

UNICEF Madagascar is recruiting:

Title of the consultancy	Institutional contract to conduct a country-led formative evaluation of the integrated social protection programme in the south of Madagascar (United Nations Joint SDG Fund)
Objective	Design and implement the evaluation of the integrated social protection programme (implemented by UNICEF, WFP, ILO, UNFPA, and funded by the United Nations Joint SDG Fund)
Location	Remote and in country (Antananarivo and Anosy region, Madagascar)
Length of the contract	From April 2020 to April 2022 including an approximate 22 weeks of work
Supervision	Research and Evaluation Specialist, UNICEF, jointly with the MPSPPW, WFP, UNFPA and ILO

1. INTRODUCTION

In an effort to promote accountability and enhance learning and documentation, the Ministry of Population, Social Protection and Promotion of Women (MPSPPW), jointly with UNICEF, WFP, ILO and UNFPA are commissioning a country-led formative evaluation of the integrated social protection programme (ISPP) in the south of Madagascar. These Terms of Reference (ToR) set out the purpose and objectives, methodological options and operational modalities for an institutional contract with a team of at least two evaluation consultants. Findings and recommendations from this formative evaluation will inform the replication and scale-up of integrated social protection programmes in Madagascar. Implementation of this model programme will begin in January 2020 and continue into 2021. The evaluation is expected to be conducted from April 2020 to April 2022 for a total duration of approximately 18 working weeks (90 days). It will be supervised by the UNICEF Research and Evaluation Specialist in Madagascar, in collaboration with a focal point from MPSPPW, WFP, UNFPA and ILO, and in coordination with a social protection technical working group and the UNICEF Regional Office for Eastern and Southern Africa (ESARO).

2. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

The current structure of social protection spending in Madagascar is highly inequalitarian with allocations and benefits concentrated on a small fraction of the urban population working in the formal economy. In fact, 40 per cent of the total social protection spending is allocated to the coverage of civil servants and their families, representing less than 1 per cent of the population.

The Government has a strong political commitment to re-focus the social protection system and spending toward the poorest households, in particular by expanding the coverage of the national social safety nets (SSN) programme (pillar 1 of the National Social Protection Strategy, NSPS) and developing a more integrated model. Beside the SSN programme, the Government of Madagascar made also a strong commitment to reaching universal health coverage (UHC) and developed a national strategy to extend social health protection to all. The Government adopted a national strategy, which foresees the extension of health protection coverage through both contributory and non-contributory mechanisms. The ISPP program will build on this renewed political commitment for social protection and will support the Government in establishing a more efficient, integrated and inclusive social protection model.

Four UN agencies (UNICEF, WFP, ILO and UNFPA) under the leadership of UNICEF have developed a joint programme for social protection in Madagascar. The programme is initiated under the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal Fund (Joint SDG Fund) and it will be implemented between January 2020 and December 2021 in the Anosy region (South of Madagascar). It has a total budget of USD 4,238,423.00 including the following contributions: Joint SDG Fund: USD 1,999,723.00; UNICEF: USD 998,000.00; WFP: USD 840,700.00; ILO: USD 70,000.00; and UNFPA: USD 330,000.00.

The main objective of the joint programme is to develop and implement an integrated package of social protection interventions tailored to the needs of vulnerable households living in extreme poverty, especially people living with disabilities. The integrated package will include a combination of SSN, social health protection and gender-based violence (GBV) protection schemes, agricultural insurance and livelihood promotion activities. The ultimate objective of the programme is twofold: i) to promote social and economic inclusion of households living in extreme poverty in Madagascar, including persons with disabilities, by providing them with complementary social protection interventions aimed at supporting consumption, managing socio-economic risks and promoting human and productive investments; and ii) to reinforce the national social protection institutional framework by supporting the Government in developing an efficient integrated social protection model that could be scaled-up nationally. The programme is fully aligned with the NSPS for the period 2019-2023, approved by the Government in 2019.¹

So far social protection programmes in Madagascar have been isolated and fragmented, separately addressing various type of risks and vulnerabilities with no geographic convergence nor a common administrative framework. For example, households covered by the national safety nets programme (Conditional Cash Transfer) benefit from increased income stability and reduced liquidity constraints, however, without complementary interventions aimed at supporting productive activities and managing risks, they remain extremely vulnerable. This situation undermines the long-term poverty reduction potential of the safety net programme. The joint programme will link beneficiaries of the existing national safety net programme (financed by UNICEF and the World Bank), to insurance mechanisms and productive activities to reduce their long-term vulnerability and increase their resilience. This approach will simultaneously support households to ease their consumption, manage socio-economic and environmental risks, access basic services and invest in productive activities. This combined approach will lay the foundation for their progressive graduation out of poverty. In addition, by focusing on an integrated and coordinated approach, the programme will allow for social protection schemes that are at an early stage of development and implementation, such as the social health insurance scheme, to benefit from existing eligibility assessment, affiliation and referral mechanisms. This will foster synergies and economies of scale that will be key to the financial viability of newly implemented schemes, such as the social health insurance scheme. The Theory of Change of the joint programme is available in Annex I of these ToR.

The joint programme specifically targets extremely vulnerable households with a special focus on people living with disabilities. It is expected to reach a minimum of 4,000 vulnerable households, mostly households with young children, including children with disability. A more precise profile of targeted households will be defined in collaboration with the MPPSPF by May 2020 based on an ongoing review of social protection programmes. Extremely poor households comprise people facing different types of deprivations: they are primarily families with a constrained access to the basic socio-economic services namely nutrition, health, education and productive activities. In addition, because of their restricted capacity to cope with natural disasters, socio-economic crisis and resulting shocks, they have greater exposures to their negative impacts. This joint programme is intended to provide an integrated package of social protection interventions to targeted beneficiaries. The integrated package of programmes comprises interventions that have been recognized as Government priorities under the NSPS: (i) safety nets programme (social protection strategy), (ii) health protection (access to basic social service), (iii) agricultural insurance and livelihood promotion (agriculture), and (iv) gender-based violence protection (national strategy against gender-based violence). Rather than creating new programmes, it will enhance and build on the existing ones, making those interventions more sensitive to the needs of vulnerable people. This is a brief outline of targeted beneficiaries by the programme and the main activities that will be delivered. Full programme description and results framework, detailing the components of the programme and the responsibility of each UN agency, is in Annex II.

The first semester of the joint programme (January 2020 to June 2020) will focus on preparatory activities in order to have all social protection interventions at the same operational level to deliver an integrated package of interventions in 2020. A referral system that will liaise all programmes is expected to be

¹ Ministère de la Population, de la Protection Sociale et de la Promotion de la Femme (2019), Stratégie Nationale de La Protection Sociale

developed by June 2020 and will be operational during the second semester of 2020. According to the current implementation timeline, registration of beneficiaries in the new common system will be done in July 2020 and the integrated package of interventions will be delivered from July/August 2020.

The evaluation plan for this joint programme is also expected to be developed during the first semester of 2020 in order for the evaluation plan to be effectively implemented by July 2020 (when the integrated package of interventions will be delivered). UNICEF as lead agency for the joint programme is responsible for commissioning and managing an independent evaluation, in collaboration with the other UN agencies. To this end, UNICEF, jointly with the MPSPPW, WFP, UNFPA and ILO, is commissioning an evaluation to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the joint programme before future replication and scale-up. The evaluation is anticipated to be learning-oriented. It will help identify lessons learned, good practices and innovations to inform the strategic direction of integrated social protection in Madagascar.

3. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF WORK

The purpose of this evaluation is **knowledge generation and high-quality lessons learned (learning)**. As described before, the pilot was designed to test a model of integrated social protection system. In addition, a formative part of evaluation is planned to reinforce evaluability of the programme.

In that sense the evaluation objective is manifold, first, to determine the overall functioning and finetuning of the joint programme supported by UNICEF, WFP, UNFPA and ILO to meet the needs of vulnerable households. The evaluation will also help the MPSPPW and the UN explore ways to further adapt and **improve social protection services in Madagascar**. The initial evaluability assessment will provide programme staff and partners with evidence on the extent to which results can be demonstrated based on programme documentation and the monitoring systems being established. The evaluability assessment will provide assurance to stakeholders that the programme is robust, that objectives are adequately defined, that causal linkages are clarified, that its indicators are validated and measurable, and that systems are in place to measure and verify results. The subsequent **formative component of the evaluation will examine whether the proposed programme elements are likely to be needed, understood, and accepted by the population to be reached with a view to allow for modifications of the programme before full implementation begins**.

The primary users of the evaluation include the MPPSPPF, UNICEF, WFP, UNFPA and ILO (duty bearers). Secondary users include the World Health Organization (WHO), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the World Bank (WB), GIZ, FID, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Public Health along with the Couverture de Santé Universelle (CSU) and the Caisse Nationale de Solidarité pour la Santé (CNSS). And finally, another non-negligible stakeholder is the Groupe Thématique de Protection Sociale (GTPS), the national platform for coordinating social protection interventions, which include various government departments involved in social protection programming and financing. This platform is also decentralized at regional level and it is operational in the area of intervention.

The evaluation **will be used to inform the replication of inclusive social protection** services in other districts in Madagascar. It will identify lessons learned, good practices and innovations for scaling up support that will be provided to the MPSPPW, collaborating ministries, and other implementing partners for their consideration.

The objectives of the evaluation are as follows:

- To examine the conceptual underpinnings and design of the integrated social protection programme including its underlying Theory of Change (ToC) integrated (in the course of the evaluability assessment); and provide an assessment of how developed the services are based on evidence from programme experiences and approaches that have proven effective in meeting the needs of vulnerable households, in particular people living with disabilities;

- To assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and sustainability of the joint programme from its inception to its completion, with focus on its ability to respond to the needs of the most vulnerable households, including people with disabilities;
- To assess whether the integrated social protection services are in line with the national social protection strategy provided by the MPSPPW using the ToC, in terms of: (i) coordination, collaboration and organisational structures formed for modelling integrated social protection services; (ii) quality of the outreach/communication for development plan in the district; (iii) delivery of planned integrated services; (iv) the internal M&E system;
- To examine the evolution of the integrated social protection services being provided until 2021, its relationship with, and the immediate impact in the district, and the possible expansion of services altogether over time; and
- To document and provide recommendations regarding lessons learned, good practices and innovations that can be applied to other regions in Madagascar.

The formative evaluation will provide an independent assessment of the joint programme, and it will be forward-looking by reinforcing good practices, identifying areas for improvement and providing conclusions and recommendations. It will be conducted to assess and improve programme process, and not to judge the performance of individual staff members. The evaluation will not focus on identifying impacts and outcomes of services, instead it will attempt to assess the approach taken by UNICEF, WFP, UNFPA and ILO, whether the assumptions made in the ToC are appropriate, whether activities and interventions are indeed contributing to progress within the framework of the ToC, whether the proposed approach is scalable and to determine why or why not progress is occurring. Of course, where the evaluation does yield evidence in relation to impact and outcomes, these will be reflected upon in the evaluation report.

Within the policy context of integrated social protection services, the evaluation will cover the development and evolution of the social protection strategy from 2020 onwards, paying particular attention to the policy framework in relation to people living with disability. Data collection will focus on the district where the joint programme is being implemented. To the extent possible, the evaluation should be participatory in nature and include the views of young children with developmental delays and disabilities and their families. District authorities, social workers, medical social workers, health workers, teachers as well as programme beneficiaries should be consulted during the data collection.

Formative evaluation evidence will be judged using modified Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, as well as equity, gender equality and human rights considerations. Key evaluation questions (and sub-questions) include the following:

Relevance of integrated social protection services provided in the district of Amboasary in relation to the national social protection priorities and policy and the needs of households in Madagascar:

- How relevant are the integrated social protection services to priorities and policy at the national level?
 - o Are the activities and outputs of the joint programme consistent with the national social protection strategy and the attainment of its objectives?
 - o Have contextual factors (specific to each of the programme sites) been considered in the design and implementation and adaptation of integrated social protection services?
- How relevant are the integrated social protection services to the needs of the most vulnerable households?
 - o To what extent are the integrated social protection services relevant to the most vulnerable households? Have services been fully adapted to meet the needs of different groups, in particular people living with disabilities?
 - o Are the activities and outputs of the joint programme consistent with the intended plan for service delivery?

Coherence: The evaluation will assess the coherence of the programme with key international commitments including gender equality and women’s empowerment, equity for children, and the human rights-based approach; the comparative advantage of this joint programme over other social protection programmes to deliver expected results; and added value of coordination and convening roles:

- To what extent is the programme addressing gender and equity? Are the rights of people with disabilities consistently integrated in all aspects of programming and implementation?
- What are the comparative strengths of the joint programme in comparison to other social protection programmes?
- What are the comparative strengths of the coordination and convening roles of the joint programme?

Effectiveness of the integrated social protection services in achieving its programme development objectives, including:

- How feasible are the social protection services with respect to meeting the needs of vulnerable households, and what are the major influencing factors?
 - o To what extent have the programme objectives been achieved in each site? Were they achieved on time?
 - o What have been the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the programme objectives in providing integrated services?
 - o What have been the main challenges faced during the implementation of the joint programme?
 - o To what extent is the responsibility for ensuring adherence to human rights, equity and gender equality objectives well-articulated in the programme monitoring framework and implementation plans?

Efficiency of integrated social protection services outputs – both qualitative and quantitative – in relation to the inputs provided:

- How efficiently have the integrated social protection services been managed, given the human and financial resources available? What have been the costs, including both funds and in-kind support?
 - o Are activities low in cost and affordable (yet, of adequate quality to improve the situation of vulnerable households)?
 - o Is the current organisational set-up, collaboration and contribution of concerned ministries and others working effectively to help ensure accountability? What more might be done?
 - o Have the integrated social protection services been implemented in an effective and efficient way, both in terms of human and financial resources to other alternatives?

Sustainability of the benefits of the integrated social protection services provided:

- To what extent have the strategies adopted by the joint programme contributed to sustainability of results, especially equity and gender-related results?
- To what extent is the joint programme supporting long-term buy-in and ownership by duty bearers and rights holders?
- What is the likelihood of the integrated services objectives to be sustained beyond the duration of the joint programme?
 - o What are the lessons learned about the provision of integrated social protection services?
 - o To what extent are the benefits of the joint programme likely to continue?
 - o What have been the major factors that influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the joint programme in Amboasary?
 - o In what ways should the current joint programme approach be revised or modified to improve the sustainability of the programme services?

4. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

Based on the objectives of the evaluation, this section indicates a possible design, approach, methods and processes for the evaluation. **Methodological rigor will be given significant consideration in the assessment of proposals. Hence bidders are invited to interrogate the approach and methodology proffered in the ToR and improve on it or propose an approach they consider more appropriate. In their proposal, the bidder should refer to triangulation, sampling plan and methodological limitations and mitigation measures.** Bidders must also demonstrate methodological expertise and considerable experience in evaluating social protection programmes.

The evaluation will employ both a theory-based, iterative (using a developmental approach) and a mixed methods approach drawing on key background documents and the internal M&E system. The actual M&E plan includes:

- A baseline and end line surveys²,
- A regular context/situation monitoring survey² (planned to be monthly) that cover the three communes treatment and other communes and districts broader,
- An annual and a final narrative consolidated report,
- A mid-term progress review,
- A regular updates on financial delivery (frequency to be determined); and
- An annual and a final financial report.

In initial inception phase, the evaluation should undertake an evaluability assessment. The purpose of the Evaluability Assessment is not to question whether an evaluation is possible; but to inform the evaluation of evaluability constraints early in the process. This will include the following (i) clarify logic and coherence of the programme, (ii) assess the adequacy and validity of the indicators, tools and systems for monitoring, measuring and verifying results, (iii) assess, according to the learning purpose, the adequate availability of human resources and financial resources to monitor and evaluated the expected results and (iv) provide guidance on approaches to the evaluation of the programme.

For this last point the evaluator should review the feasibility and adequacy of delivering a quasi-experimental design for some key quantitative indicators. In addition to this, a refinement or reprioritisation of initial evaluation questions should be planned within a participatory approach after conducting a stakeholder mapping.

The timing of this independent evaluation is such that it will take an iterative and utilization-focused approach, identifying and assessing the feasibility and likely results of the joint programme in terms of inputs and outputs, as well as service sustainability and potential for replication and scaling-up. The M&E system should be reviewed, and data used (anonymously) to assess the delivery of social safety nets. The evaluation should consider throughout issues of equity, gender equality and human rights, in line with the CRC, the CRPD, the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), Revised Evaluation Policy of UNICEF (2018) and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016).

At a minimum, the evaluation will draw on the following methods:

- Literature review and desk review of background documents and other relevant data, including review and analysis of secondary quantitative data;
- Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with the following stakeholders: the main duty bearers MPPSPPF, UNICEF, WFP, UNFPA and ILO, the implementing technical partners including the WHO, the FAO,

² Data collection for this M&E system in the Amboasary district will be done by a local firm that will be recruited directly by the Evaluation team.

the WB, GIZ, FID, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Public Health along with the CSU and the CNSS, and the national platform coordinating social protection interventions, GTPS.

- Review of programme documentation in each site;
- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with relevant stakeholders at the national and sub-national level, including children and their families, community members and frontline workers;
- Case studies (in-depth interviews) of each core social protection services;
- Cost analysis of the implementation of the joint programme;
- Collation of existing statistical data, where available, and quantitative data relevant to the evaluation questions; and
- A quantitative survey to selected households to gather data on the effectiveness of integrated social protection services (in addition to providing data on other criteria).

Data collected should be disaggregated by age, gender, disability status, site, etc. where relevant. Sampling for conducting Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group Discussions should be done in consultation with the MPSPPW, UNICEF, WFP, UNFPA and ILO. Baseline data will be secured and/or provided based on the project document. Additionally, secondary data sources can be used, where relevant.

The proposed methodology should be based on continuous collection and analysis of key process and impact indicators during project implementation (ex: monthly surveys and administrative data collection), periodic reports (ex: every two/three months) to draw recommendations to improve the programme design. Availability/quality and access to administrative data could be a major limitation of the evaluation, other data collection tools developed (monthly surveys, KII, FGD) should integrate essential information needed for the evaluation.

Likewise, conventional ethical guidelines are to be followed during the evaluation. Specific reference is made to the UNEG Ethical Guidelines, as well as to the UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation, the UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator, and the UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation and Data Collection and Analysis and UNICEF's Evaluation Reporting Standards. Good practices not covered therein are also to be followed. Any sensitive issues or concerns should be raised with the Evaluation Management Team as soon as they are identified.

5. MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION

The evaluation will be conducted by an independent Evaluation Team to be recruited by UNICEF Madagascar. The Evaluation Team will operate under the supervision of the Research and Evaluation Specialist at UNICEF Madagascar, in collaboration with the MPSPPW, WFP, UNFPA and ILO. They will act as Evaluation Management Team and therefore be responsible for the day-to-day oversight and management of the evaluation and for the management of the evaluation budget. The Evaluation Management Team will assure the quality and independence of the evaluation and guarantee its alignment with the UNICEF's Evaluation Policy and Procedure, UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation and other relevant procedures, provide quality assurance checking that the evaluation findings and conclusions are relevant, and recommendations are implementable, and contribute to the dissemination of the evaluation findings and follow-up on the management response. An additional layer of quality assurance will be provided by the Regional Office of UNICEF (UNICEF Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office) that will be assess the quality of all evaluation deliverables against key standards outlined in the regional quality assurance checklists that are in Annexes III and IV. Evaluation deliverables will only be accepted by UNICEF and considered final when they receive a satisfactory rating or above.

A Reference Group will be established, bringing together representatives of the MPSPPW, UNICEF, WFP, UNFPA, ILO among others. The Reference Group will have the following role: contributing to the preparation and design of the evaluation (including providing feedback and comments on the inception report and on the quality of the work of the evaluation team); providing comments and substantive feedback to ensure the quality – from a technical point of view – of the draft and final evaluation reports; assisting in

identifying internal and external stakeholders to be consulted during the evaluation process; participating in review meetings organized by the Evaluation Management Team, as required; playing a key role in learning and knowledge sharing from the evaluation results; and contributing to disseminating the findings of the evaluation and follow-up on the implementation of the management response.

6. EVALUATION TEAM PROFILE

The evaluation will be conducted through an institutional contract with an evaluation firm. The proposed evaluation team will consist of at minimum one (1) senior-level consultant (Team Leader) to conduct the evaluation that will be supported by at least one (1) additional consultant (Team Member/Technical Expert). Additional researchers/enumerators can be considered by the bidders to conduct the data collection.

The Team Leader should bring the following competences:

- Having extensive evaluation experience (at least 10 years) with an excellent understanding of evaluation principles and methodologies, including evaluability, capacity in an array of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods, and UNEG Norms and Standards.
- Having extensive experience on social protection interventions – planning, implementing, managing or M&E.
- Holding an advanced university degree (Master or higher) in economics, social policy, international development, public policy, public administration, or similar, including sound knowledge of social protection; familiarity with human rights.
- Bringing a strong commitment to delivering timely and high-quality results, i.e., credible evaluations that are used for improving strategic decisions.
- Having in-depth knowledge of the UN's human rights, gender equality and equity agendas.
- Having a strong team leadership and management track record, as well as excellent interpersonal and communication skills to help ensure that the evaluation is understood and used.
- Specific evaluation experience of social protection is essential, as well as a strong mixed-method evaluation background; previous experience in conducting developmental evaluation is considered an asset.
- Previous work experience in Africa is desirable, together with an understanding of the Madagascar context and cultural dynamics.
- The Team Leader must be committed and willing to work independently, with limited regular supervision; s/he must demonstrate adaptability and flexibility, client orientation, proven ethical practice, initiative, concern for accuracy and quality.
- S/he must have the ability to concisely and clearly express ideas and concepts in written and oral form as well as the ability to communicate with various stakeholders in English and French.

The Team Leader will be responsible for undertaking the formative evaluation from start to finish, for managing the evaluation, for the bulk of data collection, analysis and consultations, as well as for report drafting in French and communication of the evaluation results.

One (1) national Team Member/Technical Expert:

- Holding advanced university degrees (Masters-level) in statistics, economics, international development, public policy, public administration, or similar coursework.
- Strong training and experience in social protection.
- Hands-on experience in collecting and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data, especially in relation to socio-economic interventions.
- Strong expertise in equity, gender equality and human rights-based approaches to evaluation and expertise in data presentation and visualisation.

- Be committed and willing to work in a complex environment and able to produce quality work under limited guidance and supervision.
- Having good communication, advocacy and people skills and the ability to communicate with various stakeholders and to express concisely and clearly ideas and concepts in written and oral form.
- Excellent French and Malagasy communication and report writing skills.

The Team Member will play a key role in data collection, analysis and presentation, and preparation of the debriefings, and will make significant contributions to the writing of the main evaluation report.

The Evaluation Team is expected to be balanced with respect to gender to ensure accessibility of both male and female informants during the data collection process. Back-office support assisting the team with logistics and other administrative matters is also expected. **It is vital that the same individuals that develop the methodology for the request for proposals for services will be involved in conducting the evaluation. In the review of the proposals, while adequate consideration will be given to the technical methodology, significant weighting will be given to the quality, experience (including CVs, three referees and written samples of previous evaluations) and relevance of individuals who will be involved in the evaluation.**

7. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

Expected evaluation deliverables are as follows:

- 1) **A stand-alone Evaluability Assessment** (in French) of the joint programme that will inform the evaluation by identifying evaluability constraints early in the process.
- 2) **An Inception Report** (in French), including detailed research timeline and design, a summary note in preparation for data collection and revised data collection tools for the light monthly households' survey, the KII and FGD (in French); outlining what questions can be addressed and which cannot and propose new evaluation questions.
- 3) **A report of the initial evaluation findings from primary data collection** (in French), including a desk review analysis and a PowerPoint presentation to facilitate a stakeholder consultation exercise; Data collection for the light monthly households' survey will be done directly by the Evaluation team by contracting a local firm/association.
- 4) **A semester short analysis** of programme implementation based on monthly situation monitoring data, regular financial consolidated updated data and narrative reports on implementation advancement.
- 5) **A draft and final Evaluation Report** (in French) that will be revised until approved (including a complete first draft to be reviewed by the Evaluation Management Team and the social protection technical working group; a second draft to be reviewed by the Reference Group and the Regional Office of ESARO, and a penultimate draft);
- 6) **A PowerPoint presentation** (in both French and Malagasy) to be used to share findings with the Reference Group and for use in subsequent dissemination events; and
- 7) **A four-page Evaluation Brief** (in both English, French and Malagasy) that is distinct from the executive summary in the evaluation report and it is intended for a broader and non-technical audience. The executive summary should also be produced both in text and video versions (i.e., 1 or 2-minute video clip). Video and photo materials should be collected as part of the evaluation to enrich the evaluation dissemination.

Other interim products are:

- Minutes of key meetings with the Evaluation Management Team and the Reference Group;

- Monthly progress reports;
- Copy of the data collected during the evaluation; and
- Presentation materials for the meetings with the Evaluation Management Team and the Reference Group. These may include PowerPoint summaries of work progress and conclusions to that point.

Outlines and descriptions of each evaluation products are meant to be indicatives, and include:

- **Evaluability Assessment**: The Evaluability Assessment will help validate and reconstruct the ToC and help identify evaluability constraints early in the process. The report will be 10-15 pages in length, or maximum 8,000 words, and it will be presented to the Reference Group.
- **Inception Report**: The Inception Report will be key in confirming a common understanding of what is to be evaluated, including additional insights into executing the evaluation. At this stage, evaluators will refine and confirm evaluation questions, confirm the scope of the evaluation, further improve on the methodology proposed in the ToR and their own evaluation proposal to improve its rigor, as well as develop and validate evaluation instruments. The report will include, among other elements: i) evaluation purpose and scope, confirmation of objectives of the evaluation; ii) evaluation criteria and questions; iii) evaluation methodology (i.e., sampling criteria), a description of data collection methods and data sources (incl. a rationale for their selection), draft data collection instruments, for example questionnaires, with a data collection toolkit as an annex, an evaluation matrix that identifies descriptive and normative questions and criteria for evaluating evidence, a data analysis plan, a discussion on how to enhance the reliability and validity of evaluation conclusions, the field visit approach, a description of the quality review process and a discussion on the limitations of the methodology; iv) proposed structure of the final report; v) evaluation work plan and timeline, including a revised work and travel plan; vi) resources requirements (i.e., detailed budget allocations, tied to evaluation activities, work plan) deliverables; vii) annexes (i.e., organizing matrix for evaluation questions, data collection toolkit, data analysis framework); and viii) a summary of the evaluation (evaluation briefing note) for external communication purposes. The inception report will be 15-20 pages in length (excluding annexes), or approximately 10,000 words, and will be presented at a formal meeting of the Reference Group.
- **Initial evaluation findings**: This report will present the initial evaluation findings from primary data collection, comprising the desk-based document review and analysis of the technical support project. The report developed prior to the first drafts of the final report should be 10 pages, or about 8,000 words in length (excluding annexes, if any), and should be accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation that can be used for validation with key stakeholders.
- **Final Evaluation Report**: The report will not exceed 45 pages, or 25,000 words, excluding the executive summary and annexes.³ The structure of the report will be agreed with UNICEF and other stakeholders at the beginning of the assignment.
- **PowerPoint presentation**: Initially prepared and used by the Evaluation Team in their presentation to the Reference Group, a standalone PowerPoint will be submitted to the Evaluation Management Team as part of the evaluation deliverables.
- **An Evaluation Brief**, data and a four-page executive summary (with infographics) for external users will be submitted to the Evaluation Management Team as part of the evaluation deliverables.

Reports will be prepared according to the UNICEF Style Guide and UNICEF Brand Toolkit (to be shared with the winning bidder) and UNICEF-adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards as per GEROS

³ UNICEF has instituted the Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS), a system where final evaluation reports are quality assessed by an external company against UNICEF/UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluation reports. The Evaluation Team is expected to reflect on and conform to these standards as they write their report. The team may choose to share a self-assessment based on the GEROS with the Evaluation Management Team.

guidelines (referenced before). All deliverables must be in professional level standard French and they must be language-edited/proof-read by a native speaker.

The first draft of the final report will be received by the Evaluation Management Team and UNICEF who will work with the team leader on necessary revisions. The second draft will be sent to the Reference Group for comments. The Evaluation Management Team will consolidate all comments on a response matrix and request the Evaluation Team to indicate actions taken against each comment in the production of the penultimate draft.

Bidders are invited to reflect on each outline and effect the necessary modification to enhance their coverage and clarity. Having said so, products are expected to conform to the stipulated number of pages where that applies.

An estimated budget has been allocated for this evaluation. As reflected in Table 1, the evaluation has a timeline of 25 months from April 2020 to April 2022. Adequate effort should be allocated to the evaluation to ensure timely submission of all deliverables, approximately 18 weeks on the part of the Evaluation Team.

Table 1: Proposed Evaluation Timeline⁴

ACTIVITY	DELIVERABLE	TIME ESTIMATE	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
1. INCEPTION, EVALUABILITY, DOCUMENT REVIEW AND ANALYSIS		6 weeks (April to May 2019)	
1. Inception meeting by Skype with the Evaluation Management Team	Meeting minutes	Week 1	Evaluation Team, Evaluation Management Team
2. Inception visit (incl. initial data collection and desk review; stakeholder analysis; and evaluability assessment)	Meeting minutes	Weeks 2-3	Evaluation Team
3. Present Evaluability Assessment to the Reference Group	PowerPoint presentation	Week 4	Evaluation Team, Evaluation Management Team, Reference Group
4. Prepare Inception Report	Draft Inception Report	Week 5	Evaluation Team
5. Present draft Inception Report to the Reference Group	PowerPoint presentation	Week 6	Evaluation Team, Evaluation Management Team, Reference Group
6. Revise Inception Report, confirm planning for field visit	Final Inception Report	Week 6	Evaluation Team, Evaluation Management Team, Reference Group
2. DATA COLLECTION		8 working weeks (June 2020 to December 2021)	
1. Pilot data collection tools and conduct field-based data collection (multiple rounds of data collection can be conducted over time using a developmental approach)	-	Weeks 9-15	Evaluation Team
2. Implement additional data collection - KII,		Week 94 - 96	

⁴ Please note that the timing of the data collection may change depending on the possibility of carrying out KIIs and FGDs and other contextual factors.

case studies ...			
3. ANALYSIS, REPORTING AND COMMUNICATION OF RESULTS		9 working weeks (January to April 2022)	
1. Prepare baseline findings report and prepare presentation for validation workshop to validate data collection results	Baseline findings report (incl. desk review), PowerPoint presentation, meeting minutes	Week 16	Evaluation Team, Evaluation Management Team, Reference Group
2. Prepare semester short analysis #1	-	Week 40 - 41	Evaluation Team
3. Prepare semester short analysis #2	-	Week 62 - 63	Evaluation Team
4. Prepare semester short analysis #3	-	Week 92 - 93	Evaluation Team
5. Prepare and submit first draft of Evaluation Report	Draft Evaluation Report	Week 98 - 99	Evaluation Team
6. Receive first draft and provide feedback to Evaluation Team	Evaluation commenting matrix	Week 100-101	Evaluation Management Team
7. Prepare and submit second draft of Evaluation Report and present conclusions and recommendation in a workshop (incl. prioritization of recommendations)	Draft Evaluation Report, PowerPoint presentation, meeting minutes	Week 102	Evaluation Team
8. Receive second draft and provide feedback to Evaluation Team	Evaluation commenting matrix	Weeks 102-103	Evaluation Management Team, Reference Group
9. Prepare and submit penultimate draft of Evaluation Report	Draft Evaluation Report	Week 104	Evaluation Team
10. Submit and present final Evaluation Report to Reference Group and prepare presentation and other materials	Final Evaluation Report, Evaluation Brief, PowerPoint presentation, meeting minutes	Week 105	Evaluation Team, Evaluation Management Team, Reference Group

8. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

Unless bidders propose an alternative payment schedule, payments will be as follows:

- Approved Evaluability Assessment and Inception Report: 3 months after signing the contract; (15% of payment);
- Approved initial evaluation findings report: 18 months after signing the contract; (25% of payment);
- Approved final Evaluation Report: 23 months after signing the contract; and (35% of payment); and
- Approved final presentation and other materials: 24 months after signing the contract (25% of payment).

9. APPLICATION PROCESS

Each proposal will be assessed first on its technical merits and subsequently on its price. In making the final decision, UNICEF considers both **Technical and Financial Proposals**. The Evaluation Team first reviews the Technical Proposals followed by review of the Financial Proposals of the technically compliant firms. The proposal obtaining the highest overall score after adding the scores for the Technical and Financial Proposals together, that offers the best value for money, will be recommended for award of the contract.

The Technical Proposal should include but not be limited to the following:

-
- a) **Request for Proposals for Services Form** (provided above).
- b) **Presentation of the Bidding Institution** or institutions if a consortium (maximum two institutions will be accepted as part of the consortium), including:
- Name of the institution;
 - Date and country of registration/incorporation;
 - Summary of corporate structure and business areas;
 - Corporate directions and experience;
 - Location of offices or agents relevant to this proposal;
 - Number and type of employees;
 - In case of a consortium of institutions, the above listed elements shall be provided for each consortium members in addition to the signed consortium agreement; and
 - In case of a consortium, one only must be identified as the organization lead in dealing with UNICEF.
- c) **Narrative Description of the Bidding Institution's Experience and Capacity** in the following areas:
- Evaluation of social protection interventions;
 - Formative evaluation of social protection interventions, ideally implemented by government institutions and partner NGOs; previous experience in conducting developmental evaluation is considered an asset;
 - Previous assignments in developing countries in general, and related to social protection programmes, preferably in Africa; and
 - Previous and current assignments using UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluation.
- d) **Relevant References** of the proposer (past and on-going assignments) in the past five years. UNICEF may contact references persons for feedback on services provided by the proposers.
- e) **Samples or Links to Samples of Previous Relevant Work** listed as reference of the proposer (at least three), on which the proposed key personnel directly and actively contributed or authored.
- f) **Methodology**. It should minimize repeating what is stated in the ToR. There is no minimum or maximum length. If in doubt, ensure sufficient detail.
- g) **Work Plan**, which will include as a minimum requirement the following:
- General work plan based on the one proposed in the ToR, with comments and proposed adjustments, if any; and
 - Detailed timetable by activity (it must be consistent with the general work plan and the Financial Proposal).
- h) **Evaluation Team:**
- Summary presentation of proposed experts;
 - Description of support staff (number and profile of research and administrative assistants etc.);
 - Level of effort of proposed experts by activity (it must be consistent with the Financial Proposal); and
 - CV and three referees of each expert proposed to carry out the evaluation.

The Technical Proposal will be submitted in hard copy and electronic (PDF) format.

Please note that the duration of the assignment will be from April 2020 to April 2022 and it is foreseen that the Evaluation Team will devote roughly 18 weeks of their time to the evaluation. The presence of a conflict of interest of any kind will automatically disqualify prospective candidates from consideration.

The Financial Proposal should include but not be limited to the following:

- a) **Resource Costs:** Daily rate multiplied by number of days of the experts involved in the evaluation including the cost for monthly data collection for the light household's survey.
- b) **Conference or Workshop Costs (if any):** Indicate nature and breakdown if possible.
- c) **Travel Costs:** All travel costs should be included as a lump sum fixed cost. For all travel costs, UNICEF will pay as per the lump sum fixed costs provided in the proposal. A breakdown of the lump sum travel costs should be provided in the Financial Proposal.
- d) **Any Other Costs (if any):** Indicate nature and breakdown.
- e) **Recent Financial Audit Report:** Report should have been carried out in the past two years and be certified by a reputable audit organization.

Bidders are required to estimate travel costs in the Financial Proposal. Please note that: i) travel costs shall be calculated based on economy class fare regardless of the length of travel; and ii) costs for accommodation, meals and incidentals.

The Financial Proposal must be fully separated from the Technical Proposal. The Financial Proposal will be submitted in hard copy. Costs will be formulated in US\$ and free of all taxes.

10. EVALUATION WEIGHTING CRITERIA

Proposals will be evaluated against two elements: technical and financial. The ratio between the technical and financial criteria depends on the relative importance of one component to the other. Cumulative Analysis will be used to evaluate and award proposals. The evaluation criteria associated with this ToR is split between technical and financial as follows:

- Weightage for Technical Proposal = 70%
- Weightage for Financial Proposal = 30%
- Total Score = 100%

a. Technical Proposal:

The Technical Proposal should address all aspects and criteria outlined in this Request for Proposal.

Table 2: Evaluation of Technical Proposal

The Technical Proposals will be evaluated against the following:		
REF	CATEGORY	POINTS
1	Overall response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completeness of response • Overall concord between the ToR requirements and proposal 	2
		3
2	Company/key personnel/individual consultant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Range and depth of experience with similar projects • Samples of previous work • References • Key personnel: relevant experience and qualifications of the proposed team for the assignment 	8
		5
		5
		14
3	Proposed methodology and approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed proposal with main tasks, including sound methodology to achieve key outputs • Proposal presents a realistic implementation timeline 	20
		13
Total Technical		70
Only proposals which receive a minimum of 60 points will be considered further.		

b. Financial Proposal

The total amount of points allocated for the price component is 30. The maximum number of points will be allotted to the lowest price proposal that is opened and compared among those invited firms/institutions which obtain the threshold points in the evaluation of the technical component.

All other price proposals will receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest price, e.g.,

$$\text{Score for price proposal X} = \frac{\text{Max. score for price proposal} * \text{Price of lowest priced proposal}}{\text{Price of proposal X}}$$

L'UNICEF est un environnement libre de toute discrimination. *L'UNICEF est engagé pour la diversité et l'inclusion et invite les candidats compétents de toutes les origines nationales, ethniques et religieuses à postuler pour faire partie de notre organisation.* Les candidatures féminines qualifiées ainsi que celles de personnes qualifiées en situation de handicap sont vivement encouragées.

Annex II: Joint programme full description with the implications of each participating agency

The programme is structured around two pillars, each of them with expected outcomes and outputs, as follows:

1. **Pillar 1 (downstream): an integrated package of social protection interventions to protect households from risks and promote human and productive investments, tailored to the needs of poorest people, including people with disabilities is operationalized and modelled in selected locations.**

This first pillar is expected to produce tangible and transformative results on beneficiary households in selected locations (expected 4,000 beneficiaries of safety nets and at least 35 percent of them linked with a package of complementary interventions). It is structured around four main components and one transversal activity: cash transfer, social health protection, agricultural insurance, livelihood promotion and C4D activities and GBV protection (transversal). Each activity will translate in immediate outputs (2020-2021) and medium-term outcomes (2022). Those activities will jointly contribute to longer term outcomes and final impacts (2023 to 2030) detailed in the ToC graph. More specifically:

- **Output 1.1 – Cash transfer** (under the responsibility of UNICEF): by providing regular transfers to households under the conditionality of sending their children in school, the short-term output of cash transfer will be to stabilize consumption of poorest households and ensure their school age children attend school. The financial support provided will contribute over the medium term to: i) increase households consumption for both food and other essential expenditures (health, education, housing, etc.) and ii) increase enrolment rate and reduce drop out. Over the longer term this will translate in better nutrition and education outcomes, particularly for children.
- **Output 1.2 – Social health insurance** (under the responsibility of ILO): by facilitating the enrolment of poorest households in the non-contributory health insurance scheme and by mobilizing the platforms of informal workers to promote voluntary adhesion in the contributory scheme (for workers with contributory capacity) the programme will contribute to the operationalization of the national health insurance system in the targeted district and its integration in the broader social protection programme (output level). The program will also implement specific C4D activities to overcome informal and cultural barriers that prevent household from accessing health. Households in beneficiary communities will be able to better manage their health risks and will increase their attendance in health facilities. Over the longer term this will contribute to better health outcomes.
- **Output 1.3 – Agricultural insurance** (under the responsibility of WFP): by providing sensitization, information and by subsidizing their insurance prime, the programme will enrol poorest stallholders (or groups of smallholders) in an agricultural insurance scheme (output level). The insurance will transfer the risks of agriculture loss and will stabilize the revenues of smallholders. With reduced risks of agricultural production loss, smallholders will be more inclined to invest in their agricultural production. Over the medium term this will translate in increased agricultural production.
- **Output 1.4 – Livelihood promotion** (under the responsibility of WFP): the livelihood promotion approach is based on a twofold strategy: i) support to agricultural production (training on improved farms techniques, equipment's, seeds distribution, etc.) supported by the FAO under own financial resources (no contribution from the JP) and, ii) post-harvest support (improved storage and transformation techniques and linkages to markets) supported by the WFP. As immediate output poorest smallholders will receive pre and post-harvest assistance. This will translate over the medium term in increased agricultural production and increased revenues from agriculture. The results framework in Annex reports only indicators related to the WFP activities, as the FAO activities will be entirely financed by own resources without SDG financial contribution.
- **Transversal Output 1.5 – C4D activities** (under the joint responsibility of the four participating UN agencies) **and GBV protection** (under the responsibility of UNFPA): the expected output of C4D activities is to sensitize local actors on behavioral changes related to the various

aspects of the programme. They will have, among other, a particular focus on ensuring that GBV issues are properly dealt at local level and that women victims of abuse will be properly assisted, through increased multi-sectoral capacity to prevent and address GBV. Those activities will contribute to maximize the impacts of the various programme components thus reinforcing the overall expected results.

Over the long term those activities will contribute to poverty reduction by improving well-being of households (better education, health and nutrition outcomes) and increased and diversified revenues. Households will be more resilient to future shocks and this will render the poverty reduction efforts sustainable over the long term.

2. Pillar 2 (upstream): Strengthen the institutional framework for social protection to ensure the integrated model is scaled up at national level

This second pillar is expected to have an impact on the national policy framework and will contribute to have the integrated social protection approach scaled up at national level. The short-term outputs of this pillar will be reflected in improved administrative, legal and institutional system, that will translate in increased efficiency at mid-term and increased allocation of resources for social protection over the long term. More specifically:

- **Output 2.1 – Development of a referral system** (under the responsibility of UNICEF): the development of a referral system will contribute to the establishment of a common administrative tool for social protection (output level) and will improve coordination among various social protection programmes. Over the medium term this will translate into reduced cost and increased efficiency of programmes (outcome level).
- **Output 2.2 – Revision of the legal and institutional framework to make it more sensitive to the people living with disabilities and other vulnerable groups, including women victims of GBV** (under the responsibility of UNFPA and UNICEF): the provision of technical assistance to strengthen the institutional framework will contribute to the establishment and operationalization of the national commission for disability and the identification of a package of interventions tailored to the needs of people living with disabilities (output level). This will ensure that the needs of people living with disability are properly taken into account in social protection programmes. In addition, the programme will provide capacity building of duty bearers as magistrates and police officers, Listening and Legal Advice Centers to guarantee the rights and access to services of vulnerable households and GBV survivors including disabled women and youth, and strengthen GBV referral pathways, multisectoral GBV coordination platforms, and youth spaces for GBV prevention and response.
- **Output 2.3 – Institutional strengthening and coordination on social health protection integrated to the social protection system** (under the responsibility of the ILO) The existing platform of actors involved in the formulation and implementation of the national strategy on health coverage will benefit from a reinforcement of their capacities to fully partake within social protection system-wide coordination. Indeed, the health sector currently focusses a lot on service provision and the JP will support capacity building on financial protection against the cost of care and its full integration in the social protection agenda. The JP will support the strengthening of existing coordination mechanisms, will foster operational coordination around eligibility, affiliation and referral mechanisms, and will support joint advocacy to mobilize fiscal space for social health protection.
- **Output 2.4 – M&E and evidence generation** (under the responsibility of the four agencies): a strong monitoring and evaluation system will be established for the JP, this will provide evidence on the impact of the proposed integrated approach and will contribute to inform policy decision at national level and over the long term increase the resources allocation for social protection.

Annex III: UNICEF ESAR Quality Assurance Checklist for Evaluation Inception Reports

		UNICEF Evaluation Inception Reports Quality Review Checklist Universalia, 4 April 2017	
IDENTIFICATION OF DELIVERABLE			
		Response	
Country			
Region			
Title Evaluation			
Year			
Date of Review			
Date of 2nd Review (if applicable)			
Initials of Reviewer			
Initials of Reviewer (2nd Review)			
RATING SCALES			
Individual Rating Criteria Guide	Rating	Explanation	
	Yes	Criterion is addressed.	
	Mostly	Criterion is addressed, but fairly minor elements are missing or incorrect.	
	Partly	Criterion is only partly addressed, two or more important elements are missing or incorrect.	
	No	Criterion is not addressed.	
	Not rated	Criterion could not be rated, reasons are provided.	
Section Rating Criteria Guide	Rating	Score	Explanation
	Highly Satisfactory	4	Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for TOR and external contractors may rely on the information provided.
	Satisfactory	3	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for TOR and external contractors may rely on the information provided.
	Fair	2	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for TOR in some regards, but not all. External contractors may continue to
	Unsatisfactory	1	Does not sufficiently meet the UNICEF/UNEG standards for TOR; and thus external contractors cannot rely
	Missing	0	Important aspects of the TOR that are required by the UNICEF/UNEG standards were found to be absent and
	Not Rated	not applicable	An aspect of the TOR was not rated for a legitimate reason that does not undermine the quality of the TOR.
INCEPTION REPORT REVIEW			
1. OPENING PAGES AND INTRODUCTION		Rating	Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 1.1	Do the opening pages and introduction of the Inception Report contain all the relevant information?		
1.1.1	The introduction contains a short description of the purpose of the IR, the key activities undertaken for its preparation and its place in the evaluation process.		
1.1.2	The introduction highlights any emerging issues that have arisen during the inception phase (if applicable).		
1.1.3	Basic elements in the opening pages are presented (acronyms, table of contents, country on cover page, years covered by the evaluation, commissioning organization).		
Overall Feedback on Section 1 (3-5 sentences) - Summary of the section, highlighting what was done well and main areas for improvements.		Overall rating for section	Score
		Weighting: 0,05	0

2. CONTEXT AND DESCRIPTION OF THE OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION		Rating	Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 2.1	Are the context of the object of the evaluation and the description of the object of the evaluation clearly presented?		
2.1.1	The description of the context include information on the initial problem and inequities at the national and/or international level, including the social, economic and political context underlying the initiative being evaluated, as well as relevant overarching policies/strategies/political frameworks.)		
2.1.2	The object of the evaluation is briefly and clearly explained (includes: objectives of the programme, stakeholders involved and their roles and stakes, time period of initiative, budget, geographic scope, phase of the project/ programme).		
2.1.3	The description of the object of the evaluation makes adequate references to human rights, gender and equity.		
2.1.4	The logic model or the theory of change of the object being evaluated is described to some extent, with the assumption that it will be further refined or finalized in the Evaluation Report.		
Overall Feedback on Section 2 (3-5 sentences) - Summary of the section, highlighting what was done well and main areas for improvements.		Overall rating for section	Score
			0
		Weighting:	0,1

3. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION		Rating	Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 3.1	Are the purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation clearly presented?		
3.1.1	The evaluation purpose is clearly presented (includes: the rationale behind the evaluation, expected users, and intended use, and how the users stand to gain or lose from the results of the evaluation).		
3.1.2	The evaluation objectives are clearly presented.		
3.1.3	The scope of the evaluation is clearly defined. If different from TORs, the changes are justified (includes: what will and will not be covered including the geographic location, period, thematic field(s) of intervention, interventions to be evaluated, levels (regional, country, municipal), unit of analysis, population groups covered).		
Overall Feedback on Section 3 (3-5 sentences) - Summary of the section, highlighting what was done well and main areas for improvements.		Overall rating for section	Score
			0
		Weighting:	0,1

4. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK		Rating	Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 4.1	Are the evaluation criteria and questions clearly presented?		
4.1.1	The Inception Report lists all of the evaluation criteria and questions as per TORs. If criteria/questions differ from TORs, the Inception Report justifies the changes. (For example, efforts to prioritize questions and reduce number of questions to address should be noted in the report.)		
Question 4.2	Is the evaluation matrix complete and containing relevant information?		
4.2.1	The Inception Report links the evaluation criteria and questions to the chosen methodology through an evaluation matrix.		
4.2.2	The matrix specifies the indicators, data sources, and data collection and methods used to answer each question.		
4.2.3	The indicators chosen are specific, easily measurable, and relevant to the corresponding evaluation questions and TOC.		
4.2.4	The evaluation questions and indicators include reference to human rights, gender and equity dimensions.		
Overall Feedback on Section 4 (3-5 sentences) - Summary of the section, highlighting what was done well and main areas for improvements.		Overall rating for section	Score
			0
		Weighting:	0,2

5. METHODOLOGY		Rating	(1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 5.1	Is the overall methodology for the evaluation clearly presented?		
5.1.1	The data collection and analysis methods are sound and appropriate and the evaluators provide a rationale for choosing specific methods.		
5.1.2	The Inception Report describes relevant methodological limitations to the evaluation.		
5.1.3	The approach to addressing methodological limitation makes sense (includes: the answerability of evaluation questions based on desk review and available data sets, the availability and reliability of the data, and any bias that may arise).		
5.1.4	The data collection tools are linked to the specific evaluation questions (the way in which the tools are designed should facilitate capturing the information needed to answer the evaluation questions).		
5.1.5	Questions in interview protocols, discussion guides and questionnaires are robust, focused, linked to the evaluation matrix and avoid leading questions.		
5.1.6	The sampling methods described for qualitative data collection are appropriate and adequate (includes ALL of the following: sample size, the geographic area(s), specific populations, sampled site/country visits, the rationale/criteria for selection, how participants/interviewees will be selected, and criteria for selection of countries to be visited/studied (if applicable)).		
5.1.7	The sampling methods described for quantitative data collection are appropriate and adequate (includes ALL of the following: sample size, the geographic area(s), specific populations, sampled site/country visits, the rationale/criteria for selection, how participants/interviewees will be selected, and criteria for selection of countries to be visited/studied (if applicable)).		
5.1.8	Key data sources are clearly presented (includes: list of documents for desk review, the group of stakeholders to be interviewed, available databases, data gaps) and appear comprehensive and reliable.		
5.1.9	The Inception Report presents and justifies any adaptations to the methods proposed in the TOR.		
5.1.10	If the evaluation asks attribution questions (outcome or impact level), an appropriate evaluation design (qualitative or quantitative) to reliably measure attribution was proposed.		
5.1.11	The Inception Report specifies that the evaluation will follow the UNEG Norms and Standards as well as the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. weblinks: http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines		
5.1.12	The Inception Report provides details on ethical considerations that will be taken into account (e.g. confidentiality, ethical considerations related to children or vulnerable groups, possible conflict of interest, etc.).		
5.1.13	The methodology presented is technically sound, logistically feasible and appropriate considering the evaluation framework.		
Overall Feedback on Section 5 (3-5 sentences) - Summary of the section, highlighting what was done well and main areas for improvements.		Overall rating for section	Score
			0
		Weighting: 0,3	

6. EVALUATION WORKPLAN		Rating	Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 6.1	Is the workplan complete and containing relevant information?		
6.1.1	The evaluation phases are clearly described, including a timeline with associated activities, number of days for each team member, locations and deliverables.		
6.1.2	The roles and responsibilities of each member of the evaluation team are described.		
6.1.3	If the evaluation requires official ethical approval, the inception Report describes the process to be followed.		
6.1.4	The logistics of carrying out the evaluation are discussed and the expected roles and responsibilities from the commissioning organization(s) or oversight committee are adequately explained (e.g. assistance required from UNICEF for interview arrangements, field visits, etc.).		
6.1.5	The Inception Report describes the evaluation quality assurance process.		
Overall Feedback on Section 6 (3-5 sentences) - Summary of the section, highlighting what was done well and main areas for improvements.		Overall rating for section	Score
			0
		Weighting: 0,2	

7. ANNEXES		Rating	Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 7.1	Do the annexes contain all the relevant elements?		
7.1.1	The TORs are included in the annexes.		
7.1.2	The following elements are annexed to the Inception Report: logic model/TOC, evaluation matrix, bibliography, data collection tools (draft interview protocols, survey, case study formats), list(s) of people to be interviewed.		
Overall Feedback on Section 7 (3-5 sentences) - Summary of the section, highlighting what was done well and main areas for improvements.		Overall rating for section	Score
			0
		Weighting:	0,05
			1,00

8. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE INCEPTION REPORT		Rating	Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 8.1	Is the Inception Report coherent and logical?		
8.1.1	The sections of the Inception Report hold together in a logically consistent way that will allow for a coherent evaluation report.		
8.1.2	The style of the Inception Report is adequate (to the point, logically structured and easy to understand).		
Overall suggestions for improvements, suggestions made throughout the review should be listed clearly and succinctly, referring both to pages as well as individual criterion. (5-10 sentences)		Overall rating for section	Score
		Not Rated	0

Annex IV: UNICEF ESAR Quality Assurance Checklist for Evaluation Draft Reports
IDENTIFICATION OF DELIVERABLE

Title of Report		Management of	
Region		SPOA Correspondence	
Year of Report Completion		Evaluation object	
Country		Evaluation type	
TOR present		Evaluation strategy	
Date of Review		Evaluation design	
Date of 2nd review		Evaluation level	
Initials Reviewer		Geographic Scope	
Initials Reviewer 2nd Review			

RATING SCALES

	Rating	Explanation
Individual Rating Criteria Guide	Yes	Criterion is addressed.
	Mostly	Criterion is addressed, but fairly minor elements are missing or incorrect.
	Partly	Criterion is only partly addressed, two or more important elements are missing or incorrect.
	No	Criterion is not addressed.
	Not rated	Criterion could not be rated, reasons are provided.

	Rating	Score	Explanation
Section Rating Criteria Guide	Highly Satisfactory	4	Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for TOR and external contractors may rely on the information provided with a high degree of assurance.
	Satisfactory	3	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for TOR and external contractors may rely on the information provided.
	Fair	2	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for TOR in some regards, but not all. External contractors may continue to use the information with caution, but substantive improvements are possible.
	Unsatisfactory	1	Does not sufficiently meet the UNICEF/UNEG standards for TOR; and thus external contractors cannot rely on the information provided in the TOR.
	Missing	0	Important aspects of the TOR that are required by the UNICEF/UNEG standards were found to be absent and so the TOR are incomplete.
	Not Rated	not applicable	An aspect of the TOR was not rated for a legitimate reason that does not undermine the quality of the TOR.

DRAFT EVALUATION REPORT REVIEW

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)		Rating	Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 1.	Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?	#DIV/0!	
1,1	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status		
1,2	Clear and relevant description of intended beneficiaries by type (i.e., institutions/organizations, communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighborhoods, town/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation)		
1,3	Description of the relative importance of the object to UNICEF (e.g. in terms of size, influence, or positioning)		
Question 2.	Is the context of the intervention clearly described?	#DIV/0!	
2,1	Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (policy, socio-economic, political, institutional), international factors relevant to the implementation of the intervention)		
2,2	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the target groups for the intervention		
2,3	Explanation of how the context relates to the implementation of the intervention		
Question 3.	Is the results chain or logic well articulated?	#DIV/0!	
3,1	Clear and complete description of the intervention's intended results		
3,2	intervention logic presented as a coherent theory of change, logic model		
Question 4.	Are key stakeholders and their contributions clearly identified?	#DIV/0!	
4,1	identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, primary duty bearers, secondary duty bearers, and rights holders		
4,2	identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF		
-	Feedback on Section A - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	Overall rating for Section	Score
		Weighting	
		0,05	

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)		Rating	Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 5.	Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?	#DIV/0!	
5,1	Specific identification of how the evaluation is intended to be used and to what this use is expected to achieve		
5,2	Identification of appropriate primary intended users of the evaluation		
Question 6.	Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?	#DIV/0!	
6,1	Clear and complete description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the TOR		
6,2	Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation: what will and will not be covered (thematically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the TORs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention)		
-	Feedback on Section B - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	Overall rating for Section	Score
		Weighting 0,05	

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)		Rating	Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 7.	Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact. Evaluations should also consider equity, gender and human rights (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.	#DIV/0!	
7,1	Clear and relevant presentation of the evaluation framework including clear evaluation questions used to guide the evaluation		
7,2	If the framework is OTHER than UNICEF standard criteria, or if not all standard criteria of the chosen framework are included, the reasons for this are clearly explained and the chosen framework is clearly described		
Question 8.	Does the report specify methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?	#DIV/0!	
8,1	Clear and complete description of a relevant design and set of methods that are suitable for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope		
8,2	Clear and complete description of the data sources, rationale for their selection and sampling strategy. This should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this), how accuracy is ensured, and the extent to which data limitations are mitigated		
8,3	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including triangulation of multiple lines and levels of evidence (if relevant)?		
8,4	Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias?		
Question 9.	Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:	#DIV/0!	
9,1	Explicit reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability)		
9,2	Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues described (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm)		
9,3	ONLY FOR THOSE CASES WHERE THE EVALUATION INVOLVES INTERVIEWING CHILDREN: explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children		
9,4	If the Evaluation Report required an official ethical approval, it is included as an annex in the draft final evaluation report.		
-	Feedback on Section C - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	Overall rating for Section	Score
		Weighting 0,15	

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)		Rating	Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 10.	Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?	#DIV/0!	
10.1	Findings contain sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions and criteria		
10.2	If feasible and relevant to the purpose, cost analysis is clearly presented (how costs compare to similar interventions or standards, most efficient way to get expected results)-if not feasible, an explanation is provided		
10.3	Reference to the intervention's results framework in the formulation of the findings		
Question 11.	Are evaluation findings derived from the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence.	#DIV/0!	
11.1	The evaluation clearly presents multiple lines (including multiple time series) and levels (output, outcome, and appropriate disaggregation) of credible evidence.		
11.2	Findings are clearly supported by and respond to the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison.		
11.3	Unexpected effects (positive and negative) are identified and analyzed		
11.4	The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings analyze the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).		
Question 12.	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?	#DIV/0!	
12.1	Clear and comprehensive assessment of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework -including vertical and horizontal logic, M&E tools and their usage)		
12.2	Clear and complete assessment of the use of monitoring data in decision making		
-	Feedback on Section D - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	Overall rating for Section	Score
		Weighting 0,2	

SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)		Rating	Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 13.	Do the conclusions present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?	#DIV/0!	
13.1	Clear and complete description of the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings		
13.2	Description of the foreseeable implications of the findings for the future of the intervention (if formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phase)		
13.3	The conclusions are derived appropriately from findings		
Question 14.	Are lessons learned correctly identified?	#DIV/0!	
14.1	Correctly identified lessons that stem logically from the findings, presents an analysis of how they can be applied to different contexts and/or different sectors, and takes into account evidential limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.		
-	Feedback on Section E - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	Overall rating for Section	Score
		Weighting 0,15	

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)		Rating	Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 15.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?	#DIV/0!	
15,1	Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions		
15,2	Recommendations are useful to primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention and provide realistic description of how they can be made operational in the context of the evaluation)		
15,3	There is a clear description of the process for developing recommendations, including a relevant explanation if the level of participation of stakeholders at this stage is not in proportion with the level of participation in the intervention and/or in the conduct of the evaluation		
Question 16.	Are recommendations clearly presented?	#DIV/0!	
16,1	Clear identification of target group for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations)		
16,2	Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use		
-	Feedback on Section F - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	Overall rating for Section	Score
		Weighting	
		0,15	

SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)		Rating	Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 17.	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?	#DIV/0!	
17,1	Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the object evaluated, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes- list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers		
17,2	Annexes should include, when not present in the body of the report: Terms of Reference, Evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, copy of the results chain, information about the evaluator(s)		
Question 18.	Is the report logically structured?	#DIV/0!	
18,1	The structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles)		
18,2	Context, objectives and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations		
18,3	The draft evaluation report has an appropriate length? (range in pages ex. 40-60 pages)		
-	Feedback on Section G - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	Overall rating for Section	Score
		Weighting	
		0,05	

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)		Rating	Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 19.	Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity?	#DIV/0!	
19.1	Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, and/or CCC, and/or CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation		
19.2	Clear description of the level of participation of key stakeholders in the conduct of the evaluation, and description of the rationale for the chosen level of participation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering)		
19.3	Stylistic evidence of the inclusion of these considerations can include: using human-rights language; gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing; disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups; disaggregating data by socially excluded groups.		
Question 20.	Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addressed gender, equity & child rights?	#DIV/0!	
20.1	Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of equity considerations in the design and implementation of the intervention		
20.2	Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of gender in the design and implementation of the intervention		
20.3	Explicit analysis of the involvement in the object of right holders, duty bearers, and socially marginalized groups, and the differential benefits received by different groups of children		
20.4	Clear proportionality between the level of participation in the intervention and in the evaluation, or clear explanation of deviation from this principle (this may be related to specifications of the TORs, inaccessibility of stakeholders at the time of the evaluation, budgetary constraints, etc.)		
Question 21.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?	Missing requirements	
Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards		0	
21.1	GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis and indicators are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected		
21.2	Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved.		
21.3	A gender-responsive Evaluation Methodology, Methods and tools, and Data Analysis Techniques are selected.		
21.4	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation reflect a gender analysis		
-	Feedback on Section H - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	Overall rating for Section	Score
		Weighting	
		0,15	

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)		Rating	Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 22.	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?	#DIV/0!	
22.1	An executive summary is provided that is of relevant conciseness and depth for primary intended users		
22.2	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, key conclusions, key recommendations)		
22.3	Includes all the necessary information to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not contain information not already included in the rest of the report		
-	Feedback on Section I - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	Overall rating for Section	Score
		Weighting	
		0,05	
		1	
		Weighting checksum (should equal 1)	
OVERALL SCORE (max=4, min=0)		 0	Not Rated
OVERALL SECOND REVIEW SCORE (max=4, min=0)		 0	Not Rated