

## Terms of Reference (ToR)

### For the Evaluation of DG ECHO Disaster Preparedness projects in Lebanon (BETTER and PPP projects)

#### Contact Person:

GRC Lebanon Delegation  <i>Cecilia Trevisan</i> <a href="mailto:Cecilia.trevisan@drk.de">Cecilia.trevisan@drk.de</a>	Lebanese Red Cross  Disaster Risk Reduction- DRR  <i>Kassem Chaalan</i> <a href="mailto:Kassem.chaalan@redcross.org.lb">Kassem.chaalan@redcross.org.lb</a>
---	---

Section	Content
<b>Background</b>	<p>All communities, regardless of their characteristics, are susceptible to various emergencies and disasters, encompassing infectious disease outbreaks, conflicts, natural calamities, technological hazards, and more. Additionally, recent humanitarian efforts have revealed deficiencies within the national and local disaster risk management (DRM) framework in Lebanon, which have impeded timely, effective, and relevant responses, ultimately compromising the quality of services provided to crisis-affected individuals. As a response to these challenges, the LRC has implemented from 2021 till April 2022 in partnership with the German Red Cross the BETTER project (Building-on Existing Techniques to Enhance Resilience).</p> <p>The project was designed to offer support to local and national responders through a "systems" approach aimed at enhancing resilience. Specifically, this approach seeks to enhance in-country preparedness and response capacity within existing government and community DRM structures. The project incorporates innovative digital solutions to streamline data collection and analysis, facilitate risk-informed decision-making, and improve anticipation and response management. The project places significant emphasis on enhancing the effectiveness and accountability of nationally-led humanitarian responses across all levels by addressing specific weaknesses identified within the existing systems. These weaknesses primarily pertain to coordination, information management, and the interconnectedness of various structures.</p> <p>In May 2022, the LRC initiated the implementation of the ECHO-PPP project under the disaster risk management pillar, as an extension to the above-mentioned project. This project was built on the achievements and learnings of the BETTER project and included additional geographical coverage. The project targeted community emergency response teams in 12 communities to enhance their readiness to prepare for and respond to crises. Additionally, emergency operation rooms in Beirut Governorate, Mount Lebanon Governorate, Baalbeck Hermel Governorate, Akkar Governorate, North Governorate, Bekaa Governorate, Nabatiye Governorate, Hermel Union Kaemakam, Zgharta</p>



	<p>Kemmakam, Koura Kemmakam, Minieh Donnieh Kaemmakam, and Deir Al Ahmar Union of Municipalities were targeted and equipped with the needed materials and equipment for an efficient and timely response. These named institutions received improved support from national and international structures and responses through the implementation of enhanced coordination mechanisms, procedures, and policies.</p>
<b>Purpose and Objectives</b>	<p>The LRC is seeking consultancy services from a qualified consultant or a consultancy company capable of conducting an outcome assessment of the DRM component of both projects mentioned above (ECHO BETTER, and ECHO-PPP: Disaster Risk Management pillar) to provide an external opinion based on the identified evaluation criteria. The assessment is expected to look at all aspects of the project implementation, assess the progress made towards achieving the objectives and according to the work plan. More specifically, the consultant will look at the main challenges and successes of the program to generate lessons learnt and recommendations for the current implementation of the program (year 3).</p> <p><b>Specific Objectives:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- Assess project performance against the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development Assistance Committee Criteria OECD/DCA, specifically: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. Additionally, a criterion related to community engagement and accountability (CEA) will be included in order to collect the community's feedback and perceptions in relation to Result 5. Assess to what extent the program has achieved its intended outcomes and goals, particularly at the level of Emergency Operation Rooms (EORS) and CERTs.</li> <li>2- Evaluate programmatic potential to produce capitalization documents and needed measures to assure learning is well captured for future opportunity to scale up similar interventions.</li> <li>3- Highlight key lessons learnt, best practices and recommendations to feed back into current and future ECHO programming.</li> </ol> <p>In summary, the consultancy services aim to comprehensively evaluate the ECHO projects' performance and impact within the context of the disaster preparedness pillar. This evaluation will inform future strategies, resource allocation, and project enhancements to further contribute to community resilience and disaster preparedness. The consultancy services will also explore LRC's auxiliary role to the local authorities, and in particular the risks of working so closely with governmental structures in Lebanon via this program.</p> <p><b>Users:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lebanese Red Cross</li> <li>• German Red Cross</li> <li>• DG ECHO</li> <li>• Disaster risk management at grand sarail</li> <li>• Disaster risk management committees on the level of Governorates, districts, union of municipalities and municipalities</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation criteria</b>	<p><b>Relevance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent are the objectives of the programme valid?</li> <li>• Was the action adequately designed to respond to the needs of the direct beneficiaries and stakeholders?</li> <li>• Was the action aligned with government strategies, policies and strategy papers?</li> <li>• Were the project methodologies and activities relevant to achieve the project objectives?</li> </ul>



	<p><b>Coherence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent were policies of different concerned actors in the intervention complementary?</li> <li>• How well is the intervention aligned with the LRC/ movement policies (e.g. IFRC DRM policy)?</li> <li>• How well does this project fit with other projects the LRC DRR team is implementing?</li> <li>• How well does this project fit with other DRM projects in the country?</li> </ul> <p><b>Effectiveness</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent were the objectives achieved?</li> <li>• What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the expected objectives?</li> </ul> <p><b>Efficiency</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well was the project managed in terms of resource allocation, utilization, and management (human, financial and other resources versus the expected objectives)?</li> <li>• How timely were the objectives achieved?</li> <li>• In what ways were the synergies capitalized on with other actors (local and international) involved in similar projects?</li> </ul> <p><b>Impact</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What evidence is there that the project contributed to the achievement of its overall objective?</li> <li>• Was the project able to monitor, mitigate and respond to any unintended negative effects?</li> </ul> <p><b>Sustainability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What evidence supports the likelihood of the project's interventions and/or results being sustained beyond the project's completion?</li> <li>• In what ways can the project's outcomes be replicated and extended, exploring possibilities for broader application or implementation?</li> </ul> <p><b>Accountability:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well were the LRC feedback and response mechanisms embedded within the EoRs?</li> <li>• How effective were the LRC feedback and response mechanisms (in terms of closing the loop, etc...)?</li> <li>• Were the communication channels used in accordance to community preferences?</li> <li>• To what extent are the CERT activities implemented contributing to community engagement and decision-making?</li> <li>• How well did LRC provide information to communities <b>about the organization, the principles it adheres to, how it expects its staff to behave, the project and what they intend to deliver?</b></li> <li>• What, if any, were the unintended impacts of the project intervention, both positive and negative?</li> <li>• How did this project account for the diverse vulnerabilities of the marginalised groups of the targeted communities?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Methodology of the research</b></p>	<p>In general, LRC wants as much transparency and participation as possible in the evaluation process. The consultant/s contribute a comprehensive perspective and substantial expertise acquired through engagement with diverse communities. This enrichment elevates the quality of work by integrating a diverse array of insights and incorporating proven best practices. Furthermore, their understanding of national trends, economic conditions, and regulatory frameworks is indispensable for aligning</p>



findings and analyses with broader national contexts. In addition, national consultants offer valuable insights into potential risks at the national level. This insight enables the integration of effective risk mitigation strategies into the project's scalability, thereby enhancing its capacity for successful expansion.

The team structure will always be discussed with the project partner beforehand. The team composition as well as the design and methodology of the evaluation are subject matters of the negotiations with the evaluator/s.

### Participation of stakeholders

- Government officials.
- Relevant LRC staff and volunteers.
- DRM Committees and EOR personnel
- CERT members.
- Community lead.
- Project beneficiaries.

### Proposed data collection methodology

The evaluation team should use the available secondary data for analysis. It is expected that primary data will be collected, through FGDs and key informant interviews for instance. The choice of methods will have to be presented and described by the evaluation team and will be approved by LRC in the kick-off meeting. The IFRC standards for evaluation<sup>1</sup> should be respected and are the framework and basis for any evaluation activity executed by a consultant under GRC contract.

GRC and LRC expect the consultant to elaborate his or her own detailed methodology based on the ToR and on the available data. Therefore, the main primary data collection method is qualitative; however, quantitative data collection can also be present to further verify and triangulate the data as needed.

In addition, the following methods serve as guidance for the preparation of the proposal, and do not constitute a fixed list of possible methods and modalities:

#### a) Desk Review

- Dissect all relatable project documentation, encompassing project proposals, reports, and monitoring data.
- Review the project's objectives, implementation approaches, and anticipated outcomes.

#### b) Data collection

##### Stakeholders interview

- Conduct interviews and consultations with stakeholders, such as government officials, relevant LRC staff and volunteers, CERT members, community leaders, and project beneficiaries.

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.ifrc.org/sites/default/files/2021-09/IFRC-Framework-for-Evaluation.pdf>



<p><b>Role of LRC and GRC</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Solicit feedback regarding the project's performance and its influence on crisis management at the governorate level.</li> </ul> <p><b>Field visits</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visit the designated project sites and operational facilities within selected governorates to assess their functionality, infrastructure, and capacity.</li> <li>Identify any challenges and gaps in the activation of operational facilities during crises using a standardized observation checklist.</li> </ul> <p><b>c) Data Compilation and Analysis</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gather, validate, review, and analyse data associated with the project's outputs and outcomes. The greater bulk will be qualitative data, to mention that there might be a quantitative data tackled based on the need.</li> <li>Evaluate the project's role in enhancing crisis management and response capabilities in the specified governorates.</li> <li>Assess the impact of CERT Teams on the disaster preparedness and response capacity of the local community.</li> </ul> <p>The evaluator team will have access to all relevant project documents like project proposal, project management documents (Log frame, activity plan, budget), monitoring tools, project reports (narrative and financial), monitoring and evaluation tools reports (Perception survey, KAP...), audits etc. These documents are confidential but can be cited and used in the evaluation process. Information which could do harm to any stakeholder if published should be treated in a confidential way. The decision about the publication is the right of the Lebanese Red Cross and the German Red Cross.</p> <p>LRC will also support the consultant for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>workstation in the office,</li> <li>transportation to project site (if needed)</li> <li>any kind of logistical or material support for meetings/workshops in case not online.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Deliverables and Schedules</b></p>	<p>The consultant is required to provide the following deliverables in English</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>A detailed inception report</b>, including a methodology breakdown, elaborated key questions and evaluation matrix, detailed work plan, data collection tools and dissemination plan. To be validated by GRC and LRC. The report must be submitted within <b>10 days</b> from the initiation of the contract.</li> <li><b>A preliminary evaluation report</b>, subject to review and feedback, is to be delivered within <b>3 weeks</b> following the completion of data collection.</li> <li><b>A final evaluation report</b>, integrating feedback and recommendations, should be submitted within <b>2 weeks</b> of the receipt of feedback on the preliminary report. It needs to include findings, lessons learnt, best practices, interpretations, and actionable recommendations. The report should adhere to a logical structure, comprising an executive summary, methodology, findings, conclusions, and recommendations.</li> <li><b>Creating two presentations</b> on the primary report findings and the final report to be delivered to LRC/GRC and other stakeholders. The presentation will be also used during the final workshop during the year 3 implementation of ECHO PPP.</li> </ol>



	<p>The consultant is required to provide the following deliverables in English</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Executive summary of the final report</li> <li>Presentation of the final report</li> </ol> <p>The maximum number of pages of the final report without annexes must be 50 pages.</p>
<b>Reporting Requirements</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The consultant will be accountable to the Disaster Risk Reduction Director or the designated focal person. Consistent progress updates and periodic meetings with LRC and GRC focal point will be mandatory during the course of the evaluation process.</li> <li>An inception report, which clarifies the consultant's approach, methodology, and work plan.</li> <li>A preliminary evaluation report for the purpose of review and imploring feedback.</li> <li>A conclusive evaluation report, which integrates feedback and recommendations, in addition to any requisite annexes or supplementary documentation.</li> </ol>
<b>Profile Requirements</b>	<p>The consultant or the consultancy company is expected to possess the following qualifications and experience:</p> <p><b><u>Required</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expert in Disaster Risk Reduction, and in the nature of work of the RCRC.</li> <li>Demonstrated experience of 5 years in conducting evaluations of community development or disaster preparedness management projects.</li> <li>Understanding of DRR / DRM related issues, governance and key stakeholders.</li> <li>Exceptional analytical and report writing skills.</li> <li>Proven experience in conducting evaluations and in using a mix of evaluations tools and in applying a variety of mixed-methods evaluation approaches.</li> <li>Proven experience of at least 3 years in external evaluation, including ECHO or other international funded projects.</li> <li>Knowledge of best practices in community-based disaster preparedness and response.</li> <li>Fluent English oral and written Arabic is required for the national consultant.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Preferred</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Experience in Inter-agency coordination is an asset.</li> <li>Demonstrable experience in monitoring and evaluation is an asset.</li> <li>Experience in DRR/humanitarian/development sector is an asset.</li> <li>Familiarity with the Lebanese context is an asset.</li> </ul> <p><b>Requirements on the submission of the bid</b></p> <p>Interested consultants or consulting firms are encouraged to submit their proposals by 10<sup>th</sup> of June 2024. Proposals must encompass a comprehensive CV/Company/consultant team profile, organisation of team for this assignment and key experience related to assignment, two samples of evaluation reports developed previously, a technical proposal outlining the proposed approach, <b>methodology, workplan (including timeframe, milestones and deliverables)</b> and a financial proposal featuring a detailed cost breakdown.</p> <p>Selection will be contingent on competitive pricing that aligns with the specifications outlined in the call. The evaluation criteria will comprise 20% for financial considerations and 80% for professional experience and qualifications.</p>

	<table><tr><th>Component</th><th>Score</th><th></th></tr><tr><td>Work samples</td><td>30%</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Methodology, work plan and approach to the evaluation.</td><td>30%</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Financial and budget proposal</td><td>30%</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Presentation</td><td>10%</td><td></td></tr></table>	Component	Score		Work samples	30%		Methodology, work plan and approach to the evaluation.	30%		Financial and budget proposal	30%		Presentation	10%						
Component	Score																				
Work samples	30%																				
Methodology, work plan and approach to the evaluation.	30%																				
Financial and budget proposal	30%																				
Presentation	10%																				
Evaluation timeline	<p>The evaluation process has different phases and is described in the following paragraphs. The process will be guided by the contracting parties. The timetable will be agreed by both parties. The consultant should deliver a concept for the evaluation process in form of the inception report. Reporting will consist of a preliminary report, which will serve as basis for an evaluation workshop and the final report, which will be the product to be delivered, including the validated workshop results. The consultant will be expected to meet weekly with the relevant LRC and GRC evaluation focal persons to provide updates on the timeframe online or in person.</p> <table><tr><th>Task</th><th>35 Days</th></tr><tr><td>Conduct introductory meeting with the evaluation team selected</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>Review and analyze relevant available documentation</td><td>3</td></tr><tr><td>Develop the inception report</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td>Hold the evaluation Kick-off meeting</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>Conduct the data collection</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td>Analyze the data collected based on the criteria chosen and the research questions</td><td>9</td></tr><tr><td>Draft the final evaluation report</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td>Gather all relevant stakeholders' comments and insights during a validation workshop</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>Finalize the Final report</td><td>5</td></tr></table>	Task	35 Days	Conduct introductory meeting with the evaluation team selected	1	Review and analyze relevant available documentation	3	Develop the inception report	5	Hold the evaluation Kick-off meeting	1	Conduct the data collection	5	Analyze the data collected based on the criteria chosen and the research questions	9	Draft the final evaluation report	5	Gather all relevant stakeholders' comments and insights during a validation workshop	1	Finalize the Final report	5
Task	35 Days																				
Conduct introductory meeting with the evaluation team selected	1																				
Review and analyze relevant available documentation	3																				
Develop the inception report	5																				
Hold the evaluation Kick-off meeting	1																				
Conduct the data collection	5																				
Analyze the data collected based on the criteria chosen and the research questions	9																				
Draft the final evaluation report	5																				
Gather all relevant stakeholders' comments and insights during a validation workshop	1																				
Finalize the Final report	5																				
Evaluation quality and ethical standards	<p>The evaluator/s should take all reasonable steps to ensure that the evaluation is designed and conducted to respect and protect the rights and welfare of people and the communities of which they are members, and to ensure that the evaluation is technically accurate, reliable, and legitimate, conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and contributes to organizational learning and accountability. Therefore, the evaluator/s should adhere to the evaluation standards of the IFRC.</p>																				