



## **NMAS 14.10**

### **Evaluation of Mine Action Interventions**

**March 2020**

**Edition 2.1**

**Lebanon Mine Action Center-LMAC**

Chekri Ghanem Casern–Fayadieh

Tel: +961 5 956143, Fax: +961 5 956192

Email: [info@lebmac.org](mailto:info@lebmac.org)

Website: <http://www.lebmac.org/>

### **Warning**

This document has been released on the date shown on the cover page. The National Mine Action Standards (NMAS) of Lebanon are subject to regular review and update, so users are advised to consult the most recent version. To ensure that you have access to the current version, contact the Lebanon Mine Action Center (LMAC) through the [www.lebmac.org](http://www.lebmac.org) website or by sending an email to [info@lebmac.org](mailto:info@lebmac.org).

### **Copyright Notice**

This is a national document generated and owned by Lebanon. It must not be copied or altered without the written consent of the LMAC.

Tel: +961 5 956143,

Fax: +961 5 956192

Email: [info@lebmac.org](mailto:info@lebmac.org)

The LMAC gratefully acknowledges UNDP support during the preparation of this NMAS.

© LMAC 2020 – All Rights Reserved.

## Table of Contents

Foreword.....	iv
Acronyms .....	v
Introduction .....	vi
1. Scope.....	1
2. References .....	1
3. Key Terms and Definitions .....	1
4. Evaluation - General.....	2
5. Purpose and General Principles of Evaluations .....	2
6. Comparison between Monitoring and Evaluation.....	3
7. Evaluation Criteria.....	4
7.1 Criteria .....	4
7.2 Evaluations in Complex Emergencies .....	5
8. Types of Evaluation .....	5
8.1 General .....	5
8.2 Formative Evaluations .....	5
8.3 Performance Assessments.....	5
8.4 Outcome Evaluations.....	6
8.5 Impact Evaluations .....	6
9. Implementing Evaluations .....	6
9.1 Engaging Evaluators.....	6
9.2 Preparation of the Work-Plan .....	6
9.3 Conducting Evaluations .....	7
9.4 Reporting, Dissemination, and Follow-Up.....	7
10. Roles and Responsibilities.....	8
10.1 Role of the LMAC.....	8
10.2 Role of the Implementing Agencies (IAs) .....	8
10.3 Donors .....	9
ANNEX A: Normative and Informative References.....	10
ANNEX B: Evaluation Terms of Reference .....	11
NMAS 14.10, Edition 2.1: Amendment Record.....	12

## Foreword

The National Mine Action Standards (NMAS) of Lebanon were first developed in the form of Technical Standards and Guidelines (TSG). After the Lebanon Mine Action Policy was released in 2007, these TSG were edited into the first edition of the NMAS in 2010 and were written to concurrently comply with the first edition of the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS). Since then, the scope of the IMAS has been expanded to include more components of mine action and amended to mirror the most recent changes to standards as required in today's operations. These changes, as well as changes in the local context of Lebanon, have necessitated a review and update of the NMAS.

As detailed in the National Mine Action Policy of 2007, the Lebanon Mine Action Center (LMAC) has the responsibility to execute and coordinate the Lebanon Mine Action Program (LMAP) on behalf of the Lebanon Mine Action Authority (LMAA), including the development and amendment of standards. Such standards shall be developed in a participatory approach that shall involve international, governmental, and nongovernmental organizations.

The NMAS shall be reviewed as needed to reflect amendments in the IMAS as well as incorporate changes to international obligations and local requirements. Such revisions shall be regularly made available on the LMAC's website [www.lebmac.org](http://www.lebmac.org) or can be obtained through contacting the LMAC via the email [info@lebmac.org](mailto:info@lebmac.org).

## Acronyms

ERW	Explosive Remnants of War
GoL	Government of Lebanon
HMA	Humanitarian Mine Action
IAs	Implementing Agencies
IMAS	International Mine Action Standards
LMAA	Lebanon Mine Action Authority
LMAC	Lebanon Mine Action Center
LMAP	Lebanon Mine Action Program
NMAS	National Mine Action Standards
PAE	Performance Assessments Evaluation
PCM	Project Cycle Management
QA	Quality Assurance
QC	Quality Control
RBM	Results-Based Management
ToR	Terms of Reference
TSG	Technical Standards and Guidelines

## Introduction

The Government of Lebanon (GoL) has a duty to ensure the safety and security of the people in Lebanon. In response to the suffering and damage caused by mines and Explosive Remnants of War (ERW), the GoL does all that it can to provide humanitarian, economic, social, and environmental support that reduces the impact of mines/ERW on individuals and the community.

To further this goal, the GoL assigned responsibility for managing and overseeing the Lebanon Mine Action Program (LMAP) to the Lebanon Mine Action Authority (LMAA), chaired by the Minister of Defense. In 2007, the GoL published a National Mine Action Policy, outlining the structure, roles, and responsibilities within the LMAP. This Policy made the Lebanon Mine Action Center (LMAC) the body responsible for executing and coordinating the LMAP on behalf of the LMAA. It also assigned to the LMAC the responsibility for managing, coordinating, and facilitating mine action interventions implemented within the framework of Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA) to ensure that all interventions are aligned with the National Mine Action Strategy.

The LMAC is empowered to monitor, follow-up, and evaluate all HMA interventions by implementing agencies (IAs). Objective and independent evaluations add value to mine action activities by assessing relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. They provide a knowledge base on which to base the Quality Management cycle of continual assessment, revision and responsive change in pursuit of excellence.

Recognizing that evaluation is a core stage in both the Project Cycle Management (PCM) and in Quality Management, this NMAS sets out clear standards for the systematic evaluation of mine action programs, projects, and activities.

## Evaluation of Mine Action interventions

### 1. Scope

This NMAS describes the framework that shall be used for evaluating mine action programs, projects, and activities in Lebanon. Evaluations help to ensure objective accountability in pursuit of the highest levels of professionalism. Evaluations shall be evidence based and use a quantitative and qualitative results-based management (RBM) approach that values the impact of work done as well as numbers achieved. Evaluations should also assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability of interventions.

This NMAS also describes the requirements for reporting the results of evaluations and sharing such results in order to maximize benefits from the lessons learnt in a Quality Management cycle seeking continuous improvement.

### 2. References

A list of normative and informative references is provided in Annex A.

Normative references provide cross-referencing to other standards referred to in this standard and which form an integral part of the provisions of this standard.

Informative references provide a list of documents that may be consulted for a clearer understanding of this standard.

### 3. Key Terms and Definitions

The following terms and definitions are used in this NMAS:

- *Evaluation*: the assessment of the value and outcomes achieved by a mine action program, project, or intervention in terms of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact.
- *Monitoring*: the continuous tracking of progress achieved by a program, project, or intervention towards the established mine action objective(s) or targets by comparing advancement against context sensitive pre-set milestones or indicators.
- *Outcome*: refers to the changes that the interventions seek to make in the surrounding environment when dealing with a mine action related problem or challenge.
- *Output*: refers to the results achieved by a mine action intervention.
- *Results Based Management*: a tool that supports tracking progress and demonstrating impact. It extends the traditional focus on inputs and outputs by focusing on measuring outcomes and impacts.
- *Triangulation*: the comparison of findings from different types of analysis, methods of data collection, or varied sources of information.

In addition to the above terms, NMAS 04.10 provides a glossary of terms and definitions used across all standards.

As in the IMAS, the terms 'shall', 'should' and 'may' are used across all standards to indicate the required degree of compliance. For any organization working in Lebanon, the use of 'shall' indicates a compulsory requirement. The term 'should' indicates the national preference which may be varied with LMAC approval. The term 'may' indicates a suggestion that is not obligatory.

#### **4. Evaluation - General**

Evaluation of mine action interventions refers to a process by which a systematic and objective assessment is made of the relevance and significance of a particular project, program, or action, in terms of its level of achievement of objectives, efficiency, and effectiveness. Evaluations should consider the activities, outputs, and outcomes of mine action interventions in relation to the working context and be results-based. The results focused upon include, most importantly, improvements to the livelihood and well-being of individuals and communities adversely effected by the presence of explosive hazards. The results of these assessments should provide an evidence based guide to the iterative refinement of mine action interventions to more efficiently prioritize the achievement of the desired ends.

At all times, evaluations shall be conducted with an understanding, honesty and objectivity that focuses on providing recommendations and documenting lessons learned to enable a process of continuous improvement within HMA in Lebanon. To this end, evaluations should examine every stage of the project cycle from design through post-implementation, to allow best practices to be identified, ultimately guiding and informing the planning and implementation of future interventions. Importantly, all evaluations should involve both quantitative and qualitative data gathering, considering more than facts and figures, or the attainment of quantitative targets. The true value of evaluations lies in the recognition of critical underlying issues and factors affecting decisions, results, and outcomes so that projects that have not achieved their original goals because of unforeseen changes outside of their control are still fairly evaluated in terms of what they have achieved in support of the National Mine Action Strategy.

Evaluations may be formative, occurring at set milestones during the project/program lifetime, or summative, occurring following the completion of particular interventions.

#### **5. Purpose and General Principles of Evaluations**

Evaluations are conducted in order to provide evidence that can be used to improve the performance of current or future interventions for the benefit of the IA being assessed and the wider community including the LMAC, the GoL, and donors. In the process, evaluations



assess the impact of projects in terms of enhanced capacity of target populations and communities.

Irrespective of the type of evaluation adopted, the following general principles should apply:

- planned evaluations should be included in the overall project cycle;
- evaluations should provide unbiased insight into the project activities and their relationships to the set objectives;
- evaluations should be conducted using a participatory approach, highlight lessons learned, and provide recommendations for future actions; and
- evaluation results should be shared with all key stakeholders.

## **6. Comparison between Monitoring and Evaluation**

Ideally, monitoring should precede evaluations and the results of monitoring should then be included in the evaluation. Monitoring is the continuous or periodic surveillance of the implementation of a project against preset indicators. In most HMA projects some monitoring is conducted internally by the IA's staff and externally by the LMAC QA/QC capacity. QA/QC monitoring provides a measure of the physical progress of the project and ensures that it is conducted in the manner authorized by the LMAC. Ideally, this should also involve monitoring the project's impact and developments in the project's working environment(s).

Effective internal monitoring provides project/program managers with both qualitative and quantitative data throughout the implementation process. This data should be assembled and retained in a clear format by the IA for use by evaluators. Evaluations are independent assessments of the IA's achievement of projected deliverables and the impact, relevance, and sustainability of those deliverables, so shall be undertaken by disinterested external evaluators.

The quality of evaluations is reinforced by data gathered during monitoring activities. Internal IA QA/QC and impact monitoring should take place throughout a project/program and focus on assessing:

- progress made by the interventions towards achieving the set objectives;
- the interventions' compliance with the standards of quality and safety;
- the cyclic and intermittent changes in the environment where the intervention is being implemented; and
- any changes in the wellbeing of the intended beneficiaries, or others.

## 7. Evaluation Criteria

### 7.1 Criteria

Evaluations assess the achievement of objectives and targets in the short-term, mid-term, and long-term. They assess by criteria, including safety, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, quality, impact, and sustainability.

- **Safety:** an assessment of the extent to which the work has been conducted with appropriate identification and management of risks to the public, staff, and the environment.
- **Relevance:** the assessment of the extent to which the program, project, or intervention accurately answered the identified need(s) of its intended beneficiaries.
- **Efficiency:** the assessment of the value the program, project, or intervention achieved as compared to the investment made. It focuses on measuring the optimization of costs as they are transformed from inputs to outputs and outcomes.
- **Effectiveness:** the assessment of the extent to which implemented activities contributed to achieving the desired mine action objectives and outcomes.
- **Impact:** impact may be positive, neutral or negative and refers to intended and unintended long-term effects that the program, project, or interventions have had or are likely to have.
- **Quality:** Quality is assessed in terms of the thoroughness of post Land Release survey and any accidents or incidents involving explosive hazards that occur on land after its release.
- **Sustainability:** the assessment of the probability that the results and outcomes achieved by the program, project, or intervention would continue to exist after the intervention has ended and funding has stopped.

Of the criteria above, safety, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and quality are usually the easiest to assess. The determination of the long-term impact and sustainability of a project or program will be a projected, and so ultimately speculative, assessment unless the evaluation is carried out sometime after the intervention has been completed. Although speculative, when well informed by a body of evidence, projected assessments can be of high value.

Other common criteria that may be included for a mine action evaluation include the satisfaction levels expressed by the beneficiary or impacted community, the intervention's repeatability (the possibility of repeating the intervention in a different environment), and its scalability (the possibility of scaling up the intervention)

## 7.2 Evaluations in Complex Emergencies

In complex emergency contexts that may arise in Lebanon, evaluations need to address a broader range of factors to account for the urgency and increased need for mine action activities. During complex emergencies, resources may become more limited and it is usually more difficult to plan effectively in a changing context. In such cases, evaluators may consider the following additional criteria:

- *Coherence and coordination*: the suitability of coordination efforts between different actors and the complementary nature of actions implemented;
- *Coverage*: the suitability of the area covered in the response;
- *Protection/security*: the suitability of measures taken within the available context to ensure adequate levels of security for IA staff and at-risk communities; and
- *Timeliness*: the time it took for mine action to be initiated and the appropriateness of the response time.

## 8. Types of Evaluation

### 8.1 General

Evaluations vary depending on their timing in relation to the project cycle and coverage. They may be conducted during project implementation or after the project has been completed. Evaluations may cover discrete aspects of the project or the whole project. Accordingly, four different types of evaluations may be conducted in Lebanon. These are: formative evaluations, performance assessments, outcome evaluations, and impact evaluations.

### 8.2 Formative Evaluations

Formative evaluations are generally conducted during project/program implementation, and are intended to improve performance by offering feedback about the different components, such as which inputs are likely to achieve their intended goals, and which may benefit from being changed or adapted.

### 8.3 Performance Assessments

Performance Assessment Evaluations (PAEs) are intended to determine whether HMA projects or programs have succeeded in achieving the pre-set objectives and whether outputs have reached their intended beneficiaries. PAEs are generally conducted following the end of an intervention and focus on measuring the intervention's safety, efficiency, effectiveness, and quality without measuring whether or not intended beneficiaries make use of the intervention's outputs.

## **8.4 Outcome Evaluations**

Outcome evaluations are intended to evaluate the intervention as a whole, from need identification, to design, to implementation, and through achieving results/outcomes. Outcome evaluations generally consider the extent to which the HMA has affected an overall positive change in the target area and the extent to which intended beneficiaries (women, men, children, and the community at large) are making use of the intervention's outputs for their socio-economic benefit. They may also measure the intervention's sustainability.

## **8.5 Impact Evaluations**

Impact evaluations assess the long-term consequences of HMA interventions, considering both positive and negative consequences, as well as intended and unintended consequences. Impact evaluations consider non-project, external influences, such as political or social conditions which may have impacted the intervention. They also assess what may happen in the future as well as what would have happened without the HMA intervention. As such, they are often more difficult and complex to conduct than PAEs or formative evaluations.

## **9. Implementing Evaluations**

Evaluations should be launched with Terms of Reference (ToR) designed to set the purpose and scope of the evaluation and to find/attract suitably experienced/qualified evaluators. A guide to drafting a suitable ToR is provided in Annex B.

### **9.1 Engaging Evaluators**

All members of the evaluation team should be transparently selected by the commissioning body, and shall be adequately experienced/qualified to conduct the evaluation. Relationships between the evaluation team and the commissioning bodies shall be based on trust, openness and mutual respect.

Ideally, the evaluation team leader should have experience working in the Lebanese context or a similar context, significant experience in HMA, and previous experience in HMA project management and/or conducting evaluations. Evaluation teams should be selected in a gender neutral process.

### **9.2 Preparation of the Work-Plan**

The evaluation team should be given adequate time to prepare a work-plan before the start of the actual evaluation and that work-plan should be approved by the commissioning body. The work-plan should identify all key stakeholders to be involved in the evaluation.

Any adjustments to the ToR shall be proposed by the evaluation team to the LMAC and the commissioning body, who should (following detailed discussion and thorough consideration), approve or reject the proposed changes in writing to the evaluation team.

### **9.3 Conducting Evaluations**

Evaluations shall be implemented in an unbiased manner, ensuring gender and cultural sensitivity, as well as ethical, professional, and confidential conduct. They should efficiently gather all available base data and give due consideration to available resources or constraints. The evaluators' conduct should ensure integrity, accuracy, independence and impartiality.

Evaluation findings shall be well documented and based on transparent methods that provide valid and reliable data that is sex and age disaggregated whenever appropriate. Key findings should be validated through triangulation whenever practicable.

Unless explicitly required, evaluations should not evaluate individuals, except in the case that an individual assessment is critical to understanding the success or failure of a project/intervention.

### **9.4 Reporting, Dissemination, and Follow-Up**

Evaluation reports should present findings, conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations in a well-structured and easily understandable format.

The report should include an executive summary and allow the reader to garner:

- the purpose and scope of the evaluation;
- the methodology adopted to collect and analyze data;
- the evaluation criteria measured;
- the main findings and conclusions arrived at;
- key lessons learnt; and
- key recommendations to be considered in future interventions.

Further explanatory information should be provided in annexes, which should include:

- a copy of data collection instruments (surveys, checklists, etc.);
- a list of interviews and any focus group meetings conducted; and
- other detailed information which may support the evaluation findings.

When finished, evaluation reports should be disseminated to all relevant stakeholders. They should be made available by the LMAC and, where possible, to the beneficiaries and the broader mine action community. In cases where it is not possible to share the report, due to reasons of confidentiality for example, the LMAC should still make efforts to communicate

key information, including main findings and recommendations to as many stakeholders as possible.

Having received the evaluation report, the LMAC, the commissioning body if not the LMAC, and stakeholders concerned should respond to the recommendations provided by the evaluation report in an appropriate manner. This may be by producing an action plan outlining a required IA management response. Any action plan should be approved by the headquarters of the commissioning body as well as the LMAC, and its requirements should then be systematically implemented. The commissioning body should report periodically to the LMAC about the attainment of the recommendations outlined in the evaluation and the action plan.

## **10. Roles and Responsibilities**

### **10.1 Role of the LMAC**

The LMAC shall:

- actively encourage the appropriate systematic evaluation of HMA interventions in Lebanon;
- make provisions for the evaluation of its own activities as part of the LMAP;
- make provisions to ensure that action is taken on the findings of evaluations, when appropriate;
- facilitate and encourage the exchange of information between members of the mine action community in Lebanon by distributing the findings of evaluation reports and lessons learned to relevant stakeholders, such as the GoL and donors whenever practicable; and
- ensure that no breach of confidentiality occurs.

### **10.2 Role of the Implementing Agencies (IAs)**

IAs shall:


- make provisions for the regular evaluation of HMA interventions, including both independent and internal evaluations,
- make all necessary resources available to external evaluators;
- ensure that all relevant stakeholders are involved in the evaluation process;
- encourage community participation in evaluations, as an educational process for building the capacity of the mine affected communities and IA staff;
- ensure that external evaluators are fully briefed and supported prior to and during evaluations;
- coordinate with the LMAC on the ToR of the evaluation team; and

- ensure that the results of an external evaluation are considered and an adequate action plan drafted.

### **10.3 Donors**

When relevant, donors should:

- make provisions in project/program planning for the conduct of independent evaluation, including financial provisions and adequate timing;
- support the independent evaluation of projects that they have funded; and
- consider the conclusions and recommendations of evaluations when considering future funding of HMA interventions.

	LEBANON NATIONAL MINE ACTION STANDARDS		Edition 2.1	NMAS 14.10
	<b>ANNEX A: Normative and Informative References</b>			
				March 2020


The documents listed below constitute normative references which form an integral part of the provisions of this standard.

- NMAS 05.10 Information Management;
- NMAS 07.12 Quality Management;
- NMAS 07.14 Risk Management; and
- NMAS 04.10 Glossary of Mine Action Terms, Definitions, and Abbreviations used in the Second Edition of the NMAS.

In addition to the normative references listed above, the following informative reference may be consulted:

- IMAS 14.10 Guide for the Evaluation of Mine Action Interventions.



	<b>NATIONAL MINE ACTION STANDARDS</b>		<b>Edition 2.1</b>	<b>NMAS 14.10</b>
	<b>ANNEX B: Evaluation Terms of Reference</b>			
<b>March 2020</b>				

An example of a guide for writing an external evaluation ToR is given below.

<b>1. GENERAL INFORMATION</b>
<b>Project Name</b> :
<b>Duration</b> : <b>From:</b> <b>To:</b>
<b>Location</b> :
<b>2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT</b>
Provide background information and a description of the context where the evaluation is to take place as well as a brief history of the intervention to be evaluated.
<b>3. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION</b>
Stipulate the type of evaluation to be conducted, the reason behind the commissioning of the evaluation, the key aims of the evaluation, and how the results will be used.
<b>4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION</b>
Expand on the purpose, providing further information on what the evaluation will cover and detailing the underlying questions that the evaluation seeks to answer. Such questions should cover the evaluation criteria mentioned in NMAS 14.10.
<b>5. METHODOLOGY TO BE ADOPTED</b>
The methodology to be adopted will depend upon a number of factors, including the type of evaluation being conducted, the purpose, and the scope. The methodology should ensure that data is acquired from multiple sources to increase accuracy, validity, and reliability. Efforts should be made to ensure that the methodology gathers information from all stakeholders.
<b>6. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS AND LANGUAGE</b>
Reporting requirements should be specified, including the language of the report to be submitted.
<b>7. MISSION DURATION</b>
The overall duration of the evaluation mission should be given, including the time required for producing the report, obtaining feedback on the report, and submitting the final version.
<b>8. REMUNERATION</b>
The terms of reference may set the remuneration or may require interested evaluators to submit an indicative cost.
<b>9. QUALIFICATIONS</b>
The terms of reference should clearly outline the relevant experience and/or qualifications required of the evaluation team.

## NMAS 14.10, Edition 2.1: Amendment Record

The NMAS are subject to a comprehensive or partial review by the Review Board periodically. Changes in the context as well as safety requirements and efficiency considerations may necessitate amendments to individual NMAS standards more frequently. If this occurs, such amendments shall be given a number, dated, and detailed in the table below. The amendment should also be indicated on the header under the NMAS edition number.

Whenever the formal review of the NMAS is completed, a new edition shall be issued. Amendments that have taken place before the review date shall be incorporated in the new edition and the amendment record table cleared. Consequently, the recording of amendments shall start again until the next review.

The most recent revisions of the NMAS shall be posted on the Lebanon Mine Action Center (LMAC) website on [www.lebmac.org](http://www.lebmac.org).

<b>Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Amendment Details</b>
1	March 2020	Minor revisions throughout.