging of emerging yet nascent national dialogue on the need for a new social contract. The programme seeks to directly impact on building a – currently largely absent – social protection system that protects the well-being of the most disadvantaged in the context of reform and enables all segments of society to benefit from development.

III.   Evaluation Background

10. UN considers evaluation as an integral part of the implementation of development cooperation activities. The joint programme document states that a final independent evaluation will be conducted, which will be used to assess the progress towards the results, identify the main difficulties/constraints, assess the impact of the programme for the targeted populations, and formulate lessons learned and practical recommendations to improve future engagement to the area of social protection in the country.

IV.   Evaluation Purpose and objectives

11. The final evaluation will be conducted to examine the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and likelihood of impact of the joint programme. This evaluation will also identify strengths and weaknesses in the programme design, strategy, and implementation as well as lessons learned, good practices, and recommendations.

12. Specifically, the evaluation will examine the following aspects:
   - **Changes in context and review of assumptions (relevance):** Is the programme design adequate to address the problems at hand? Were the programme objectives and design relevant given the political, economic, and social context?
   - **Results in terms of outcomes and outputs achieved (effectiveness):** How has the programme contributed towards programme's intended results, particularly for the most vulnerable?
   - **Use of resources in achievement of programme performance (efficiency):** How have the human/financial resources been used to fulfil the programme performance in an efficient manner?
   - **Assessment of impact (impact):** To what extent is the programme likely to have contributed the long-term intended impact? To what extent did the programme contribute to the SDGs?
   - **Sustainability:** Will the programme's effects remain over time? To what extent have the programme contributed the sustainable capacity and ownership of the government and other relevant stakeholders?
   - **Coherence of UN Development System:** to what extent has the programme contributed the reinvigoration of the resident coordinator (RC) system and supported the empowerment of the RC? To what extent has the programme affected country-level programming for development towards a more integrated working model towards SDG achievement? To what extent has the programme contributed to coherence of UNCT's support to government?

13. The evaluation will comply with the UNEG ethical guidelines[1] and ILO evaluation policy[2].

V.   Scope of Evaluation

14. The evaluation will look at all the programme activities, outputs and outcomes to date within the wider context of the country. The evaluation should take into consideration the duration from the beginning of the project (January 2020) till the commencement of the evaluation.

15. Persons with disabilities are among the most vulnerable groups, whom social protection plays a critical role in supporting. As cross-cutting themes, the evaluation will look at inclusion of people

---

[1] http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866
[2] https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/policy/wcms_603265.pdf

with disabilities and will also take specific note of integration of gender mainstreaming, contribution to SDGs and COVID-19 response.

VI. Clients of Evaluation

16. The primary clients of this evaluation are the Government of Lebanon, particularly Ministry of Social Affairs, and Inter-Ministerial Committee for Social Affairs, programme participating UN organizations, secretariat and donors of the SDG fund. The secondary clients include other major partners in social protection.

VII. Evaluation Criteria and Questions

17. The evaluation will follow UN Evaluation Group's (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation and the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria:

Relevance

- ❖ Are the programme's intended results aligned with national priorities and the needs of the most vulnerable population in the country? What measures have been taken to ensure alignment?
- ❖ To what extent have persons with disabilities, in particular children and women with disabilities, been consulted through their representative organizations?

Coherence and validity of the design

- ❖ Are the programme strategies and structures coherent and logical?
- ❖ Does the programme make a practical use of a monitoring and evaluation framework? How appropriate and useful are the indicators in assessing the programme progress? Are indicators gender sensitive? Are the means of verification for the indicators appropriate? Are the assumptions for each objective and output realistic?
- ❖ To what extent did the programme design take into account: Specific gender equality and non-discrimination concerns, including inclusion of people with disabilities, relevant to the programme context?

Programme progress and effectiveness

- ❖ What progress has the programme made towards achieving the overall outcome and outputs?
- ❖ To what extent did the program contribute to support inclusion of persons with disabilities?
- ❖ To what extent did the programme respond emerging needs during the COVID-19 pandemic and economic crisis?

Efficiency

- ❖ To what extent have programme activities been cost-efficient? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the outcome? To what extent can the programme results justify the time, financial and human resources invested in the programme?
- ❖ How efficient was the "joint" programme vis-à-vis what would have been done as individual agency interventions?

Impact orientation

- ❖ What were the interventions long-term effects on equitable gender relations?
- ❖ To what extent has the programme contributed to accelerating the SDGs at the national level?

Sustainability

❖ Are the results achieved by the programme likely to be sustainable? What measures have been considered to ensure that the key components of the programme are sustainable beyond the life of the programme?
❖ To what extent was sustainability of impact taken into account during the design of the programme?
❖ How effectively has the programme built national ownership and capacity? In what ways are results anchored in national institutions and to what extent can the local partners maintain them financially at end of programme?

Coherence of UN Development System
❖ Was the RC able to draw on the expertise and assets of the entire UN system to address the programme's development priorities?
❖ Was the RC and UNCT able to leverage the positive results of the programme and capitalize on it to promote a working model with stronger joint up approaches for analysis and support? To what extent did the programme contribute to UN reforms, including UN Country Team coherence and efficiency?
❖ Has the programme ensured a coherent UN support to national priorities and government?

VIII.   Methodology

18. This evaluation is summative and relies on both quantitative and qualitative approaches to respond evaluation questions and fulfil the purpose. It consists of,

- **Desk review of existing documents:** The evaluator will conduct systematic analysis of existing documents and obtain existing qualitative and quantitative evidence prior to primary data collection. The desk review also facilitates assessment of the situation and available data to plan the evaluation and develop the inception report.
- **Key information interviews:** Online or in-person individual interviews will be conducted with a pre-agreed list of stakeholders who have in-depth exposure and understanding of the programme and its context. Interview guide(s) will be developed during the inception phase to stimulate a discussion on concerned evaluation questions.
- **Preliminary finding briefing:** Upon completion of primary data collection, the evaluator will present preliminary findings to participating UN agencies and selected stakeholders. The evaluator will also collect further insight from the group to feed them into the final report.

19. Any changes to the methodology should be discussed and approved by the Joint Evaluation Management Group during the inception phase.

IX.   Work Assignments
a) Kick-off meeting
20. The evaluator will have an initial consultation with the evaluation manager, joint evaluation management group and relevant programme officers involved in the programme. The objective of the consultation is to reach a common understanding regarding changes in contextual background, the status of the programme, the priority assessment questions, available data sources and data collection instruments and an outline of the final assessment report. The following topics will be covered: status of logistical arrangements, programme background and materials, and key evaluation priorities.

b) Desk Review

21. The evaluator will review programme background materials before conducting interviews. Documents to review include Joint Programme Document, progress reports, studies, analytical papers, reports, tools, and publications produced, and any other relevant background notes.

c) Inception Report

22. The external evaluator will draft an Inception Report, which should describe, provide reflection and fine-tuning of the following issues:
    • Programme background
    • Purpose, scope and beneficiaries of the evaluation
    • Evaluation matrix, including criteria, questions, indicators, data source, and data collection methods
    • Methodology and instruments
    • Main deliverables
    • Work plan

d) Primary Data Collection

23. **Key Informant Interviews:** Following the approval of the inception report, the evaluator will conduct interviews with stakeholders. The list of interviewees will be determined during the inception phase, but the preliminary list of organisations includes Ministry of Labour, Ministry of Social Affairs, National Social Security Fund, organizations of People with Disabilities engaged through the program, UNICEF, RCO, ILO, WFP, UNDP, UNWOMEN, World Bank, and EU.

e) Preliminary finding presentation

24. Upon completion of data collection, the evaluator will provide a briefing of preliminary findings to the Joint Evaluation Management Group and programme officers of the programme.

f) Final Report

25. The final report will follow the format below and be in a range of **35-45 pages** in length, excluding the annexes:
    1. Title page
    2. Table of Contents, including List of Appendices, Tables
    3. List of Acronyms or Abbreviations
    4. Executive Summary with key findings, conclusions, and recommendations
    5. Background and Programme Description
    6. Purpose of Evaluation
    7. Evaluation Methodology and Evaluation Questions
    8. Key evaluation findings (organized by evaluation criteria)
    9. A table presenting the key results (i.e. figures and qualitative results) achieved per objective (expected and unexpected)
    10. Clearly identified conclusions and recommendations (identifying which stakeholders are responsible and the time and resource implications of the recommendations)
    11. Lessons Learned
    12. Good practices
    13. Annexes (list of interviews, TORs, list of documents consulted, good practices and lessons learned in prescribed template, etc.)

26. The quality of the report will be assessed against UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports[3] as well as the evaluation guidelines of participating UN organizations (e.g. ILO[4]). The deliverables will be submitted in the English language.

X.   Evaluation Timeframe

27. The evaluation is to commence in July 2022 and complete in September 2022. The following table describes the timeline. Number of working days refer to level of efforts and do not necessarily accord with actual days.

Responsible person	Tasks	Number of Working days	Indicative Date
Evaluator & Evaluation Manager	Kick-off meeting	0.5	6th June 2022
Evaluator	Desk review of documents related with programme; drafting inception report	8	
Evaluator	Submitting inception report		By 20th June
Evaluation Manager	Review of inception report		By 1st July
Evaluator with the logistical support of programme staffs	Interviews	7	4th – 22nd July
Evaluator	Data analysis & drafting report	5	
Evaluator	Presentation of preliminary findings	1	29th July
Evaluator	Drafting report	7	
Evaluator	Submission of the report to the evaluation manager		By 8th August
Evaluation manager	Circulating the draft report to key stakeholders		
Evaluation manager	Send consolidated comments to evaluator		By 19th August
Evaluator	Revising draft final report	0.5	By 25th August
Evaluation Manager	Review of Second Draft		By 2nd September
Evaluator	Integration of comments and finalization of the report	1	By 8th September
Evaluation Manager	Approval of the final report		By 15th September

28. Total estimated working days of consultant: 30 Days

XI.   Implications of the COVID crisis on the evaluation

29. The current COVID-19 pandemic restricts the mobility of staff and consultants. The evaluator will conduct this evaluation remotely relying on online methods such online surveys, telephone or online interviews, whereas for some country components it will be feasible to use a hybrid face to face/remote approach for collecting data.

---

[3] http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/607
[4] http://www.ilo.ch/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm

The Joint Evaluation Management Group may propose alternative methodologies to address the data collection that will be reflected in the inception phase of the evaluation developed by the evaluation team. These will be discussed and require detail development in the Inception report and then must be approved from the evaluation manager.

XII.   Deliverable

30. The main outputs of the evaluation consist of the following:
    - Deliverable 1: Inception Report, including data collection tools
    - Deliverable 2: PowerPoint Presentation on preliminary findings
    - Deliverable 3: Draft evaluation report
    - Deliverable 4: Final evaluation report with separate template for executive summary and templates for lessons learned and good practices duly filled in

XIII.   Payment Term

   i.   10 per cent of the total fee against deliverable 1 above approved by the evaluation manager
   ii. 30 per cent of the total fee against deliverable 2 and 3 above
   iii. 60 per cent of the total fee against deliverable 4 above approved by the Joint Evaluation Management Group.

XIV.   Management Arrangement

31. The Joint Evaluation Management Group, chaired by the Office of the Resident Coordinator, will be responsible for the evaluation. The Group is supported by the evaluation manager as the administrative focal point. The evaluator will communicate with the Evaluation Manager to discuss any technical and methodological matters. The participating UN organizations will provide administrative and logistical support during the data collection.

32. The External Evaluator is responsible for conducting the evaluation according to the terms of reference (ToR). He/she will:
    - Review the ToR and provide input, propose any refinements to assessment questions, as necessary, during the inception phase
    - Review programme background materials (e.g. programme document, progress reports).
    - Prepare an inception report
    - Develop and implement the evaluation methodology (i.e. conduct interviews, review documents) to answer the evaluation questions;
    - Conduct primary data collection and collect information
    - Present preliminary findings
    - Prepare an initial draft of the evaluation report
    - Prepare the final report based on the participating UN organizations and stakeholders' feedback obtained on the draft report.

33. The Evaluation Manager is responsible for:
    - Drafting the ToR
    - Preparing a short list of candidates in coordination with the Joint Evaluation Management Group
    - Hiring the consultant
    - Providing the consultant with the programme background materials in coordination with participating UN organizations
    - Participating in preparatory consultations (briefing)

- Assisting in the implementation of the assessment methodology, as appropriate (i.e., participate in meetings, review documents)
- Reviewing the inception report, initial draft report, circulating it for comments and providing consolidated feedback to the External Evaluator (for the inception report and the final report)
- Reviewing the final draft of the report, and executive summary
- Disseminating the final report to all the stakeholders
- Coordinating follow-up as necessary

34. The Joint Evaluation Management Group consists of evaluation officers from participating UN organizations with technical capacity to assess the performance of the evaluator. The Group will:
    - Provide support to the planning of the evaluation
    - Finalize ToR
    - Select the evaluation consultant
    - Review and approve the draft and final evaluation report
    - Disseminate the report as appropriate
    - Ensure the impartiality and independence of the external evaluator

35. The Programme Officers involved in the joint programme are responsible for:
    - Reviewing the draft TOR and providing input, as necessary
    - Providing programme background materials, including studies, analytical papers, reports, tools, publications produced, and any relevant background notes
    - Providing a list of stakeholders
    - Participating in the preparatory briefing prior to the primary data collection
    - Scheduling all meetings and interviews for the primary data collection
    - Ensuring necessary logistical arrangements for the primary data collection
    - Reviewing and providing comments on the initial draft report
    - Participating in the debriefing on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations
    - Providing translation for any required documents: ToR, PPP, final report, etc.
    - Making sure appropriate follow-up action is taken

XV.   Legal and Ethical Matters
- This evaluation will comply with UNEG Norms and Standards.
- The ToRs is accompanied by the code of conduct for carrying out the evaluation "Code of conduct for evaluation in the ILO"[5]. The selected consultant will sign the Code of Conduct form along with the contract.
- UNEG ethical guidelines will be followed throughout the evaluation.
- The external evaluator shall not have any links to programme management or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of the evaluation.

XVI.   Qualification
36. The evaluator is expected to have following qualifications,
    - Proven experience in the evaluation of development interventions
    - Expertise in social protection. Prior experience in the region, particularly in Lebanon, is asset.
    - High professional standards and principles of integrity in accordance with United Nations Evaluation Group Norms and Standards.
    - An advanced degree in a relevant field.
    - Proven expertise on evaluation methods.
    - Full command of English. Command of Arabic is an advantage.

---

[5] https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_649148.pdf

- The consultant should not have any links to programme management or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of the evaluation.
- Previous experience in evaluations for UN agencies, particularly joint evaluations, is preferred.

Annex: Theory of Change

An integrated inclusive **Social Protection System**

Political will   *Financial resources*

Social protection **coverage** is improved | **Quality** of SP programmes is improved | SP **policy** developed for implementation

Good social service delivery   *Funding*

Commitment to reach poor

Strengthened SDCs   *Adequate human resources*   *Political and public will*

Poverty data available

Provision of integrated social assistance to non-Lebanese | **Expansion** of programmes through regular enrolment | Evidence-based dialogue of introducing **cash** | Coverage of **categories** according to vulnerability | **Accountability systems** enhanced for programme delivery | Beneficiaries effectively **linked with social services** | **Programmes** strengthened | **Human resource capacity built** for effective policy and programme delivery | **SP Framework and action plan** developed with institutional mechanisms for implementation | **Resources mobilized** for institutionalized delivery of social protection

Commitment from sectors

Capacity at local level   *Positive evidence available and used*

Data available

PUNOs positive technical relationship and capacity

12