

**TERMS OF REFERENCE  
FOR  
EVALUATION OF SOCIAL PROTECTION FOR SDGs IN NIGERIA PROJECT**

<b>Title of Consultancy</b>	Contract to conduct a country led Evaluation of the Institutionalizing Social Protection for Accelerated SDG Implementation in Nigeria Programme (United Nations Joint SDG Fund)
<b>Objective</b>	Design and implement the evaluation of the Social Protection for SDGs in Nigeria programme (Implemented by UNICEF, ILO, UNDP, and WFP, with technical input from WHO and funded by the United Nations Joint SDG Fund)
<b>Programme Duration</b>	2 Years (January 2020 to January 2022) Now extended to June 2022
<b>Type of Contract</b>	Evaluation Firm
<b>Language Required</b>	English
<b>Location</b>	Abuja and Sokoto State
<b>Start Date</b>	TBD
<b>Duration of Contract</b>	50 Working Days
<b>Supervision</b>	UNICEF Evaluation Manager, jointly with UNDP, ILO, WFP, and WHO and RCO Data Management Results Monitoring/Reporting Officer

## 1. INTRODUCTION

UN Nigeria has been implementing the two-year Social Protection for SDGs in Nigeria programme since January 2020 with the end date of January 2022 but now extended to June 2022. To promote accountability and enhance learning and documentation, UN Nigeria in partnership with relevant government ministries (see annex 2 for list of MDAs) is commissioning a country-led evaluation of Social Protection for SDGs in Nigeria programme. These Terms of Reference (ToR) set out the purpose and objectives, scope, and methodology for an institutional contract with a team of at least three evaluation consultants. Findings and recommendations from this evaluation will strengthen the result of this project and inform the replication and scale-up of integrated social protection programmes in Nigeria. The evaluation is expected to be conducted between April 15 2022 to June 15, 2022 for a total duration of approximately 50 days.

Before the closure of the joint programmes, a final, independent and gender-responsive<sup>1</sup> *evaluation* is expected to be carried out. The final evaluation will be managed jointly by the PUNOs as per established process for independent evaluations, supervised by the RCO Data Management Results Monitoring/Reporting Officer, UNICEF Evaluation Manager, and in coordination with Evaluation Steering Committee not involved in the implementation of the joint programme. The evaluations will follow the United Nations Evaluation Group's (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, using the guidance on Joint Evaluation and relevant UNDG guidance on evaluations. The management and implementation of the joint evaluation will have due regard to the evaluation policies of the PUNOs to ensure the requirements of those policies are met; and with use of appropriate guidance from PUNOs on

<sup>1</sup> [How to manage a gender responsive evaluation, Evaluation handbook](#), UN Women, 2015

joint evaluation. The evaluation process will be participative and will involve all relevant programme's stakeholders and partners. Evaluation results will be disseminated amongst governments, donors, academic institutions and stakeholders of civil society (including workers' and employers' organizations) and a joint management response will be produced upon completion of the evaluation process to be made publicly available on the evaluation platforms or similar of the PUNOs

## **2. . BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE**

The two-Year UN \$2million Joint Programme Institutionalizing Social Protection for Accelerated SDG implementation in Nigeria” strengthens social protection at the Federal level in Nigeria. In addition, a social protection programme was implemented in Sokoto State to serve as a blueprint for other states. Overall, the project aimed to generate impact by combining an institutional approach (policy and -strengthening) with the implementation of tangible interventions focusing on innovative financing mechanisms for social protection.

The National Social Protection Policy in Nigeria recognizes the need for both a systemic transformation (long term) and a blueprint for accelerated implementation (short-term) towards universal social protection. In Sokoto State, the Joint Programme is expected to contribute to the expansion and articulation of the cash transfer and universal health insurance scheme for greater impact on social protection access and improved health, education, and nutrition, especially among vulnerable groups.

The Joint Program has 2 outcomes, 5 outputs, and addresses 5 sustainable Development Goals (SDG) targets (1.3, 2.2, 2.8, 4.1 and 10.4). It is expected that implementation of the Joint Programme will accelerate the achievement of SDGs through the institutionalizing and acceleration of social protection in Nigeria (SDG 1.3). The impact expected from the implementation of the programme is that more men and women, boys and girls living in Nigeria have improved *access* to social protection, education, and health. Overall, the project contributes to priorities defined in the United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership Framework (UNSDPF) Outcome 6 (Protection) under Result Area 2: Equitable Basic Quality Service (see attached Joint Programme Document for full programme details).

At the Federal Level, the Joint Programme supported the Federal Government of Nigeria to align its legislative framework with the policy reform agenda toward universal social protection for all by strengthening Nigeria's national social protection legal framework with the development of a social protection bill to realize the right to social protection, for consideration by the National Assembly. In addition, the Joint Programme support the Government of Nigeria to review the NSPP to renew commitment and further the social protection agenda during the short, medium, and long term in Nigeria particularly providing opportunity to cost, and create financing options for the renewed policy implementation plan and activities.

The Joint Programme in Sokoto State identified and enrolled 5,500 vulnerable groups to receive one year of health insurance coverage and provided conditional cash transfer as transportation reimbursement to 1,000 pregnant women and Children out of the 5,500 vulnerable individuals identified upon utilizing health insurance coverage (Ante & Postnatal

visit/Immunization). In addition, the Joint Programme in collaboration with the Office of the Senior Special Assistant to the President on SDGs (OSSAP-SDGs) conducted consultations in the six geo-political zones in close partnership with six identified States (Sokoto, Enugu, Nasarrawa, Delta, Lagos and Gombe) where the SDGs Accelerator/Innovation was established. The identified focal states provide their SDGs offices accelerator/innovation hubs for the zone.

### **3. PURPOSE, OBJECTICE AND SCOPE OF WORK**

**Purpose:** The purpose of this evaluation is to undertake an independent assessment of the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the SDG Joint Programme outcomes, interventions, and strategies and its contribution to the Nigerian Social Protection programme. In addition, the evaluation will examine the strengths and weaknesses for replication and accountability of United Nations towards Government and relevant Partners vis-à-vis the return of this SDG joint investment: What Works well for Whom, What didn't work, Why and What to do better in the future. The Evaluation Report will be disseminated to Government, UN RCO, UN agencies, UN Secretary-General and Development Partners. The evaluation is also for knowledge generation and learning. The evaluation will determine the reasons why certain results occurred or not to draw lessons, derive good practices and pointers for learning. It will provide evidence-based findings to inform the replication and scale-up of integrated social protection programmes in Nigeria.

**The objectives** of the evaluation are as follows:

- To assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, and sustainability of the joint programme with a focus on how it responded to the needs of the most vulnerable households, including people with disabilities.
- Assess the Performance of the JP in achieving expected results (outcomes and outputs) as committed within the Results Frameworks and Theory of Changes
- Determine the effective benefit (impact) and/or intended or unintended, higher-level effects of social protection interventions implemented in pilot Sokoto State on marginalized population regarding HH income generation and social coverage;
- To assess the extent the joint programme design, implementation and monitoring have been inclusive of men, women, boys and girls and persons with disabilities (accessibility, non-discrimination, participation of organization of persons with disables, data disaggregation by disability and gender)
- To measure the impact of Social Assistance on Livelihoods of marginalized households or population beneficiaries.
- To assess key success factors as well as key setbacks in the implementation of the SDG joint programme.
- To assess level of innovation, leveraging financing for social protection, strategic communication, and the capacity and leadership of governments and other stakeholders for ensuring that JP results are (institutionally and financially) sustainable.
- To identify and document good practices, innovative approaches and draw lessons and forward-looking recommendations to support future joint programmes and/or adapt in expanding the programme to other states including partnerships.

### **Scope:**

The evaluation will provide an independent assessment of the joint programme. It will cover the implementation of the Joint programme from January 2020 to end of June 2022 paying particular attention to the policy framework in relation to gender, including Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) and people living with disabilities, and the Outcomes Effects of the Project for communities/marginalized beneficiaries in Sokoto State. To the extent possible, the evaluation would be participatory in nature and include the views of all relevant stakeholders at the national and state levels. In line with the 'Leaving No One Behind' principle and the obligation stemming from the conventions on the rights of persons with disabilities, programme needs to ensure that persons with disabilities within the targeted population access programmes without discrimination. As persons with disabilities are among the most vulnerable and marginalized groups across countries and considering the critical role that social protection can play in supporting their inclusion, most joint programmes had identified them as direct or indirect beneficiaries and they will be part of the critical stakeholders to be interviewed during the evaluation.

The geographical scope of the evaluation will be at the Federal level, in Sokoto state, and 6 Select States (Sokoto, Enugu, Nasarawa, Delta, Lagos and Gombe) for the SDG Hubs where the JP was implemented.

The evaluation would focus on the 3 main results of the Joint Programme.

1. **The implementation of a legally and financially strengthened social protection system (SDG 1.3).** The JP is expected to have a draft SP bill which will include financial provisions on social protection expenditure of the Government presented to the National Assembly by the end of the JP. Reinforcement of Institutional framework which will accelerate progress of social protection in Nigeria.
2. **The integration of cash transfer programme to alleviate out-of-pocket expenditure in contributory health insurance under a State-financed health insurance scheme for the poorest and most vulnerable (SDG 3.8).** 5,000 poorest and most vulnerable groups are being identified to be enrolled in the State health insurance scheme. In addition, 2,100 pregnant women enrolled will be provided with transportation reimbursement through cash transfer and basis for cash transfer to pregnant women will be laid down in the State. In particular, the state cash transfer institutions will be provided with a foundation to adopt a shock- responsive social protection approach using their cash transfer mechanism in the event of future shocks.
3. Established and built the capacity of 6 state SDGs offices, to serve as innovation hub for other states' SDGs offices. The six pilot states will provide a platform to share some implementable innovative solutions that will use social protection to overcome bottlenecks and expand financing in order to accelerate SDG achievement. The JP will ensure the achievement of social protection-related SDGs can be accelerated and learning and sharing across states can be improved.

#### 4. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PRELIMINARY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation will be conducted based on the modified Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, impact and sustainability, as well as equity, gender equality, and human rights considerations including persons with disability.

The evaluation will assess to what extent did the Joint programme design, implementation, and monitoring have been inclusive of persons with disabilities (accessibility, non-discrimination, participation of organizations of persons with disabilities, data disaggregation) as well as how effectively the Joint Programme contributed to the socio-economic inclusion of persons with disabilities by providing income security, coverage of health care, and disability-related costs across the life cycle (See attached Guiding questions on Persons with Disabilities).

The suggested evaluation questions (and sub-questions) are listed by the evaluation criteria below:

**Relevance** of integrated social protection services provided in relation to the national social protection priorities and policy and the needs of households in Nigeria:

1. How relevant are the integrated social protection services to priorities and policies at the national and state levels?
  - Are the activities and outputs of the joint programme consistent with the national social protection strategy and the attainment of its objectives?
  - Have contextual factors (specific to each of the programme sites) been considered in the design and implementation and adaptation of integrated social protection services?
  - 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 women, girls and people living with disabilities?

**Coherence:** The evaluation will assess the coherence of the programme with key international commitments including gender equality, 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:

3. 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 Joint programme in achieving its set objectives and its results, including any unintended and differential results:

4. To what extent has the JP contributed to accelerating the SDGs at the national and state levels as well as contribution to UNSDPF Outcome 6?
5. What have been the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the programme objectives in providing integrated services? Did any innovations or

unintended (negative or positive) consequences arise as a result of implementation of the JP?

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

6. How efficiently has the JP been managed, given the human and financial resources available? What have been the costs, including both funds and in-kind support?
  - Have the integrated social protection services been implemented in an effective and efficient way, both in terms of human and financial resources compared to other alternatives?
  - To what extent did the JP contribute to enhancing UNCT coherence and UNCT efficiency (reducing transaction costs)?
  - Are activities low in cost and affordable (yet, of adequate quality to improve the situation of vulnerable households)?
  - 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?

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

7. To what extent has the strategy adopted by the JP contributed to sustainability of results, especially in terms of LNOB and the social protection system?
8. To what extent has the JP supported the long-term buy-in, leadership and ownership by the Government and other relevant stakeholders? How likely will the results be sustained beyond the JP through the action of Government and other stakeholders and/or UNCTs?
  - What are the lessons learned about the provision of integrated social protection services?
  - To what extent are the benefits of the joint programme likely to continue?
  - In what ways should the current joint programme approach be revised or modified to improve the sustainability of the programme services?

**Impact of Cash Transfer in Sokoto:**

9. To what extent has the Social Assistance (Cash Transfer) provided to vulnerable population in the pilot state of Sokoto has generated significant positive effects in income and social transformations to Households and communities vis-à-vis SDG1 (ending poverty) and SDG10 (reducing inequality).

## **5. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY**

A detailed methodological Inception Report will be developed by the Consortia and submit to discussions and deliberations which provide clarifications about adequate methods required to generate sound evidence to meet expectations formulated within the objective and evaluation questions. If there is an expectation to measure the impact of cash transfer on beneficiaries in pilot state of Sokoto, then appropriate quantitative method of HH data collection and analysis will be proposed by the Consortia including appropriate sampling strategy and Solid Measurement of Impact.

The evaluation will be summative and employ a participatory approach whereby discussions and surveys of key stakeholders provide/verify the substance of the findings under appropriate COVID-19 protocols. Proposals submitted by prospective consultants should outline a strong mix of methodological approaches to data collection and analysis, clearly noting how various forms of evidence will be employed and strategies for data triangulation. At the inception phase of the evaluation, the evaluation team will prepare a methodological note, which will include the evaluation matrix and outline the key data collection protocols and stakeholder mapping (to identify key informants) collected information.

Proposals should clearly outline specific roles both at the Federal level and in Sokoto State each methodological approach plays in helping to address individual evaluation questions.

**Sampling approach:**

A purposive sampling approach will be used to select the sites and the stakeholders to be interviewed as the project was implemented by specific UN entities, in specific locations. The selection will be informed by the stakeholder mapping to be undertaken during the inception phase of the evaluation. This analysis will yield information on the relevant initiatives and partners to be part of the evaluation. The evaluation team in the inception report will clearly outline the sample selection criteria and process, and any potential bias and limitations.

The sampling technique should ensure that the selected samples adequately reflect the diversity of stakeholders of the intervention and pay special attention to the inclusion, participation, and non-discrimination of the most vulnerable stakeholders. Failing to do so may affect the credibility and technical adequacy of the information gathered.

If the impact of cash transfer on beneficiaries in pilot state of Sokoto, is to be measure, then the evaluation consortia will propose appropriate quantitative method of HH data collection and analysis including appropriate sampling strategy and Solid Measurement of Impact.

**Data collection:** The evaluation will use quantitative and qualitative approaches, including literature review, statistics at national and local levels, review of survey and monitoring data, semi-structured and structured interviews, direct observation, focus groups and workshops.

Data collection methodologies shall be reviewed and assessed on the strength of their relevance with evaluation questions and objectives. The appropriateness of data collection methodologies shall be in relation to clarity of understanding of project stakeholders including country SDG JP team, officials from key ministries and the government, representatives of civil society organizations, and beneficiaries.

**Quality assurance:** The data collected should be subjected to a rigorous quality assurance for validation purposes, using a variety of tools including triangulation of information sources.

**Evaluation Matrix<sup>2</sup>:** The evaluation team will use the template of the evaluation matrix provided by the evaluation manager to systematically structure and consolidate the data collected for each of the evaluation questions. This matrix will allow them, among other

---

<sup>2</sup> Annex 1

things, to identify the missing data and thus fill these gaps before the end of the collection. This matrix will also help to ensure the validity of the data collected.

**Participation and inclusion:** This evaluation should be conducted using a participatory and inclusive approach<sup>3</sup>, involving a wide range of partners and stakeholders. The evaluation team will carry out a stakeholder mapping to identify the direct and indirect partners of the project

Stakeholder's mapping may include government, civil society organizations<sup>4</sup>, social partners, the private sector, other multilateral, and bilateral cooperation organizations and, above all, the beneficiaries of the program.

**Finalization of the evaluation questions and assumptions:** The evaluation team will finalize the evaluation questions after consultations with the evaluation steering committee. The final evaluation questions should be a reasonable number, generally not exceeding 10. They should clearly reflect the evaluation criteria as well as the indicative evaluation questions listed in this Terms of Reference. The evaluation questions will be included in the evaluation matrix (see appendix).

## 6. EVALUATION PROCESSES

### a. *Preparation phase*

The RCO will develop the TOR for the evaluation. The TOR will be shared with the participating agencies for review and final approval. The quality assurance of the joint programme Terms of reference will be provided by the SDG Fund Secretariat. In addition, the Evaluation Steering Committee (ESC) constituted for the evaluation of the UNSDPF will also provide overall oversight in the implementation of the evaluation. Once the ToR is approved by the SDG Fund Secretariat, the ToR will be published, followed by identification and recruitment of the evaluation team. Also, during the preparatory phase, the evaluation manager will assemble all relevant documents and list of key stakeholders to share with the evaluation team while also preparing the logistics for the commencement of the evaluation exercise.

### b. *Design phase*

- The consortia will undertake the conduct of the evaluation.
- Preliminary desk review of available sources. The documentation that will be made available to the evaluation team is provided under Bibliography below. The evaluation team will also be encouraged to search for information from other available sources for producing a complete desk review report.
- The consortia will discuss with project team and the ESC (see Evaluation Management, below) to: a) understand the peculiarities of the evaluation questions and refine them; b) understand relevant contextual factors and finetune the methodology accordingly.
- Preparation of the inception report: Based on the agreed template, the evaluation team will be required to submit an inception report aligned to the UNEG Norms and

---

<sup>3</sup> An inclusive approach entails ensuring the key groups are involved and that everyone involved has access to the same information on an equal basis.

<sup>4</sup> In line with the UN Disability Inclusion Strategy, it is particularly important to include Organizations of Persons with Disabilities in your outreach to civil society organizations, as they are often forgotten and represent an important stakeholder group.



Standards. The Inception Report will be subjected to quality assurance by the UN M&E group, ESC, and an ethical review. The approval of the inception report will mark the completion of the inception phase.

*c. Field Phase*

At the completion of the inception phase, the consortia will proceed to the collection of qualitative and quantitative data (key Informant interviews and focus group discussions and household survey) with key stakeholders. Also, verification of available information in secondary sources will be conducted while thorough analysis of findings will be undertaken using the developed data analysis plan and evaluation matrix. The analysis and presentation of findings would include issues relating to gender equality and empowerment of women, diversity inclusion and non-discrimination, human rights and environmental sustainability. At the end of the field phase, the consortia will present its observations and preliminary evaluation findings to the Evaluation Steering committee and the project team as well as conduct stakeholders meeting to validate the result from the evaluation.

*d. Reporting Phase*

The consortia will develop a draft report after the data collection and analysis exercise. The Leader of the Consortia will submit the evaluation report to the ESC/RCO. The consortia will address any comments or observations towards eventual finalization of the report. The final evaluation report is expected to be between 40-60 pages excluding the annexes.

*e. Management response; Dissemination and use Phase*

Following receipt of the final evaluation report, the project team will provide management response to the evaluation and determine the actions to be taken to operationalize the evaluation recommendations.

## **7. Expected deliverables**

- *Inception report* describing consortia's understanding of the assignment and which includes their detailed plan to execute it (15-20-page document). The report should also further refine the overall evaluation scope, approach, design and timeframe, and provide a detailed outline of the evaluation methodology and is to be delivered 10 days after the start of the assignment.
- *Progress report/Power Point Presentation* of findings to ESC/RCO and JP project team after completion of data collection" (the briefing periodicity to be determined in the Inception Report)
- *Comprehensive Final Evaluation Report (40-60 pages content including not more than 4-page Executive Summary and excluding annexes)*
- *A final Power Point presentation* containing the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation for dissemination and debriefing purposes.

The submission of the Inception Report, Final Evaluation Report and Management Report should be in electronic copy. The Reports should be of high quality in terms of

presentation, relevance and utility, presented in Times New Roman Text, font size 12 and have the following attributes:

- Concision: The reports should cover the required material without being irrelevant and unwieldy.
- Readability: The report should be written in English, jargon-free language and should be simple, clear and reader friendly

## 7. Workplan – Indicative timeframe

This tentative work-plan was developed with the assumption that the evaluation will be conducted by a consortia (see the *Evaluation Management* Section). The workplan matrix provides a provisional indication of major actions to be carried out throughout the evaluation process by the consortia and the required time allocation to these actions. However, the consortia can propose alternative actions and timeframes for the benefit of quality and timely evaluation. A final workplan will be approved by the ESC/RCO before the beginning of the evaluation. The workplan matrix for the evaluation team is reflected as follows:

Task		DELIVERABLES	TENTATIVE TIME	PERSONS DAYS	PAYMENT SCHEDULE
<b>Signing of Contract</b>		Contract signed	February 2022		10%
<b>INCEPTION PHASE Including Desk Review (In country)</b>					
<b>1</b>	Preliminary desk-review & Briefing with ESC & RCO	- Desk Review	April 2022	5 days	15 days 20%
<b>3</b>	Preparation of methodology, evaluation matrix, data collection tools	- Data collection tools - Revised tools		5 days	
<b>5</b>	Preparation of draft Inception Report	- Draft report		2 days	
<b>6</b>	Presentation to the ESC	- ESC and RCO feedback		1 day	
<b>7</b>	Preparation of final Inception Report (incorporation of feedback)	- Final Inception report		2 days	
<b>DATA COLLECTION and Analysis PHASE (In country)</b>					
<b>8</b>	Data Collection	KII records, Household Field	May 2022	10 days	20 days 40%
<b>9</b>	Analysis & Presentation of preliminary findings	Data collection & FGD transcription		10 days	

REPORT WRITING PHASE					
10	Preparation of draft evaluation report (In country)	- Tabulations - Draft report	May 2022	10 days	15 days 30%
11	Preparation of final evaluation report	Presentation	June 2022	5 days	

## 8. Management of the evaluation

### a. The steering committee

As per UNEG norms and standards, the evaluation will involve all key stakeholders in order to bolster ownership of the evaluation findings. In line with these standards, the following groups of stakeholders will manage the evaluation:

Who: Actors and Accountability	What: Roles and Responsibilities
RC Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lead the preparation of TORs</li> <li>▪ Facilitate solicitation, selection and recruitment of the evaluation team members.</li> <li>▪ Ensure close communication with the evaluation team during the whole evaluation process.</li> <li>▪ Facilitate communication between the evaluation team and the Project team, ESC stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Help arrange the travel to the project site and other logistic issues.</li> <li>▪ Consolidate the feedback on the evaluation reports, and send it to the Team Leader within 7 days</li> <li>▪ Facilitate dissemination of evaluation reports to stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Convenes the meetings of the ESC</li> </ul>
Evaluation Steering Committee (ESC) will comprise a selected group of representatives from the Government, UN agencies, The ERG will be chaired by the RCO and Government of Nigeria.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Contribute to the TORs and evaluation process;</li> <li>▪ Contribute to the final selection and validation of evaluation questions</li> <li>▪ Participate in the review and validation of the evaluation methodology and provide comments to the evaluation team.</li> <li>▪ Support the evaluation team in identifying the places to be visited for data collection</li> <li>▪ Facilitate access of the evaluation team to information sources (documents and interviewees) to support data collection,</li> <li>▪ Provide logistics support during evaluation field work and supervise the field work</li> <li>▪ Provide technical inputs and comments on the main deliverables of the evaluation, including the design, draft, and final reports,</li> <li>▪ Safeguard the independence of the evaluation exercise and ensure quality of evaluations</li> <li>▪ Advise on the quality of the work done by the evaluation team,</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assist in the integration of the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation into future programme design and implementation.</li> <li>▪ Approve final report</li> <li>▪ Approve the evaluation management response and its implementation plan</li> </ul>
--	---

## **b. The Evaluation Team**

### *i. Roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team*

The evaluation will be conducted through an institutional contract with an evaluation firm. The proposed evaluation team for the consortia will consist of at minimum one (1) senior-level consultant (Team Leader) to conduct the evaluation that will be supported by at least two (2) additional consultants (Team Member/Technical Experts). 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 Nigeria 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.

The Team Leader will be responsible for undertaking the 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 English and communication of the evaluation results.

Two (2) Team Member/Technical Experts responsible for assessment of one outcome each:

- 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 visualization.
- 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 English communication and report writing skills.
- Familiarity with the local language and culture are required in Sokoto

The Team Members 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 consortia should ensure that there is gender balance in the evaluation team 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.

#### **Evaluation Ethics:**

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG “Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation”. The consultants will safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing the collection and reporting of data. The evaluation team will respect the confidentiality of information handled during the assignment and note that documents and information provided must be used only for the tasks related to the terms of reference of this evaluation. The team will sign an undertaking that as members of the evaluation team they will not use the data for their own research purposes, nor license the data to others, without the written consent of UN Nigeria. *For details on the ethics and independence in evaluation, please see UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Norms for Evaluation in the UN System <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/>*

#### **10. Evaluation budget and payments**

Remuneration will be in accordance with the UN Rules and Regulations and will be commensurate with the complexity of the assignment based on the signed contract. The

Consultancy fee will be paid in line with the following schedule and upon acceptance of key deliverables:

- At the signing of the Contract: 10%
- At the submission and *approval of the inception report*: 20%
- After the presentation of the preliminary finding: 40%
- At the end of the Evaluation exercise: 30%

## **11. Bibliography**

- SDG Joint Programme document
- List of national stakeholders by areas of intervention
- Evaluation Matrix Template
- <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-risks-report-2021>.
- Joint Programme Quarterly reports

## 12. ANNEXES

### ii) Tentative List of stakeholders

#### PUNO and Partners:

##### **PUNO**

Convening agency: UNICEF – Peter Hawkins, [phawkins@unicef.org](mailto:phawkins@unicef.org) Country Representative  
Other PUNO (receiving funds)

- ILO – Vanessa Phala, [phala@ilo.org](mailto:phala@ilo.org) Director
- UNDP – Mohamed Yahya, [Mohamed.yahya@undp.org](mailto:Mohamed.yahya@undp.org) Resident Representative
- WFP – Ronald Sibanda, [ronald.sibandaq@wfp.org](mailto:ronald.sibandaq@wfp.org) Representative and Country Director a.i
- WHO – Walter Kazadi, [walterk@who.int](mailto:walterk@who.int), Representative

#### **16.2 Partners**

National authorities:

- **Ministry of Finance, Budget and National Planning** (Sanjo Faniran, MBNP, [depofaniran@gmail.com](mailto:depofaniran@gmail.com) - Deputy Director for Social Development, Ministry of Finance, Budget and National Planning – custodians of the National Social Protection Policy)
- **Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs, Disaster Management and Social Development** (Mr. Valentine Ezule [valo142000@yahoo.com](mailto:valo142000@yahoo.com) - Deputy Director, Social Protection Services)
- **National Social Safety Nets Coordinating Office** (Apera Iorwa, [iapera05@gmail.com](mailto:iapera05@gmail.com) – National Coordinator)
- **National Cash Transfer Office (NCTO)** under the National Social Investment Office (Dr. Tope Sinkaiye, [topsinkaiye@yahoo.com](mailto:topsinkaiye@yahoo.com) - National Coordinator of the National Cash Transfer Office)
- **National Health Insurance Scheme** (Dr. Kurfi Abubakar, [abukurfi@gmail.com](mailto:abukurfi@gmail.com) – Head of International Partner Relations)
- **Office of the Senior Special Assistant to the President on SDGs** (OSSAP-SDGs) (Princess Adejoke Orelope-Adefulire – Senior Special Assistant to the President on the SDGs, Rose Keffas [rose.keffas@sdgs.gov.ng](mailto:rose.keffas@sdgs.gov.ng))
- **Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment** (Mrs. Dorcas Ayiboye, [dorcacasebun62@gmail.com](mailto:dorcacasebun62@gmail.com) – Director of Social Security and Cooperatives)
- **Sokoto State Ministry of Budget and Economic Planning** (Mr. Sani Abdullahi, [saniguru454@gmail.com](mailto:saniguru454@gmail.com) – Desk Officer)
- **Sokoto State Contributory Health Insurance Management Agency** (Mr. Abubakar Hassan, [abuhassan200@gmail.com](mailto:abuhassan200@gmail.com), Director, Programs)
- **Sokoto State Government, Ministry of Education** (Mr. Mahmuda Galadima, [galadima114@gmail.com](mailto:galadima114@gmail.com) - State Programme Implementation Unit Coordinator for the Girls Education Cash Transfer Programme)
- **Sokoto State Zakat Commission** (Muhammad Lawal Maidoki, CEO Zakat Commission), [mulamaidoki@gmail.com](mailto:mulamaidoki@gmail.com))
- **Sokoto State Ministry of Women and Children Affairs** (Hajiya Kulu Abdullahi Sifawa Honourable Commissioner) Sokoto State Scheme for Social Health Insurance (SOHEMA)(Mr. Bala Garba, [balagj2018@gmail.com](mailto:balagj2018@gmail.com) and [balagj@yahoo.com](mailto:balagj@yahoo.com) – Director)
- **State SDGs Office** (Dr. Zainab Sani – +234-8062332372)

Civil society organizations:

- **Federation of Muslim Women (FOMWOM)** – Maryam Amina, [maryamamina@yahoo.com](mailto:maryamamina@yahoo.com)

Social partners:

- **Nigeria Labour Congress (NLC)** – Emmanuel Okechukwu, General Secretary ([gsec@nlcng.org](mailto:gsec@nlcng.org))
- **Trade Union Congress of Nigeria (TUC)** - Musa Lawal, Secretary General, ([sescan2000@yahoo.com](mailto:sescan2000@yahoo.com))
- **Nigerian Employers' Consultative Association (NECA)**, Timothy Olawale, Director General ([tim@neca.org.ng](mailto:tim@neca.org.ng))

Private sector:

**The SDG Private Sector Advisory Group** (<http://psagnigeria.org/>, Mr. Oluseyi Ojorongbe, [oluseyi-ojorongbe@sahara-group.com](mailto:oluseyi-ojorongbe@sahara-group.com))

IFIs:

- **World Bank** (Fanen Ade, [fade@worldbank.org](mailto:fade@worldbank.org) Social Protection Specialist, Nigeria Country Office)

Other partners:

- **European Union Delegation** (Montse Pantaleoni, [montse.pantaleoni@eeas.europa.eu](mailto:montse.pantaleoni@eeas.europa.eu) Head of Sector Resilience)
- **UK Department of International Development** (Sam Coope, [s-coope@dfid.gov.uk](mailto:s-coope@dfid.gov.uk) - Senior Social Development Advisor)
- **USAID** (Stephen Haykin, [shaykin@usaid.gov](mailto:shaykin@usaid.gov) Mission Director)
- **Save the Children** (Ms. Karina Lopez, [karen.lopez@savethechildren.org](mailto:karen.lopez@savethechildren.org) - National Programme Manager Child Grant Development Programme in Nigeria)

**Note;** The comprehensive list with the names of focal persons and their contact information is currently being collated and will be presented to the evaluation team during inception phase

### iii) Outline for Reports

#### A) Outline for Inception report

- Introduction
- Analysis of the context
- Evaluation criteria and evaluation questions
  - Criteria
  - Questions
- Methodology for conducting the evaluation
  - Methodology
  - Evaluation Approach
  - Quality assurance



- Evaluation process
- Workplan
- Management of the evaluation
  - Roles and responsibility of the evaluation team
  - Composition of the evaluation team
- Proposed Evaluation Budget and payment schedule

*Annexes:*

- Completed Evaluation matrix
- Data Analysis plan
- Data collection tool for each group of respondents
- List of respondents
- List of documents
- Outline of the final report

Any other relevant material that supports the evaluation findings and recommendations

B) Outline for final evaluation Report

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Analysis of the context
- Description of the evaluation methodology
- Key findings
- Conclusions
- Practical, actionable recommendations
- Limitations and Lessons Learned
- Annexes including:
  - Evaluation ToRs
  - Evaluation matrix
  - Inception report (including gaps and stakeholders' analyses)
  - List of respondents and sites visited
  - Summary of field interviews
  - List of documents reviewed
  - Data Collection Instruments
  - Bibliography

Any other relevant material that supports the evaluation findings and recommendations.

## Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix Template

Evaluation Question 1: To what extent...			
Assumptions <sup>5</sup> to be assessed	Indicators	Sources of Information	Methods and tools for data collection
Assumption 1			
<p><i>Evaluators must fill in this box with all relevant data and information gathered during the field phase in relation to the elements listed in the “assumptions to be assessed” column and their corresponding indicators. The information placed here can stem from: documentary review, interviews, focus group discussions, etc. Since the filled matrix will become the main annex of the final evaluation report, the evaluation team leader and evaluation manager must ensure that all of the information displayed:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Is directly related to the indicators listed above</i></li> <li>• <i>Is drafted in a readable and understandable manner</i></li> <li>• <i>Makes visible the triangulation of data</i></li> <li>• <i>Has source(s) that are referenced in footnotes</i></li> </ul>			
Assumption 2 <i>(See example in Tool 1)</i>			
Assumption 3 <i>(See example in Tool 1)</i>			
Evaluation Question 2: To what extent...			
Assumptions to be assessed	Indicators	Sources of Information	Methods and tools for data collection
Assumption 1 <i>(See example in Tool 1)</i>			
Assumption 2 <i>(See example in Tool 1)</i>			
Assumption 3 <i>(See example in Tool 1)</i>			
Evaluation Question n: To what extent...			
Assumptions to be assessed	Indicators	Sources of Information	Methods and tools for data collection
Assumption 1 <i>(See example in Tool 1)</i>			

<sup>5</sup> Assumptions are interfaces between the evaluation question and the data sources. It narrows the evaluation question further by specifying what evaluators should focus on and what they should check precisely when attempting to answer the question.

