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Purpose
To generate practical solutions to improve the coverage and quality of UNICEF response to humanitarian crises in complex high threat environments.

Timeline
The evaluation will be undertaken in two phases:
1. Inception and Pilot Phase, involving one country based case study and two desk/interview-based case studies and reviews (4 months, provisionally September – December 2017);
2. Main Evaluation Phase, involving further case studies, analysis, consultation and reporting (6 months, provisionally January 2018 - June 2018).

Reporting to
Evaluation Manager (Senior Evaluation Specialist: Humanitarian), UNICEF Evaluation Office

1 Introduction
The UNICEF Evaluation Office (EO) wishes to commission an institution (consultancy firms, university) to undertake an evaluation of the ‘Coverage and Quality of UNICEF Humanitarian Response in Complex/High-Threat Environments’ (the evaluation), which forms part of the EO Plan for Global Thematic Evaluations 2014–2017. The plan has been decided in consultation with the UNICEF Executive Board.

This Terms of Reference (TOR) has been prepared by EO, in consultation with an internal Reference Group, and drawing on a Scoping Report, which provides important additional background information.\(^1\) As explained below, the evaluation will be preceded by a Learning Phase, the results of which will become available before the evaluation begins.

2 Evaluation background, rationale and use

2.1 Background
UNICEF is mandated by the United Nations General Assembly to advocate for the protection of children’s rights, to help meet their basic needs and to expand their opportunities to reach their full potential. The organization is committed to continually improve its performance for children, including in humanitarian settings.

Emergencies\(^2\) have negatively affected children’s and women’s rights’ realization, both directly (i.e., through death, injury, and loss of protective forces) and indirectly (i.e., by disproportionately affecting poor countries and eroding development gains).\(^3\) Accordingly, the call to humanitarian action has been central to UNICEF’s mandate since the Organization’s inception in December 1946, when it was originally named the United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund. Later, the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and its Optional Protocols further articulated UNICEF’s mandate and mission.

The CRC and its associated Protocols identified the universal rights enshrined within it as inalienable – and non-severable during emergencies – and conferred specific rights and duties in emergency

\(^1\) Please note that in case of any discrepancy, the Terms of Reference supercedes the Scoping Report.


situations. The Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action (‘the CCCs’), revised in 2010, constitute UNICEF’s central policy on how to uphold the rights of children affected by humanitarian crisis. They provide UNICEF and its partners with a framework for humanitarian action, and commit it to help realize these rights in emergencies. The CCC indicators are also part of the UNICEF’s Strategic Plan, and thus a core business of the organization. The CCCs have a programme commitments for each one of UNICEF sectors of intervention and operational commitments adapted to the phase of the humanitarian response (Preparedness, Response and Early Recovery). Each Commitment also has its corresponding benchmark.

Over time, UNICEF’s role in emergencies has grown to keep pace with escalating needs. An estimated 535 million children – nearly one in four – live in countries affected by conflict or disaster, often without access to medical care, quality education, proper nutrition and protection. More than 1 in 10 children are living in countries and areas affected by violent, often protracted conflicts, translating to nearly 250 million children living in countries affected by conflict. Natural disasters continue to endanger the wellbeing of hundreds of millions of children living in areas prone to floods, droughts, cyclones earthquakes and, tsunamis. Climate change poses an ever more serious threat to children, with over half a billion children living in flood-prone areas and nearly 160 million living in high drought-risk regions. Children are also facing a new generation of fast-spreading epidemics like Ebola.

Figure 1 provides a snapshot of UNICEF’s role in emergencies over the past decade. In 2014, 98 UNICEF country offices (COs) responded to 294 humanitarian situations, including large-scale Level 3 responses to the crises in the Central African Republic, Iraq, the Philippines, South Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, and the Ebola outbreak in West Africa. In 2015, this had grown to 102 COs and 310 humanitarian situations. As significant as the number of such crises, is the importance of their intensity and the extent and nature of the threats, vulnerabilities and needs to which they give rise.

---


5 Nutrition, Health, WASH, Child Protection, HIV/ AIDS and Education


7 UNICEF Press Release, “Nearly a quarter of the world’s children live in conflict or disaster-stricken countries” December, 2016. [https://www.unicef.org/media/media_93863.html]

8 UNICEF 2016 Humanitarian Action for Children; [www.unicef.org/appeals/]


Over the past decade, financial resources contributed by partners to support UNICEF’s work in responding to the needs of children affected by crisis have increased almost three-fold. More than one-third of overall UNICEF funds are allocations to emergencies. Figure 2 shows the funding received since 2006. In 2015, UNICEF received US$1.780 billion in revenue, an increase of nearly US$1.2 billion compared to 2006. The increase in funding has enabled UNICEF to support multiple, simultaneous large-scale emergencies requiring organization-wide response, including in the Central African Republic, Iraq, Nepal, South Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yemen.

Complex high threat environments refer to humanitarian contexts that are multidimensional in nature - where multiple complexity factors converge and that are political and politicized. This includes but is not limited to armed conflict, restricted access to affected populations, civil or political upheaval, and large scale violations of international humanitarian and human rights law. While programme interventions for all humanitarian situations have their fair share of challenges, the general consensus is that humanitarian response in complex high threat environments has some unique challenges vis-à-vis risks management and principled humanitarian action (which comprises assistance, protection and advocacy). Many of these environments are characterized by fragile or failing political and social institutions, weak governance, limited state capacity or will to respond to needs, and/or affected


12 Change in accounting policy to IPSAS on 1 January 2012 does not allow for comparisons between 2012 figures and prior years
populations living in areas under the control of non-state entities. In 2015, UNICEF responded to 301 humanitarian situations in 102 countries, of which 63 were socio-political crises, including in countries, such as Syria, South Sudan, Yemen, Burundi, Central African Republic, Iraq, Afghanistan, Somalia, Ukraine, Nigeria.

Children in countries affected by armed conflict face grave threats and are affected in various ways, ranging from direct killings and injuries, of becoming victims of sexual violence, of being separated from their families, of being recruited and used by parties to conflict, and suffering extreme distress, to more subtle, yet persistent and irreversible effects on schooling, health, nutrition, future opportunities and overall well-being. In complex high threat environments, the most vulnerable people are often located in hard-to-reach or the most insecure locations. Humanitarian response in these settings is conducted in a difficult political and highly insecure environment. As a result, coverage and quality of the humanitarian assistance has been a significant challenge in most complex high threat environments, since insecurity and inaccessibility have limited organizations' capacity to implement, manage and adequately monitor humanitarian response.

UNICEF aims to meet humanitarian needs in a timely, appropriate, effective and efficient manner, in adherence with the humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality, and independence, and in line with UNICEF’s CCC and equity approach, endeavouring to reach the most vulnerable and marginalized. Complex high threat environments can pose significant challenges to these principles and objectives, including in working with other humanitarian partners to provide humanitarian assistance to affected populations. Under Humanitarian Reform, sector coordination among the wider Humanitarian Country Team is guided by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Cluster Approach. The aim of the Cluster Approach is to strengthen system-wide preparedness and technical capacity to respond to humanitarian emergencies by ensuring that predictable leadership in the main sectors leads to predictable and effective humanitarian response. UNICEF is the global and country cluster lead agency for nutrition and WASH, and with Save the Children, co-lead agency for education. UNICEF is also the lead agency for the Child Protection Area of Responsibility which falls under the Protection Cluster.

Coverage is important in reflecting UNICEF activities in terms of geography and reach, sectoral or thematic focus, in resource allocations and expenditure. Where UNICEF’s humanitarian access is hindered due to high security threat environments or as a result of restrictions imposed by authorities or other actors, it has become critical to adopt innovative approaches in order to deliver on UNICEF’s mandate and the CCCs. For example, remote programming and third party monitoring have been options used in various locations, given the negative consequences of suspending UNICEF activities which outweigh the risks of implementing the remote programming modality.

2.2 **Rationale for the evaluation**

The challenges of managing around security/access constraints and quality of UNICEF’s programming has emerged in several recent UNICEF evaluations. The evaluation of the UNICEF humanitarian

---


14 Whereby human suffering must be addressed wherever it is found. The purpose of humanitarian action is to protect life and health and ensure respect for human beings. ([https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/OOM-humanitarianprinciples_eng_June12.pdf](https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/OOM-humanitarianprinciples_eng_June12.pdf))

15 Humanitarian actors must not take sides in hostilities or engage in controversies of a political, racial, religious, or ideological nature.

16 Humanitarian action must be carried out on the basis of need alone, giving priority to the most urgent cases of distress and making no distinctions on the basis of nationality, race, gender, religious belief, class or political opinion.

17 Humanitarian action must be autonomous from the political, economic, military or other objectives that any actor may hold with regards to the areas where humanitarian action is being implemented.
response in complex high-threat environments aims to provide a deeper, more systematic and objective analysis across country contexts, of the extent to which UNICEF is succeeding or failing to reach affected populations with principled and high quality programming in complex high threat environments; and how this is attributable to the limits of humanitarian action vis-à-vis political spheres and the conflict dimension (where applicable). This, in turn, should enable UNICEF to innovate and introduce alternative approaches and mitigation measures that will improve the coverage and quality of UNICEF action in such challenging contexts.

The evaluation is important to UNICEF. UNICEF would like to take stock of the effectiveness of its response to crises in high-profile complex high threat environments, where a large and increasing percentage of its humanitarian-related expenditure is focused (UNICEF’s total humanitarian expenditure for 2015 was calculated at US$1.658 billion, 37 per cent of total expenditure, with the bulk of humanitarian expenditure concentrated in countries with complex high threat environments).18

Following consultations between the Director of Evaluation and the Evaluation Committee, the evaluation has been included in the Evaluation Office (EO) Plan for Global Thematic Evaluations, 2014–2017, submitted to the UNICEF Executive Board, which states:

‘A thematic evaluation of the UNICEF humanitarian response in complex high-threat environments would allow for a deeper and more systematic analysis with a view to further improving, where possible, the coverage and quality of UNICEF action in such challenging contexts’19.

2.3 Evaluation use

The evaluation will be used to generate consensus and a global action plan to improve UNICEF’s performance in its response to humanitarian crises in complex high threat environments. The end client for the evaluation is the UNICEF Executive Board. Internally, the primary stakeholder for the evaluation is the Office of Emergency Programmes (EMOPS) as the division responsible for policy, guidance and support for UNICEF’s humanitarian action. Implementation of any recommendations emerging from the evaluation for the improvement of UNICEF’s response in complex high threat environments will require a collective effort across UNICEF’s regions and divisions. A management response will be prepared following the evaluation and will assign responsibilities for an agreed set of actions to divisions and offices, as required.

3 Purpose and objectives of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to generate practical solutions for the improvement of the coverage and quality of UNICEF response to humanitarian crises in complex high threat environments.

The objectives of the evaluation are:

1. To capture good practice and innovations that are improving humanitarian action in complex high threat environments and analyse their potential for more general application by UNICEF.
2. To assess the coverage and quality of UNICEF’s humanitarian action based on a sample of complex high threat environments, including identifying internal and external enabling factors and challenges;
3. To identify internal and external enabling factors and challenges to UNICEF fulfilling its protection mandate and role in complex high threat environments, including its designated

---

18 UNICEF (2016), Annual Results Report 2015 Humanitarian Action
19 Executive Board document E/ICEF/2016/3, para 22
role in the Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism\textsuperscript{20} resulting from UN Security Council resolutions on Children Affected by Armed Conflict;

The detailed evaluation questions that need to be investigated through this evaluation are included in Annex 1. Bidders are invited to comment on them and propose adjustments, deletions or additional questions as they feel appropriate. While the comments made on the annex will be considered within the technical review, the actual final decisions on the detailed questions will be taken in the inception phase.

\subsection*{3.1 Scope of the evaluation}

- **Period to be covered**: The evaluation will assess coverage and quality of UNICEF’s response in selected, on-going humanitarian responses in complex high threat environments for the period from January 2015 to the present. With respect to past responses in CHTE, the evaluation will only rely on prior evaluations, reviews and monitoring data.
- **Thematic focus (UNICEF and partners)**. The evaluation focuses on coverage and quality of UNICEF’s humanitarian response in complex high threat environments:
  - **Coverage** is defined as: ‘the extent to which major population groups facing life-threatening suffering are being (or were) reached by humanitarian action’.\textsuperscript{21} For UNICEF, the concept of coverage also includes the extent to which UNICEF is identifying and reaching the most vulnerable and in need, and is addressing differences in vulnerability due to, for example, age and gender, and disability.
  - **Quality** of humanitarian response has no definition in UNICEF. For the purposes of the evaluation, the assessment of quality is understood to be \textit{the degree to which UNICEF is adhering to the benchmarks set out in its Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action (CCCs) in complex high threat environments, and also supplementary commitments the organisation has made to: 1) the Core Humanitarian Standard\textsuperscript{22} (and related Commitments for Accountability to Affected Populations), 2) technical standards for humanitarian programming (primarily the Sphere standards\textsuperscript{23} and the INEE minimum standards\textsuperscript{24} and the Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action), and 3) the high level common themes of the World Humanitarian Summit and accompanying Grand Bargain commitments as they have been reflected in the new UNICEF Strategic Plan 2018-2021,\textsuperscript{25} notably coherence and connectedness between humanitarian and development programming, AAP, localization and strengthening social protection measures including the use of cash-based transfers in humanitarian response. In assessing performance, the evaluation will recognise that this list represents a mixture of well-established and new commitments by UNICEF and that the qualitative aspects of these commitments overlap to a considerable degree. The evaluation will take advantage of and feed into an ongoing process within the organization to develop a framework that helps interpret and show the convergence and relationships between these references on quality. That said, the evaluation will focus on understanding the extent to which UNICEF uses and interprets these programming and sector standards in complex high threat environments, and providing an

\begin{itemize}
  \item For further information on MRM click here
  \item Evaluation of Humanitarian Action Guide, ALNAP/ODI, 2016, p114
  \item https://corehumanitarianstandard.org/the-standard
  \item http://www.sphereproject.org/
  \item http://www.ineesite.org/en/minimum-standards
  \item As neither the WHS nor Grand Bargain commitment process were official member state processes, they are not referenced explicitly in the Executive Board document; that said the core themes and issues have been integrated into the SP narrative and results framework. The new Strategic Plan is pending approval by the Executive Board in September 2017.
\end{itemize}
analysis of the extent to which quality standards can realistically be adhered to, and the quality ‘trade-offs’ that are appropriate for UNICEF to make in such contexts.

- **Sectoral coverage:** The evaluation has no specific sector focus and will assess performance in all sectors where UNICEF plays a leading role in complex high threat environments.

- **Geographic coverage:** This is a global evaluation and aims to generate learning and proposals for the enhancement of UNICEF’s performance in all the complex high threat environments where UNICEF operates. The evaluation will generate evidence using a case study approach, with a total of 12 case studies covering 4-5 UNICEF regions, as detailed under evaluation methodology, below.

## 4 Evaluation approach

In its approach, the evaluation is expected to:

1. **Address issues specific to complex high threat environments.** The evaluation will focus on a number of core issues (to be agreed in the learning phase) specific to humanitarian response in these environments. While a number of challenges faced by UNICEF in responding in complex high threat environments may be general to all UNICEF humanitarian responses, the evaluation will focus on whether, and if so how, these challenges uniquely play out in complex high threat contexts.

2. **Focus on the field.** The primary data to be collected by the evaluation is *good practice* and *innovation* by UNICEF country offices and their partners operating in complex high threat environments. In the evaluation, considerations of theory, policy and guidance are secondary to the improvement of field practice.

3. **Add value to the field.** Where UNICEF country teams are engaged in the evaluation, they should derive some direct benefit for the current humanitarian response. The evaluation team will provide real-time feedback on the initial case study findings to the UNICEF country office before the team leaves the country.

4. **Be learning focused.** As in all UNICEF evaluations, the evaluation will combine accountability with learning. However, the emphasis is more on learning than on accountability. The evaluation will take an inductive approach to extract lessons from field practice.

5. **Assess UNICEF contribution.** Humanitarian response is a collective multi-stakeholder enterprise. The evaluation will assess UNICEF’s contribution to results, more than direct attribution.

6. **Be consultative.** The evaluation manager and the evaluation team will ensure that key stakeholders are consulted on emerging findings and recommendations to ensure that they are tested, refined and actionable.

7. **Build on past evaluative exercises.** The evaluation should maximise the use of past evaluations and lessons learned exercises and engage country and regional offices to provide evidence that is not already available elsewhere.

Bidders are invited to propose how they will carry out the evaluation in line with this approach.

## 5 Evaluation phasing

1. **This is the first UNICEF evaluation focused specifically on its humanitarian action in complex high threat environments.** As noted above, UNICEF does not have one clear set of measures for quality in humanitarian programming. For all these reasons, the evaluation has been designed to follow
a phased approach, so that the concepts, scope and methodology employed are well understood and tested before the main evaluation is launched.

2. The evaluation is preceded by a Scoping phase, the report from which is complete and available to bidders, and a Learning phase, which will be completed before the evaluation begins. A document repository was assembled for the Scoping Study and for future use by the evaluation team and the documents held in the repository are listed in Annex 3. The Learning Phase is using an electronic survey to gather and document perceived good practice in increasing coverage and quality and country office perceptions of the challenges faced in complex high threat environments.

3. The evaluation itself has two phases, Phase 1 – Inception and Pilot, including pilot case studies and methodology review, and Phase 2 - the main evaluation, comprising case studies, analysis, consultation and reporting. Bidders are asked to submit proposals for Phases 1 and 2 combined.

4. The contract for the evaluation will include a break clause at the end of Phase 1. (See 7.1.4 below).

6 Evaluation methodology

6.1 Evaluation Phase 1 – Inception and Pilot (4 months)
Much of the background work for the evaluation inception report will have been provided by the scoping and learning phases. The inception period will be used to consider issues related to evaluability, orient the evaluation team, make any final adjustments to the ToR and develop the elements of the methodology.

6.1.1 Document Review
Building on this scoping exercise and the accompanying literature review, the evaluation team will undertake a more extended desk review of the following:
- UNICEF evaluations
- UNICEF policy documents
- UNICEF humanitarian training materials
- UNICEF funding data for humanitarian response in complex high threat environments
- UNICEF response plans and reports on operations in complex high threat environments
- Data on human resource deployments and recruitment to emergencies in complex high threat environment countries
- Policy and evaluation reports from a few key partners working in complex high threat environments specifically focusing on coverage and quality
- Relevant evaluations from other humanitarian organisations, and academic and research literature

6.1.2 Interviews
The inception phase will include HQ-level interviews with (provisional list):
- UNICEF – managers of key Divisions at HQ including Geneva and Copenhagen
- UN agencies - OCHA, UNFPA, UNHCR, WFP
- INGOs – e.g. NRC, IRC, MSF
- ICRC
- Donors – top 7-8 humanitarian donors to UNICEF for response to complex high threat environments
- Consultants/academics – 2-3, familiar with UNICEF’s work in complex high threat environments

And the newly established ICRC, MSF, UNHCR, WFP, and Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue Centre initiative, the Centre for Competence in Humanitarian Negotiation
The evaluation team will generate a synthesis report of the findings from the above interviews, not exceeding 20 pages, as an annex to the inception report.

**6.1.3 Pilot Case Studies**

The whole evaluation will include 12 country case studies (5 country-visit based case studies and 7 case studies based on document review and remote interviews). Phase 1 will include only three pilot case studies, one country-visit-based and two desk/interview-based. (See 7.2.2 for details of case studies). The purpose of the pilots is to test the relevance and feasibility of the proposed case study approaches. The pilot country visit based case study will be undertaken by a majority of the evaluation team members and ideally all team members who will undertake subsequent Phase 2 country visits, to ensure learning across the team is achieved in the application and any adjustments required to the case study methodology.

For Phase 1, the proposed country case studies are:
- Pakistan: Field-based case study (eight to ten days)
- Northern Nigeria: Desk and remote interview-based case study
- Ukraine: Desk and remote interview-based case study

**6.1.4 Presentation and revision of methodology and tools**

The evaluation team will present the findings of the case studies to EO and the Reference Group (RG), and propose revisions to the evaluation methodology and tools to be used for subsequent country visit based, and desk based, case studies.

If the inception and pilot phase has been satisfactorily completed, the same evaluation team will be invited by EO to conduct Phase 2, based on their original bid. If Phase 1 is not completed satisfactorily, EO will negotiate with one of the other suppliers whose bid met the requisite technical standards to revise their bid to undertake Phase 2 only, or Phase 2 may be re-advertised.

**6.2 Evaluation Phase 2 – Full evaluation (6 months)**

**6.2.1 Case Study Selection**

By December 2017, the remaining case studies for the main evaluation phase (four country-based and five desk/interview-based) will be agreed by the Director of Evaluation, advised by the Reference Group, using the criteria described in Annex 2. It is the responsibility of the Evaluation Office to make the necessary agreements with the country and regional offices concerning the inclusion of country case studies within the evaluation. The final list of case studies will be included in the inception report.

**6.2.2 Scope of the country-visit based case studies**

Each visit-based country cases study in Phase 2 will be conducted by at least two consultants for 8-10 working days in each country.

Well in advance of each country visit, the following country-level documents and data will be requested by EO:
- Current programmes, past reviews, lessons learned and evaluations
- UNICEF and interagency/government appeals
- Government policy/legislation
- Coordination and information management mechanisms
- Interagency/cluster response plans needs assessments

---

27 Given the volatility of the crises under consideration and should the operating environment change significantly, last minute changes before the country visits take place may be required.
• Data from programme monitoring systems HPMS (and MRM, GBViE IMS, where possible)
• UNICEF emergency funding overall, funding by sector
• UNICEF human resources for the emergency response
• Technical support provided to offices, including deployments from RRM, regional offices
• Relevant prior evaluations by humanitarian agencies that are available either on the UNICEF evaluation database or on the ALNAP evaluation database

Country visit based case studies will include Interviews with:
• UNICEF staff
• UN Special Representatives (where relevant), Resident/Humanitarian coordinator
• UN Integrated Mission (where present)
• UN agencies (OCHA, UNFPA, WFP, UNHCR, DPKO, OHCHR – others as relevant)
• International and National NGO partners
• Government ministries (where possible)
• Major donors to UNICEF humanitarian response, where represented. (2-3 donors should be interviewed remotely if they are not present)
• Implementing partners, including those undertaking remote programming
• The relevant UNICEF regional office and ‘regional IASC’, where active
• Others, as agreed with the country office

Desk based case studies will include remote interviews with:
• UNICEF staff
• Resident/Humanitarian coordinator
• UN Integrated Mission (where present)
• 3-4 UN agencies
• 5-7 implementing partners including INGO and, where relevant and possible, national NGOs and government ministries; this should include 2-3 involved in remote programming where this is an implementation modality
• The relevant UNICEF regional office

Visit based case studies will include:
• Beneficiary consultation. Qualitative feedback will be gathered via participatory methods (e.g. focus groups), as far as the security environment will allow (bearing in mind that the evaluation is not programme critical). The evaluation team may work with local consultants or NGOs to increase the scope for direct engagement with affected individuals/communities. Any interaction should maintain full respect for the dignity, confidentiality, privacy and security of informants, avoiding degrading and ineffective ‘flying’ visits. As far as possible, interaction with beneficiaries should be of some benefit to them, not just to the evaluation.
• Direct observation of projects, where possible. International consultants may be limited in their access to projects in high risk environments.

The result of the case studies will be a separate report for each, up to 25 pages plus annexes for the four country visit based reports, and up to 15 pages plus annexes for the five desk/interview-based case studies (total nine reports for Phase 2). Country offices, the respective regional offices, and the Reference Group will be given two weeks to send their comments to the EO on their respective draft reports. The EO will sort and assemble the comments and forward them as one set for each report to the evaluation team. The evaluation team will then have one week to finalize each report and provide detailed feedback on how the comments have been used.
6.2.3 Draft evaluation report
The first draft evaluation report will be assembled by the evaluation team according to UNICEF evaluation report standards, once the case studies are completed (or have reached the draft report stage).

6.2.4 Consultation
The emerging results of the evaluation will be discussed periodically by the Reference Groups. A selection of staff and managers from HQ/RO/CO’s affected by complex high threat environments will be invited to a 2-day meeting, to be led by the Evaluation Office and EMOPS, in partnership, to review and debate the draft report, and its proposed recommendations.

The draft evaluation results will be presented and debated at two sessions at Regional Management Team (RMT) meetings and/or Deputy Representatives and/or Operations Chiefs (DROPS) meetings to gauge participants’ response to the draft findings and recommendations (two meetings total). The team leader may be required to provide a remote presentation to these meetings.

The evaluation team (at a minimum, the evaluation team leader) will present the draft evaluation report findings and recommendations, but will not facilitate the meeting. The purpose of the workshop will be 1) to share learning from the evaluation between and beyond the case study countries, 2) validate the report’s findings and recommendations against field and political realities, and 3) generate practical action steps. This will require careful facilitation to ensure that the meeting refines the evaluation’s findings and proposed recommendations.

These consultations will not affect the independence of the evaluation. The evaluation team will use the results of the workshop at their discretion in finalizing the evaluative assessments in their report. The team is expected to take careful note of UNICEF staff feedback in crafting its recommendations to prioritize them and make them as practical, operational and realistic as possible.

6.2.5 Second Draft Report and Final Report
Using the results of the workshop and other consultations, the team leader will generate the second draft evaluation report and submit it to EO. This report will be finalized based on feedback from the EO.

6.2.6 Management Response
Once received and reviewed by EO, the Reference Group and some of the workshop participants will reconvene to debate the final evaluation findings and recommendations and to comment on the management response. Other follow up processes should then be initiated by the respective Divisions, with periodic progress reporting.

7 Evaluation Deliverables

7.1 Summary
Phase 1 will produce:

a) Inception Report
b) Pakistan Country Case Study Report (based on country visit), plus a presentation delivered before leaving the country
c) Ukraine and Nigeria Country Case Study Report (based on desk review and interviews)
d) Report on lessons learned regarding the methodology and tools to be used for future country case studies, specifically those in phase 2
e) Draft Evaluation Report based on document review, interviews at HQ and RO, and the three country case studies (above)

28 Bidders are free to propose changes to the structure of deliverables to enhance their clarity. However, products are expected to conform to the stipulated number of pages, where specified.
f) Presentation to the reference group on the draft evaluation report and a presentation on lessons learned regarding the methodology and tools

g) A global workshop / webinar to present the results of the Pilot Phase

h) Draft and Final Evaluation Report, including executive summary and annexes

Phase 2 will produce

a) Revised inception report, that draws from the Phase 1 report about revisions to the methodology and tools for country case studies

b) Four visit-based country case study reports (and presentations, delivered on leaving the country)

c) Five desk/interview-based country case study reports

d) Draft global evaluation report synthesizing the country visit-based reports and the desk-based case study reports

e) A global workshop / webinar, or other consultative process as proposed by the bidder and agreed with EO, on the evaluation report

f) Final evaluation report, plus executive summary and annexes

g) PowerPoint (or similar) presentation that summarizes the evaluation

7.2 Deliverables in Detail - Phase 1

7.2.1 Inception Report

The inception report will be instrumental in confirming a common understanding of what is to be evaluated, including additional insights into the execution of the evaluation beyond the TOR, including issues of evaluability. The evaluation team will refine and confirm evaluation questions and the scope of the evaluation, further improve on the evaluation methodology in agreement with the evaluation manager and the reference group. The report will include, *inter alia*,

- Evaluation purpose and scope – confirmation of objectives and the main themes of the evaluation;
- Evaluation criteria and questions – final set of evaluation questions, organised under evaluation criteria for assessing performance;
- Evaluation methodology – a description of data collection methods and data sources; draft data collection instruments (with a data collection toolkit as an annex); a data analysis plan; a discussion on proposed paths 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;
- Proposed structure for the final report;
- Evaluation work plan and timeline, including a travel plan;
- Resources requirements – detailed budget allocations tied to evaluation activities and deliverables.
- Annexes, including the evaluation framework and questions, data collection toolkit, and data analysis framework, stakeholders mapping, synthesis of interviews (see 7.1.2) and document review.
- The document review report will present preliminary findings from the desk-based document review and analysis of UNICEF and inter-agency documents, (assessment, planning, monitoring and evaluation, reporting) and other UNICEF and non-UNICEF research and evaluations, building on the scoping report and supporting literature review from the scoping and learning phases, with the document review not to exceed 20 pages in length.

---

29 UNICEF has instituted the Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS), a system where final evaluation reports are quality-assessed by an external independent company against UNICEF/UNEG 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 manager.
The inception report will be 15-20 pages in length, plus annexes, and will be presented at a formal meeting of the reference group. A summary of initial key informant interviews, highlighting key themes emerging from the interviews, will be annexed to the inception report.

7.2.2 Pakistan Country-visit based Case Study report
a) This report will include:
   - a description of the context and the humanitarian situation, and overview of the national and international humanitarian response;
   - a statement of findings regarding the coverage and quality of UNICEF’s humanitarian response to the crisis in question, based explicitly on the data and evidence collected;
   - an assessment of UNICEF’s strengths, weaknesses, challenges and lessons learned regarding the coverage and quality of UNICEF’s humanitarian response (highlighting those elements specific to complex high threat environments), against the evaluation criteria set out in the evaluation framework;
   - recommendations for how UNICEF can improve its humanitarian response to the crises in complex high threat environments;
   - annexes (evaluation terms of reference; background materials used; annotated description of methodology, including any limitations experienced; and, list of people /groups interviewed).

The report should not exceed 25 pages in length, excluding executive summary and annexes.

Before leaving the country, the team will prepare and deliver a presentation on the preliminary findings for the country office staff.

7.2.3 Ukraine and Nigeria Desk and interview based Country Case Study Reports
The desk based case study reports will cover the same ground as the country visit based case study but in less depth. The reports will not exceed 15 pages, plus executive summary and annexes. The desk based study will be focused on learning. They will concentrate on lessons learnt and on documenting good practices, rather than providing recommendations.

7.2.4 Report on lessons learned regarding the case study methodology and tools
This report, no more than 20 pages in length, will describe the experience of the methods and tools used in the country case studies, describe their strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations to improve the methods and tools for Phase 2.

7.2.5 Draft Evaluation Report based on document review and the three country case studies
The report will not exceed 40 pages, (excluding the executive summary and annexes). The structure of the evaluation report will be set out in the inception report. The report should cover:
   - Background, purpose and objectives of the evaluation
   - An assessment of UNICEF’s mandate, strengths, weaknesses, challenges and successes in achieving coverage and quality in its humanitarian response in complex high threat environments
   - Evaluation findings, well substantiated by the data and evidence, and cross-referenced against the evaluation questions and organised by evaluation criteria;
   - A limited and prioritised set of actionable recommendations, based on the evaluation conclusions
   - Annexes (evaluation terms of reference; bibliography and list of background materials used; annotated description of methodology; data analysis framework, list of people interviewed, etc.).
7.2.6 Reference Group Presentations
Presentation on the draft evaluation report and the report on lessons learned regarding the methodology and tool.

7.2.7 Final Evaluation Report
As per the Draft Evaluation Report, incorporating the feedback from the Reference Group.

7.3 Detail of Deliverables - Phase 2

7.3.1 Revised Inception report
Based on the Phase 1 inception report and revised based on the experience of Phase 1, the evaluation team will confirm and adjust the evaluation questions and the scope of the evaluation, and refine the evaluation methodology, based on the report about methods and tools from Phase 1, in agreement with the evaluation manager and the Reference Group. The report will include, *inter alia*, updates as agreed with the EO on evaluation purpose and scope;

- Evaluation criteria and questions, with a final set of evaluation questions for Phase 2;
- Evaluation methodology, with an updated description of data collection methods and data sources;
- Data collection instruments (with a data collection toolkit as an annex);
- A data analysis plan;
- Proposals for enhancing the reliability and validity of evaluation conclusions;
- The field visit approach;
- A description of the quality review process;\(^{30}\);
- Discussion on the limitations of the methodology;
- Proposed structure for the final report will be updated as required;
- Evaluation work plan and timeline, including a travel plan;
- Resources requirements – detailed budget allocations tied to evaluation activities and deliverables.
- Annexes, including the evaluation framework and questions, data collection toolkit, and data analysis framework stakeholders mapping

The revised inception report will not exceed 20 pages in length, plus annexes, and will be presented at a formal meeting of the Reference Group.

7.3.2 Four visit-based country case study reports
These reports will include:

- a description of the context and the humanitarian situation, and overview of the national and international humanitarian response;
- a statement of findings regarding the coverage and quality of UNICEF’s humanitarian response to the crisis in question, based explicitly on data and evidence collected;
- an assessment of UNICEF’s strengths, weaknesses, challenges and lessons learned regarding the coverage and quality of UNICEF’s humanitarian response (specifically those elements related to complex high threat environments), against the evaluation criteria set out in the evaluation framework;
- recommendations on how UNICEF can improve its humanitarian response to the crisis;
- annexes (evaluation terms of reference; background materials used; annotated description of methodology, including any limitations experienced; and, list of people / groups interviewed).

\(^{30}\) UNICEF has instituted the Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS), a system where final evaluation reports are quality-assessed by an external independent company against UNICEF/UNEG 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 manager.
The reports should not exceed 25 pages in length (excluding executive summary and annexes). Before leaving each country, the team will prepare and deliver a presentation on the preliminary findings for the country office staff.

7.3.3 Five desk-based country case study reports
The desk based case study reports will cover the same ground as the country visit based case studies but in less depth. Each report will not exceed 15 pages, plus executive summary and annexes. The desk based case studies will concentrate on lessons learnt and on documenting good practices, rather than providing recommendations.

7.3.4 Draft global evaluation report
The report will be prepared according to UNICEF evaluation reporting standards, with executive summary and annexes. The report will not exceed 50 pages, plus the executive summary and annexes. The structure of the evaluation report will be set out in the inception report. The report should cover:
- Background, purpose and objectives of the evaluation
- An assessment of UNICEF’s mandate, strengths, weaknesses, challenges and successes in achieving coverage and quality in its humanitarian response in complex high threat environments
- Evaluation findings, well substantiated by the data and evidence, and cross-referenced against the evaluation questions and organised by evaluation criteria;
- A limited and prioritised set of actionable recommendations, based on the evaluation conclusions
- Annexes (evaluation terms of reference; bibliography and list of background materials used; annotated description of methodology; data analysis framework, list of people interviewed, etc.).

The first draft of the final report will be received by the evaluation manager who will work with the team leader any revisions required before the report is shared with the Reference Group.

7.3.5 Presentations to the regional meetings and global workshop, as agreed with EO
The format and content of any presentations to regional meetings and the global workshop will be agreed with EO.

7.3.6 Final evaluation report, plus executive summary and annexes
As per 8.3.4 above, incorporating feedback from the Reference Group and other stakeholders.

7.3.7 PowerPoint (or similar) presentation
The presentation will summarize the final evaluation report purpose, methods, findings, conclusions and recommendations.

7.3.8 Webinar to disseminate the evaluation findings
1.5-2 hours online presentation and discussion, open to all UNICEF offices. It may be necessary to repeat the webinar so that all time zones can covered.

All reports will be prepared in English, according to the UNICEF House Style and UNICEF standards for evaluation reports as per the GEROS guidelines (to be shared with the winning bidder).

8 Ethical and safety considerations:
- Conventional ethical guidelines are to be followed during the evaluation. Specific reference is made to the UNEG and UNICEF ethical guidelines and code of conduct for evaluation. Any sensitive issues or concerns should be raised with the evaluation management team as soon as they are identified.
- The evaluation methodology should not introduce risks to participants in the evaluation by exploring sensitive issues that may unbalance delicate relationships between parties, or by

exposing stakeholders to security or other risks. The bidder should indicate as part of its proposal how it intends to avoid introducing harm in the conduct of the evaluation.

- Given the highly sensitive nature of some of the discussions likely to be held with UNICEF country offices concerning, for example, negotiating humanitarian access, bidders are required to show how they will maintain confidentiality of verbal and written inputs to the evaluation.
- The evaluation methodology may indicate children as informants or objects of study. In all contacts with children, the UNEG and UNICEF ethical guidelines regarding issues like confidentiality and not exposing the child to danger must be carefully respected.
- In addition to exercising ethical considerations for informed consent, no participant other than UNICEF staff may be compelled to cooperate with the evaluation. UNICEF staff are expected to participate where requested to by their management.

9 Potential Evaluation Limitations

The evaluation is likely to be subject to the limitations common to humanitarian evaluations, and perhaps more so, given the challenges of operating in complex high threat environments.

- Poor data in terms of quality and comparability in UNICEF and UNICEF partner reports and information systems
- Lack of clear programme goals against which to assess results
- Lack of records of sensitive discussions and operational decisions and reluctance of senior staff to be explicit about how such decisions were reached
- Limited access to field locations and communities because of security constraints, which may or may not be mitigated using local consultants
- The workload of busy field staff may limit the time and attention they give to the evaluation
- Staff turnover means that first hand informants from earlier phases of UNICEF humanitarian responses may not be available (partially mitigated by EO/DHR tracing staff transferred to new duty stations),
- Beneficiary participation will be relatively hard to arrange, with risks of limited added value (evaluators should either do it well, or, where this is likely to produce little benefit, not at all).

Bidders are invited to indicate how these limitations might be mitigated.

10 The evaluation team

The Evaluation Office will contract with an institution (consulting firm, research institute, university, or a vendor with similar capacities), which will offer a core team of 4-5 qualified evaluation professionals. Based on their understanding of the task, the team may choose to enlist additional expertise as they see fit, including subcontracting with national evaluation partners for field-based activities.

A well-qualified evaluation team is required for this evaluation, including an experienced humanitarian evaluation team leader with an understanding of, and past evaluation experience covering, key issues pertaining to UNICEF’s response in complex high threat environments, supported by a further 3-4 evaluation team members.

The evaluation team should demonstrate the following experience, knowledge and competencies:

- Humanitarian evaluation experience of large scale programmes
- Field experience of humanitarian response in complex high threat environments and conflict settings where access and security represent major challenges
- Previous work or consultancy experience with UNICEF and understanding of UNICEF’s mandate is desirable

32 For more information about insurance and liabilities please see Annex A of UNICEF Institutional Contracts.
• Sectoral knowledge of UNICEF programme sectors: Child Protection, WASH, Nutrition, Health, Education (of a majority, if not all, sectors), as well as the Core Commitments to Children
• Advanced understanding of humanitarian principles, humanitarian space, humanitarian access, security management, gender, equity, risk assessment, international humanitarian law, human rights law, the human rights based approach to programming, humanitarian advocacy, Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism33, ‘Do No Harm’ principles34
• Advanced understanding of UN coordination for humanitarian response (including roles of the Humanitarian Coordinator and humanitarian clusters), and interagency instruments applied to humanitarian response (strategic response planning, needs overview etc.)35
• Advanced understanding of accepted norms and standards for humanitarian response; Core Humanitarian Standards, Sphere standards, INEE, Child Protection Minimum Standards, and IASC guidance materials for protection and cross cutting issues in humanitarian response
• Advanced understanding of current humanitarian initiatives, including the results of the World Humanitarian Summit and implementation of the Grand Bargain.
• Gender balanced team and geographic regional balanced team (desirable)
• Advanced technical knowledge, skills and expertise in evaluation concepts and capacity to execute a multi-country evaluation, including field level case studies;
• Strong quantitative and qualitative data collection, and analysis and synthesis skills
• Highly developed communications skills; presentation, facilitation, and report writing in English.
• English language skills. French and Arabic language skills for interviews are an asset.

The evaluation team is responsible for its own travel insurance, including medical evacuation, and for its own security arrangements. Under a corporate contract for services, the company does not fall under UN security management arrangements, although security briefings will be provided on arrival in-country.

The evaluation team leader will:
• Report to the evaluation manager in EO;
• Work full time on the evaluation throughout its duration, and manage the evaluation team;
• Agree the work plan for all aspects of the evaluation with the evaluation manager;
• Conduct the evaluation according to UN Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2008), the UNEG Norms and Standards (2016), and UNICEF Ethical Research Guidelines involving children in humanitarian settings36;
• Prepare the evaluation report according to the UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards (2010), with all evaluation product(s) written in English (or French for any Francophone country visits);
• Ensure that the evaluation produces evidence and analysis to the highest possible standards;
• Flag any limitations/constraints to the evaluation manager at the earliest opportunity, so that, as far as possible, they can be addressed, with any outstanding limitations noted in the evaluation report;
• Propose and conduct the evaluation with appropriate methodologies;
• Ensure that confidentiality is maintained and that the evaluation does not increase physical or reputational risks for UNICEF stakeholders operating in complex high threat environments;
• Take responsibility for delivering the evaluation in accordance with the Terms of Reference;

33 https://www.unicef.org/protection/57929_57997.html
35 as detailed at https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/
36 See https://www.unicef-irc.org/research/278/
• Ensure the quality of all the evaluation products.

Current UNICEF staff and consultants may be involved as informants or in specific roles (e.g. member of the Reference Group) but are not eligible to be evaluation team members. Former UNICEF staff with the requisite experience may be proposed to be members of the evaluation team but any prior involvement with UNICEF should be declared in the technical proposal, and any conflict of interest should be declared in advance. The EO reserves the right to reject former UNICEF staff members where a possible conflict of interest may potentially exist or be deemed to exist.

11 Evaluation Stakeholders

Key stakeholders for the evaluation are as follows:

• End Client for the Evaluation – the UNICEF Executive Board
• Client for the Evaluation Team – UNICEF Director of Evaluation
• Evaluation Manager – Senior Evaluation Officer / Humanitarian, Evaluation Office
• Evaluation Office principal stakeholder for the evaluation – EMOPS and members of the RG
• Evaluation Reference Group – (see 13.2 below)
• Client for the individual country case studies – the UNICEF Country Representative

12 Evaluation Management

12.3 Evaluation Manager

The evaluation will be managed by the Evaluation Manager (EM) from UNICEF’s Evaluation Office, who will have overall responsibility for:

• facilitation of initial consultations with relevant staff in the UNICEF HQ, and arrange for subsequent meetings and consultation with the global reference group;
• day-to-day coordination and supervision of all activities of the evaluation team, and decision-making;
• technical management of all phases the evaluation, according to the terms of reference and stipulations of the inception report;
• consulting and liaising with the Evaluation Reference Group in key moments in the evaluation, including collation and rationalisation of Reference Group written comments on evaluation products;
• liaising with evaluation focal points in the case study countries;
• facilitating internal and external review and quality assurance processes, including being the liaison between UNICEF and the reference group;
• approving all deliverables, based on consultation with the EO Director;
• preparing publishing-ready versions of the reports for issuing by the Director, Evaluation Office; and
• providing overall guidance to the evaluation team on UNICEF requirements and standards for evaluative work.

12.4 Reference Group

Appointed by the Director, Evaluation Office, a Reference Group (RG) will provide advice to the evaluation, with members responsible for receiving and responding to progress updates and evaluation products by deadlines agreed by the group. The RG will undertake any additional consultations required within their own Divisions/Offices and review the inception report, the draft country case studies, and the draft and final draft reports. The RG will provide written comments on key evaluation products to the evaluation team through the evaluation manager. The RG will contribute to the consultation processes, management response, action plan and dissemination strategy post-evaluation. The RG membership includes:
- Senior Evaluation Specialist (Humanitarian), Evaluation Office, who will chair the reference group;
- One Senior Advisor (Security) and the Humanitarian Policy Specialist for CHTE, Office of Emergency Programmes (EMOPS);
- One Senior Advisor, Programme Division (PD);
- Supply Specialist, Supply Division (SD)
- One Regional Emergency Adviser
- One Regional Evaluation Adviser

12.5 Evaluation Focal Points

For all case studies, and well in advance, the UNICEF Country Office will be invited by the Director of Evaluation to designate a focal point for the evaluation, whose role will be to facilitate communication between the evaluation team and the staff of the country office, and to provide the necessary assessments, plans, reports and other background documentation. In the case of country visits, the focal point will assist with the planning of the evaluation team’s itinerary and appointments and other logistical support, as required.

13 Evaluation of proposals

As stipulated in Section 11, we estimate that the evaluation can be duly executed by a team of 4-5 evaluators/consultants with the right mix of skills and expertise. However, bidders have the right to vary the team size, with proper justification for allocation of work and cost. This section presents a few guidelines for proposal submission, and should be read together with the RFPS.

13.1 Content of the proposers’ technical proposal

The written technical proposal will be in PDF format and include the following elements as a minimum requirement:

A. Request for proposals for services form (provided in RFPS)
B. Presentation of the bidding institution, or institutions if a 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 member, in addition to the signed consortium agreement.
   - In case of a consortium, only one must be identified as the organization lead in dealing with UNICEF
C. Narrative description of the bidding institution’s team experience and capacity, as articulated in Section 11 of the TOR, and includes the following areas:
   - Evaluations of Humanitarian Action of large scale programmes
- Field experience of humanitarian response in complex/high threat environments and conflict settings
- Previous and current assignments
- Capacities, including the ability (if part of the proposed methodology) to locate and manage local partners in the case study countries proposed as case studies in this Terms of Reference (ToR).

D. Relevant references of the proposer (past and on-going assignments) in the past 7 years (use template provided in Annex 4.1). UNICEF may contact references persons for feedback on services provided by the proposers.

E. Samples or links to previous relevant work listed as reference of the proposer (at least 3), on which the proposed key personnel directly and actively contributed or authored.

F. Methodology. The proposal should be written in a manner that minimizes repeating what is stated in the ToR, but references to sections of the ToR can be made. If in doubt, ensure sufficient detail. Required content is as follows:
   - Understanding of and comments on the context and rationale for the evaluation, based on proposers’ knowledge, experience and familiarity with the available literature
   - Understanding of and comments on the evaluation scope.
   - Comments on the evaluation criteria, key evaluation questions, and areas of particular interest.
   - Understanding of, comments on, and in-depth analysis of the aspects of complexity, potential challenges, risks and ethical issues related to this evaluation.
   - Proposed evaluation design and methodology, with a sufficient level of detail on each phase and activity of the evaluation process, including on data to be collected to answer the detailed evaluation questions, envisaged data collection and analysis methods, the sampling methodology and criteria to select the final case study countries for phase 2, as well as the duration of the country visits and the number of evaluation team members participating. A particular attention should be paid to the issues of: stakeholder participation; data disaggregation, accuracy and triangulation; approaches to data treatment and analysis; and quality assurance.
   - Comments and additional details/suggestions on the deliverables proposed in the ToR, if any
   - Comments and additional suggestions on the management arrangements described in the ToR, if any
   - Internal management arrangements and quality assurance procedures
   - The presence of any local researchers or others not normally full time members of the bidding institution should be indicated, with a description of how they will be engaged, trained, supported and supervised.

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
   - Detailed timetable by activity (use template provided in Annex 4.2). It should be consistent with the general work plan and the financial proposal.
   - Note: each case study country will require a report, and this should be taken into account in the workplan.

H. Evaluation team:
   - Summary presentation of proposed experts (use template provided in Annex 4.3).
- 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 (use template provided in Annex 4.4).
- CV of each expert proposed to carry out the evaluation (use template provided in Annex 4.5).

Note: when consulting the templates provided in Annex 4, please note the accompanying instructions – e.g. for some of the information required, Bidders are free to use their own templates, as long as the key details required for is included in their templates. Bidders without their own existing templates are welcome to use the templates provided in Annex 4.

13.2 Content of the financial proposal

The financial proposal must be fully separated from the technical proposal. The financial proposal will be submitted in PDF format. Costs will be formulated in US Dollars and free of all taxes. It will include the following elements as a minimum requirement:

A. Overall price proposal.
B. Budget by phase, activity, and cost category (use template provided in Annex 4.6).

Note: Given that the evaluation has two distinct phases, two separate financial proposals should be submitted for Phase 1 and Phase 2.

13.3 Payment schedule

Unless the Bidder proposes an alternative payment schedule, payments for both Phase 1 and Phase 2 will be as follows:
- Approved inception report: 30% of the contractual amount
- Approved interim report: 45%
- Approved final report and all presentations and workshops: 25%

As indicated in the RFPs, travel costs can be reimbursed periodically independent of the payments linked to deliverables.

13.4 Evaluation criteria

Technical proposals will be evaluated based on the following criteria and weighting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization capacity (experience, management capacity)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed methodology and work plan (clarity, comprehensiveness, relevance, soundness, technical rigour, added value to the ToR, organisation, practicality, creativity, level of effort)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team capacity (size and composition, technical aptitude and experience, time allocation between experts, quality of previous assignments)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample reports (at least three) written by the team leader and other key personnel (coherence, clarity, and relevance)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutions scoring 60 and higher on the technical components above will be invited to an Oral presentation to validate submission, and the technical scores will be adjusted accordingly.

UNICEF will request bidders for an oral presentation via teleconference in order to seek clarification on their proposal or ask any questions. Bidders who will have obtained 60 points or more following the assessment of their organization capacity, of their methodology, their team capacity, and quality of sample reports provided, will be invited to make this presentation. The teleconference will be organized by the UNICEF Evaluation Office for each invited, and respective dates will be communicated accordingly. The documentation presented by the bidders and the written minutes of the teleconference will be part of the bidder’s technical proposal package. UNICEF may also send written questions for which a written reply would be expected.

Price proposal: the maximum number of points will be allotted to the lowest price proposal that is opened and compared among those invited firms/institutions that 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.:

\[
\text{Score for price proposal } X = \frac{\text{Max. score for price proposal} \times \text{Price of lowest priced proposal}}{\text{Price of proposal } X}
\]

**13.5 Awarding the contract and payment**

UNICEF will award the contract after considering both technical and cost factors, on the principle of best value-for-money. Payment will be made only upon UNICEF’s acceptance of the work performed in accordance with agreed schedule of payment and/or contract milestones. The terms of payment are **net 30 days, after receipt of invoice and acceptance of work.** Where the need arises, earlier payment may be negotiated between UNICEF and the contracted institution, on the terms indicated in the RFPS.

**13.6 Assessment of service provider**

A performance review meetings shall be held periodically between UNICEF and the Service Provider to review Service Provider’s performance. The Service Provider’s performance will be assessed based on the agreed criteria listed in the Annex B of the RFP - Performance Evaluation Report Template.
Annex 1 – Evaluation Questions

The table below sets out the evaluation questions and sub-questions to be addressed by the evaluation under standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, as modified for humanitarian action. The questions may be developed further or modified during the inception phase in consultation between the evaluation team, EO and the Reference Group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft Evaluation questions grouped by Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In UNICEF’s humanitarian response in complex high threat environments...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriateness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How well does UNICEF’s risk, conflict and political economy analysis underpin the relevance and design of its humanitarian response strategy and its programme design and adjust these as situations evolve?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How well has UNICEF engaged with communities to ensure that programmes are designed and adjusted to meet communities’ own perceptions of their humanitarian needs and priorities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coherence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent has UNICEF’s humanitarian work been guided by the humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence, and how has this affected coverage and quality, in particular in:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- managing any constraints imposed by the UN (including in Integrated Mission contexts, and UN Sanctions regimes), government or donors to the application of humanitarian principles, or trade-offs between the principles (for example, maintaining good relations with one party to ensure access to areas it controls, i.e. neutrality versus humanity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the extent to which UNICEF has influenced government, clusters/sectors, implementing partners, the Humanitarian Country Team, and UN integrated missions in favour of a principled approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- its use (or avoidance of the use) of civil military assets and armed escorts, including with consideration to the UN SG’s 2011 Human Rights Due Diligence Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- its engagement with parties to conflict, including for both humanitarian assistance and protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connectedness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent, and to what effect, is UNICEF contributing to resilience to humanitarian crises by building national and local systems and capacities for coordination and rapid scale-up or maintenance of life-saving services and protection? What progress has UNICEF made in linking its country programme its humanitarian programming in CHTE to develop such longer term programming strategies and results under the Country Programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How well prepared is UNICEF at HQ, RO and CO levels for new humanitarian crises in situations at high risk of becoming complex high threat?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How successful has UNICEF been in achieving and maintaining coverage in 1) its humanitarian response (assistance and protection) and 2) as a cluster/sector lead agency? Which factors have enabled and constrained coverage, and to what extent has UNICEF been able to overcome the constraints?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Draft Evaluation questions grouped by Evaluation Criteria**

**In UNICEF’s humanitarian response in complex high threat environments...**

7. Which good practices and innovations has UNICEF employed to improve and maintain coverage and access? What lessons concerning humanitarian access could be more generally applied, including learning obtained through an assessment of:
   - Application of remote programming, or other alternative programming approaches
   - Negotiation with government and non government actors
   - Partnerships with local government, NGOs and engagement of communities
   - Integrated sector programming
   - Interagency consensus and action
   How well have country office been supported by regional offices and headquarters in improving access?

8. To what extent has the application of the UN’s Security Management System enabled or constrained UNICEF’s humanitarian coverage and access, including an assessment of:
   - How successful UNICEF has been in managing any constraints imposed by UN security actors external to UNICEF (e.g. UN Department of Safety and Security)
   - How successful UNICEF and its partners have been in increasing coverage and access through multi-dimensional risk mitigation approaches, including mitigating risks and increasing access by building ‘acceptance’ within communities/through acceptance-based approaches?

9. To what extent has the application of the UN’s Programme Criticality Framework and the inter-agency ‘Stay and Deliver’ strategy, enabled or constrained UNICEF’s humanitarian access?

10. How well is UNICEF analysing and managing the transfer of risk to its implementing partners?

**Effectiveness**

11. To what extent is UNICEF aware of, and meeting, its CCCs and other commitments and international humanitarian standards (Core Humanitarian Standard and Commitments to Accountability to Affected Populations, Sphere/INEE/Child Protection standards, and quality dimensions related to WHS and Grand Bargain commitments around coherence and connectedness, between humanitarian and development programming, AAP, localization and strengthening social protection measures including the use of cash-based transfers in humanitarian response)? Which humanitarian programme quality standards are applied in practice by country offices, and how are they applied? Which additional quality standards could realistically be adhered to more systematically and what quality ‘trade-offs’ are appropriate in these contexts?

12. To what extent is UNICEF fulfilling its Security Council designated protection mandate in complex high threat environments, in particular related to Children and Armed Conflict and the Protection of Civilians? How actively is UNICEF speaking out against grave violations against children in situations of armed conflict, conflict-related sexual violence against children and women, and other serious violations of international humanitarian law, and advocating for the protection of civilians and compliance with international humanitarian law? What lessons do successful examples of humanitarian advocacy provide for the organisation?

13. How successful has UNICEF been in its advocacy with donors to address funding shortfalls affecting humanitarian action in complex high threat environments, including by working with UNICEF National Committees, and through application to the Central Emergency Relief Funds, Common Humanitarian Funds and Emergency Relief Funds?

14. How well is UNICEF using programme monitoring to assess and trigger measures to address gaps in coverage and quality (programme monitoring including third party monitoring)? What are the particular factors hindering and supporting attention to coverage and quality in CHTE and what are the trade offs in strengthening this monitoring?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft Evaluation questions grouped by Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In UNICEF’s humanitarian response in complex high threat environments...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. To what extent have UNICEF’s revised humanitarian systems improved its response in complex high threat environments? (Corporate Emergency Activation Procedure, Simplified Standard Operating Procedures, and HR surge mechanisms and longer term recruitment?) To what extent has speed of response improved as a result? How could these procedures be adapted to improve performance in complex high threat environments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. How well is UNICEF managing the financial risks associated with its humanitarian programming in complex high threat environments?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 2 – Possible case study countries and selection criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>SA 0</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 1988</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chronic with peaks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>WCA 2</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 2127, 2262</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chronic with peaks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>WCA 0</td>
<td>254.6</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 1533</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chronic with peaks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>MENA 3</td>
<td>274.8</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 1518, 1267, 1989, 2253</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chronic with peaks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>MENA 0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High / med</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 1970, 1267, 1989, 2253</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>High risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>WCA 0</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Medium risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>EAP 0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(no UNM)</td>
<td>High risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>EAP 3*</td>
<td>156.9</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(no UNM)</td>
<td>Nat. dist risk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-East Nigeria</td>
<td>WCA 3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(no UNM)</td>
<td>High risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>SA 0</td>
<td>147.5</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Medium / High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(no UNM)</td>
<td>Chronic with peaks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>ESA 0</td>
<td>328.5</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 751, 1907</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chronic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>ESA 3</td>
<td>279.0</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 2206</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chronic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Palestine</td>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>165.9</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 1591</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Chronic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic***</td>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>302.9</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 1267, 1989, 2253</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(no UNM)</td>
<td>Chronic with peaks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>CEECIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(no UNM**)</td>
<td>Medium risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>CEECIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No?</td>
<td>(no UNM)</td>
<td>High risk (becoming chronic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>156.59</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 2140, 1267, 1989, 2253</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(no UNM)</td>
<td>Chronic with peaks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(no UNM)</td>
<td>High risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORE = Other Resources Emergency  
HAC = Humanitarian Action for Children (Appeal document)

* ‘Other situations’

**while there is no UN mission in Georgia, until mid-2009 there was a DPKO mission (UNOMIG) and to date there is a special monitoring mission of the EU (EUMM). Similarly so, while no UN Mission in Ukraine, there is a special monitoring mission of the OSCE (OSCE SMM).

***Excluding the refugee crises in Lebanon, Jordan, or Turkey, which are not complex high threat environments (except for immediate border areas)
Additional Case Study Selection Criteria

The choice of a total of 12 country case studies for inclusion in the evaluation will be based on a balance between the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>Countries that illustrate well the challenges of operating in complex high threat environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning potential</strong></td>
<td>Countries judged to have a high likelihood of the evaluation finding learning of corporate significance (from good practice, and perhaps from less-than-good practice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment level</strong></td>
<td>Countries with complex high threat environments where UNICEF has made the largest investments. (In descending order, countries with investments over US$200M between 2012-2015, were: Somalia, Syria, DRC, South Sudan, Iraq).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currency</strong></td>
<td>Countries where UNICEF response to complex high threat environments is ongoing or where those with first-hand knowledge of the response and responsible for new/good/innovative practice are available and willing to take part.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td>For country missions, the evaluation team should be able to talk to (and ideally meet) key informants – local staff, local government, local NGOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variety</strong></td>
<td>A mix of examples of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Countries with complex high threat environments country-wide, versus those with complex high threat environment only in a discrete area and functional governance and/or child protection/rights systems in elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At least two middle income countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At least one sub-regional crisis (crossing at least one country border)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At least five countries on the Security Council sanctions/ CAAC Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At least two countries with a UN integrated mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At least two countries not declared L2/L3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At least two poorly funded crisis responses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these criteria, the selection of desk and country mission based country case studies will need to achieve a spread across 4-5 UNICEF regions. For case studies to be successful, the support of the relevant regional directors and country representatives is required. Gaining this support is the responsibility of the Evaluation Office, not of the evaluation team.
Annex 3 – Document Repository

The following documents have been assembled into a UNICEF OneDrive directory and will be made available to the evaluation team. The list is included here by way of illustration of the documents already assembled. Bidders will not be provided access to the repository. While many of the documents are in the public domain, bidders are not expected to have comprehensively reviewed the documents in the repository as part of the bidding process.

A - General Documents

1998-09 Evaluating in complex emergencies.pdf
2010-05 Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action.pdf
2012-18-Strategic-framework_for_partnerships-ODS-English.pdf
2014 Core Humanitarian Standard.pdf
2014-01-16 Humanitarian Policy issues relevant to Operating in Complex high Threat Environments.pdf
2014-09 ALNAP Quality in Humanitarian Action.pdf
2015-06-02 Complex high threat CCC checklist.pdf
2015-09 Reps refresher on CHTE.DOCX
2015-10 Saving Lives Together.pdf
2016 -10 UNICEF Strategic Plan (Framework).pdf
2016-01 Statistics of Attacks on Aid Workers.xlsx
2016-05 Grand_Bargain_final.pdf
2016-07-05 Reps Note on operating in Complex High Threat Env.pdf
2016-10-04 Country Humanitarian Risk Index (INFORM).xlsx
2016-10-04 INFORM Global Results Report 2017 .pdf
2016-11 Enhanced Programme and Operational Support in Fragile Contexts (UNICEF).pdf
2017-01-18 EMOPS - list of countries for CHTE evaluation.docx

B - L2-3 Evaluative and Research Documents

2011 - Horn of Africa
2012-05 Somalia RTE (IA).pdf
2012-06 Horn of Africa RTE Synthesis (IA).pdf
2012-08 Horn of Africa Lessons learned (UNICEF).pdf
2013-02 Somalia Drought Response Mid-term evaluation (IFRC).pdf

2013 - CAR
2015-06 CAR Country Office Audit (UNICEF).pdf
2015-09 Engage to stay and deliver (NRC).pdf
2016-03 CAR Evaluation (IA).pdf
2016-03 CAR Evaluation (UNICEF).pdf
2016-07 Synthesis of Evaluations Philippines South Sudan CAR (IA).pdf

2013 - Mali
2013-07 Mali RTE (UNICEF).pdf

2013 - Syria Region
2013-07 UNHCR Syria Refugees RTE (UNHCR).pdf
2014-12-10 IFRC Syria RTE (IFRC).pdf
2015-01 UNHCR - Independent Programme Evaluation (IPE) of UNHCR’s response to the refugee influx in Lebanon (UNHCR).pdf
2015-04 WFP Syria Regional Response Evaluation (WFP).pdf
2015-12 Syria Region Evaluation (UNICEF).pdf
2016-01 WFP CPE Palestine (WFP).pdf
2016-05 Syria Evaluation Synthesis (IA).pdf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Accountability to the Affected Populations in Early Recovery (IA).pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Enhancing informed engagement with conflict affected communities in Yemen (IA).pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Protection and Accountability to affected Populations (IASC).pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Yemen Common Service Feedback Mechanism (IASC).pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-10 Listening to communities in insecure environments (IA).pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children and Armed Conflict</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-11 Guidance Note on UNICEF and CAAC Agenda.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Cluster Guidance Eng final version.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-09 SIDA Value for Money in Humanitarian Response.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-06-07 Overview Innovative Financing.docx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-01 Humanitarian Expenditure 2012-2015.xlsx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 to 2017 Global Humanitarian Assistance Reports (see link in txt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fragile environments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 OECD States of Fragility 2016.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-11 UNICEF Enhanced Programme and Operational Support in Fragile Contexts.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humanitarian Access</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-06 UNHCR - No Entry! A review of UNHCR's response to border closures in situations of mass refugee infl.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 To Stay and Deliver (OCHA).pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-07 Access strategies in ECHO funded interventions.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 ToR for WFP evaluation on Access.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-11-02 ToR UNICEF Access Advisor HQ draft.doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-12-07 ToR WFP Humanitarian Principles and Access.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Integrated programming Study (UNICEF).pdf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LDH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-03 ODI HPG remaking the case for LRRD.pdf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 Remote accountability in volatile operating environments.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-09 Technologies for monitoring in insecure environments.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-10 Monitoring aid in insecure environments.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-10 Third-party monitoring in insecure contexts.pdf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-12-29 UNICEF Preparedness Guidance Note (UNICEF).pdf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 IASC Protection in Natural Disasters.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-12 FBA Brief Protection of Civilians.pdf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remote Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-06-12 Remote Programming guidance (Final version).pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 ICRC Remote Management.pdf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 UNICEF Risk Management (ERM) Policy.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-05-14 UNICEF ERM Policy OED Memo.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 UNICEF ERM Risk Assessment and Reporting.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-08 OSC-Guidelines -Mission Security Clearance.docx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Annex 4 – Templates to be used for the RFPS Submission**

**Annex 4.1: Presentation of the Bidder’s References***

- If the Bidder has own template, you may simply use that template in the submission as long as all the requested information is present. This is the minimum required information for each reference. Additional information beyond the minimum may be provided at proposers’ discretion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief description of the assignment (Title, objective and scope):</th>
<th>Country(ies) of assignment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location (region, district, commune):</td>
<td>Client’s name, address, and valid email and phone number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start date (month/year):</td>
<td>End date (month/year):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate contract value (in USD):</td>
<td>Key experts mobilised for the assignment (number, names):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4.2: Template for the Detailed Timetable by Activity*

The Bidder may revise and complete the Template based on their proposed methodology. It is subject to revisions during the inception phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Duration (weeks)</th>
<th>Weeks (starting from the contract signature date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Phase Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Phase Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4.3: Template for the Summary Presentation of proposed Key Technical Experts

- This is not an optional template and must be completed and submitted as part of the proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of year of relevant professional experience</th>
<th>Specific role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical experts – international, senior *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior evaluation specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical experts – international, intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical experts – international, junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others – national consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Status:
- International expert (as opposed to local consultants e.g. those who might be recruited for the country case studies)

Level of seniority:
- Senior = more than 15 years of relevant professional experience
- Intermediate = between 6 and 15 years
- Junior = 5 years or less
Annex 4.4: Template for the Level of Effort of all Personnel by Activity*

- This is not an optional template and must be completed and submitted as part of the proposal. Proposers are asked to list in this table all personnel that will be mobilised for the evaluation, not only the key technical international experts, but also evaluation/research assistants, local consultants, etc. For local consultants, please provide their function and level of effort by activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experts*</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total person/days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name 1</td>
<td>Title / function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name 2</td>
<td>Title / function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name 3</td>
<td>Title / function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name 4</td>
<td>Title / function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name 5</td>
<td>Title / function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name 6</td>
<td>Title / function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name 7</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of person/days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4.5: Template for CVs*

➢ If the Bidder already has their own Template, you may simply use that template in the submission as long as all the requested information is present.

First name and Family name: _______________________________________________________
Function for the assignment / specific expertise: ______________________________________
Address, email and phone: __________________________________________________________
Nationality: _____________________________________________________________________
Number of years of relevant professional experience: _________________________________
Number of years as employee of the bidding institution: ________________________________
Membership in professional networks: _______________________________________________

Short biography (1 to 2 paragraphs) highlighting the specificities or comparative advantage of each proposed CV: ________________________________________________________________

Education and subsequent trainings (starting from the most recent):
Years (start/end) – Place of education (Country and Name of institution) – Graduation/Diploma obtained – Major/Focus area – Merit/honours
Years (start/end) – Place of education (Country and Name of institution) – Graduation/Diploma obtained – Major/Focus area – Merit/honours

Professional experience (including on-going and planned assignments, starting from the most recent):
Years (start/end) – Name of employer – Country and city – Function
Main relevant assignments/achievements 1 – Up-to-date contact of client or reference person – Duration of the assignment/activity – Thematic and geographic scope of the assignment – Specific role played in the assignment/activity
Main relevant assignments/achievements 2 – Up-to-date contact of client or reference person – Duration of the assignment/activity – Thematic and geographic scope of the assignment – Specific role played in the assignment/activity

Work languages and proficiency: ______________________________________________________
Publications as author or contributor: ________________________________________________

Date and signature: ___________________________________________________________________
Annex 4.6: Template for the Budget by Phase and by Cost Category

- When utilizing this annex, make sure to adhere to the full directions in the RFPS (section 3 – Content of the Financial Proposal) instructions for the financial proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit cost / rate</th>
<th>Total cost in USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Phase 1 (Pilot Phase)*

**Fees:** (subtotal)

*International, senior experts*
- Expert 1 (name)
- Expert 2 (name)
- Etc.

*International, intermediate experts*
- Expert 3 (name)
- Expert 4 (name)
- Etc.

*International, junior experts*
- Expert 5 (name)

*Local, senior experts*
- Expert 6 (name)

*Other local experts*
- Expert 7 (name)

*Other personnel*
- Personnel 8

**Travels:** (subtotal)

*International flights*

*Local transportation*

*Other travel expenses (visa...)*

*Subsistence allowance (DSA)*

**Other expenses:** (subtotal)

*Telecommunications*

*Workshop expenses*

*Translations, editing, printing...*

*Others (to be described)*

**Overhead (indirect, administrative costs)**

**Grand Total**

* The Main Evaluation Phase Budget should also use the same Budget Template
Annex 4.7: Template for the Statement of Availability of Senior and Intermediate Experts*

- This annex does not need to be submitted with the technical proposal, but will be requested from the selected institution before it is awarded the contract.

Understanding UNICEF’s concern that the senior and intermediate level experts listed in the proposal actually be available for the assignment and not also be already committed to other responsibilities and activities incompatible with this assignment, the Proposer commits that if awarded the Contract, to the extent within the Proposer’s control, the named senior and intermediate experts will be available for the period and time necessary to fulfil their responsibilities. In the event that the proposed experts are not available, they will be replaced by other experts with similar experience and qualifications, after approval by UNICEF.

Name of expert 1:
Title / Function:
Signature:
Date:

Name of expert 2:
Title / Function:
Signature:
Date:

Name of expert 3:
Title / Function:
Signature:
Date:

Name of expert 4:
Title / Function:
Signature:
Date: