

ANNEX 1

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Title:	<i>Evaluation of: Expansion and Scale-Up of HIV-Sensitive Social Protection in Eastern and Southern Africa</i>
Location:	<i>Remote and field visits to Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe</i>
Duration:	<i>55 working days</i>
Start Date:	February 2018

Background and Justification:

Eastern and Southern Africa is the region hardest hit by the HIV/AIDS epidemic; 19 million people live with HIV in the region. UNICEF is advocating for an HIV response that effectively responds to the needs of children and integrates HIV responses into the broader development context across sectors, including social protection, such as providing cash to poor and vulnerable households.

The use of social protection programmes, particularly cash transfer programmes, has increased dramatically over the past decade and has become part of poverty reduction plans and development plans across countries in Eastern and Southern Africa. Along with the growth of these programmes, accumulated research is showing impacts on productive as well as social areas, such as school enrolment, health and food security. Specifically, around HIV, cash transfers have effectively addressed structural drivers of HIV risk – including social and economic inequalities – thereby reducing risky sexual behaviour among adolescents and improving access to healthcare. When social protection in the form of cash transfers is combined with interventions such as parental support and adolescent-sensitive clinical care, the effects are even greater in terms of HIV prevention, mitigation and adherence to treatment. In Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe, three key bottlenecks that prevent HIV-sensitive social protection systems to be operationalized and thus effectively reach children are:

- Limited coverage of existing programmes, which translates into a limited response for vulnerable children and adolescents
- Limited institutional capacity at national and sub-national levels for scale-up and for the operationalization of a systems approach to social protection
- Weak linkages between social cash transfers and available social services which translates into limited knowledge around entitlements, low uptake and ultimately limited impact.

UNICEF, with funding from Government of the Netherlands, is implementing an initiative to address these bottlenecks by developing and strengthening inclusive, HIV-sensitive social protection systems in Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe. This initiative supports national processes of operationalization and scale-up of HIV-sensitive social protection systems in these four priority countries, to ensure that these systems provide a comprehensive response to the multiple vulnerabilities faced by children and adolescents, including those affected by HIV and AIDS. The initiative was implemented in two phases, activities relevant to each country context as summarized below. The first phase was implemented between December 2014 and June 2016. A second phase covers July 2016 to December 2018.

Country	Phase 1	Phase 2
Malawi	Operationalization of Social Protection Systems, support to scale-up and development of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) structures	Scale up of HIV/AIDS sensitive component within the Malawi Social Cash Transfer Programme with focus on family planning and SRH measures for adolescent SCTP beneficiaries with potential for national expansion.
Mozambique	Social Protection system strengthening through the enhanced linkages between social protection and child protection services for vulnerable children	Enhance linkages between social protection and child protection services for most marginalized children and their families through HIV sensitive community based case management and communication interventions
Zambia	Capacity development for delivery of HIV-sensitive social protection and increased access to a comprehensive package of HIV prevention services for adolescents	Scale up of the HIV-SCT initiative to an additional 12 districts with focus on including the development of a child protection module, institutionalizing operational manuals, and documenting achievements for learning.
Zimbabwe	Social Protection system strengthening through the enhanced linkages between social protection and access to education, preventive health and other essential services for children and adolescents.	Enhance implementation of an HIV sensitive social protection programme through a cash + HIV model initiated in 2015. This will see labour constrained and food poor households receiving social transfers benefitting from HIV related services within a coordinated and enhanced service delivery system

Implementation of these activities is expected to lead to the following results:

- Social Protection systems effectively reach and impact vulnerable children and adolescents, with a focus to those affected by AIDS.
- Government capacity for scale-up and for operationalization of social protection systems is strengthened.
- Greater numbers of vulnerable children and adolescents access and utilize social services, including health, child protection and other services.

Key stakeholders of the initiative include:

- Government Ministries in the four countries (Malawi: Ministry of Gender, Children Disability & Social Welfare; Mozambique: INAS as part of MGCAS; Zambia; Ministry of Community Development and Social Services and Ministry of Health; Zimbabwe: Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare) are the primary implementers of the initiative;
- Ministries of finance and economic development in the countries concerned (to consider the level in which countries will dedicate domestic funding to social protection programmes)
- Provincial and district departments, responsible for implementing the social protection programmes in the four countries
- Other development partners, involved in social protection programmes
- NGOs and CSOs with experience in social protection in the four countries.
- UNICEF, providing technical support and facilitating funding of the initiative;

- Households, including children and adolescents, benefitting from the initiative;
- Government of the Netherlands as the main donor.

Scope of Work:

Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation is to better understand how and under what conditions the interventions and the activities implemented under the grant are functioning and to assess the extent to which the initiative has met its objectives and achieved expected results. The evaluation will also document the successes, challenges and lessons learned in the implementation of the initiative. The results from this evaluation will inform decisions by the national governments to scale up and continue implementation of HIV sensitive social protection systems and what adjustments are needed. This information will also be useful for UNICEF as well as development partners in determining continued relevance of the initiative and provide information on replicability in other countries.=

Objectives

The main objectives of the evaluation are to provide: 1.) An independent assessment of the performance of the implementation of the grant in relation to its objectives in the four countries, specifically considering the robustness of the social protection systems in place in the countries concerned; and 2.) Lessons learned and recommendations for continued implementation of the initiative in the four countries and possible replication in other countries.

Specifically, under the relevant OECD DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability) the evaluation will analyse:

- a. The design of the initiative in both phases including the design of country specific results frameworks, the underlying theory of change and its assumptions.
- b. The extent to which the project has achieved its objectives and results or is likely to achieve them, including the extent to which the supported institutions have benefitted.
- c. Explore options for long-term sustainability: governance structure (institutionalisation), ownership, possible coordination/management by existing institution or organization, and long-term, stable funding.

Scope and focus

The period to be evaluated spans from 2014-2018. This includes both the first and the second phase of the grant. Geographic coverage is at the national (policy and coordination) level as well as at the relevant sub-national levels for each of the four countries Malawi (districts: Mangochi, Dedza, Nsanje, Mulanje, Balaka, Salima, Mzimba and Chitipa), Mozambique (Nampula and Zambezia provinces), Zambia (learning districts: Itezhi-tezhi, Lufwanyama, Lukulu Senanga; replication districts: Chinsali, Gwembe, Katete, Luangwa, Lungwa, Lusaka, Luwingu, Mungwi, Mwense, Petauke, Zambezi) and Zimbabwe (districts: Buhera, Mwenezi, Bulilima, Binga, Gokwe North, Zvimba, Mudzi and Rushinga).

The evaluation will also include the efficiency of the input of the different UNICEF offices involved in the programme: Country Offices in the countries concerned and the East and Southern Africa Regional Office.

Evaluation criteria and questions

The evaluation will use the five standard evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact. Human rights (including children's rights) and gender equality should be included within these criteria.¹

Overall evaluation questions include:

1. To what extent have interventions under this initiative led to anticipated outcomes and changes in social protection systems in focus countries?
2. How and why have interventions packages led to observed results and changes, and for whom?
3. What key lessons can be learned and replicated from the project?

In addition to these overall evaluation questions, specific evaluation questions by country will be developed in consultation with country stakeholders. Indicative evaluation questions are presented below:

Relevance

- To what extent has the programme contributed to national targets? Is there continued need for the initiative in the countries?
- How valuable were the results to service providers, clients, the community and/or organizations involved?
- How has implementation integrated and 'joined' up with other existing programmes and implementers?
- To what extent have (intermediate) results of the programme been shared with UNICEF offices/governments in other countries in the region?

Effectiveness

- What has been delivered in practice?
- Have the interventions resulted in scale-up of HIV-sensitive social protection systems?
- To what degree have the project outcomes/specific objectives been achieved?
- How was the intervention/service delivered?
- What was the quality of the design/content of what has been implemented?
- How well was the intervention/service implemented and adapted as needed?
- Were there any deviations from the initial proposal and results frameworks and what was the motivation for these deviations?
- What were the barriers and enablers that made the difference between successful and disappointing implementation and results?
- What are the external factors influencing the delivery and/or functioning of interventions (culture, economic context, infrastructure, etc.)? and how have these influenced results?
- What are the external factors that must be in place to replicate in other settings?

Efficiency

¹ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/980>

- Were the allocated resources used efficiently to achieve the objectives?
- To what extent did the intervention represent the best possible use of available resources to achieve results of the greatest possible value to governments, participants and the community?

Sustainability

- Are countries likely to continue investing in HIV sensitive social protection systems?
- Are positive results likely to be sustained? In what circumstances?
- Are the project activities scalable and replicable in-country and beyond?
- Have governments and other stakeholders taken any steps towards incorporating activities supported through the grant in national social protection sector plans?

Impact

- How many girls, boys, women and men living in vulnerable houses have benefited from the project and how?
- Which institutions and national processes benefited and what has changed?
- What unintended results – positive and negative – were produced? How did these occur? Were there any unintended consequences (positive or negative) of the project?
- Did the activities implemented under the grant produce the intended results in the short, medium and long term? If so, for whom, to what extent and in what circumstances?

Human rights

- To what extent did the project apply the HRBA and equity approach (i.e. focus on most deprived areas, most needy children)?

Methodology:

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluations.² A mixture of qualitative and quantitative methods will be used to answer the evaluation questions. Quantitative data from Management Information Systems (MIS) will be used together with other sources of monitoring and assessment data to determine whether the initiative has met its objectives quantitatively. The qualitative method will allow for an in-depth understanding of the key issues from different stakeholders' perspective. The qualitative data will be structured around the evaluation questions to determine what impact the initiative has had on a broad range of stakeholders and the alignment with national policies. The mixed methods approach will allow triangulation of data collected from different sources, enhancing the quality and credibility of the findings and conclusions of the evaluation.

Data collection

The data collection will be participatory in nature, engaging a broad range of stakeholders at country level. Key sources of information will include:

- **Document review:** Documents will be reviewed at the inception stage to frame the evaluation. Documents to be reviewed will include documentation related initiatives related to the grant, national

² <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

policies and strategies related to HIV-sensitive social protection and assessments and studies related to impacts of social protection in the four countries (list of key documents provided in annex 1).

- **Analysis of secondary data:** Secondary data will mainly include data from management information systems and other monitoring data to determine if the initiative has reached its objectives quantitatively.
- **Focus group interviews with:**
 - Beneficiaries
 - Community workers/volunteers
 - Government staff
- **Key informant interviews with:**
 - Government staff (at central level as well as at provincial and district level)
 - UNICEF staff
 - NGO staff

A detailed description of the methodology will be provided in the inception report. This will include an overview of the different data collection tools that will be used to answer each of the evaluation questions. Considering the number of geographic locations, the inception report should also include suggested scope for data collection in terms of number of geographical locations where data collection will take place and the number of interviews per location.

Data collected should consider gender aspects as well as age aspects by disaggregating data when relevant. Ethical considerations must be considered in line with UNICEF guidelines.³

Expected Deliverables and Reporting Requirements:

Phase	Key activities	Deliverables	Duration	Responsibility
Inception phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of detailed workplan and tools for data collection • Document review • Definition of methodology and field work requirements • Reconstructing the theory of change • Together with UNICEF COs identify and engaging local consultants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workplan and time frame agreed upon • Inception report completed including proposed methodology and requirements for field work • Tools for data collection completed • Local consultants contracted 	12 days	Consultant

³ https://www.unicef.org/supply/files/ATTACHMENT_IV-UNICEF_Procedure_for_Ethical_Standards.PDF

Data collection and analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key-informant interviews • Focus group interviews • Secondary data analysis • Presentation of initial findings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ppt-presentation available (by country) • Initial findings presented in-country 	28 days (7 days per country)	Consultant (UNICEF COs to support logistics and identification of data sources)
Report writing and presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final analysis of results • Report writing • Preparation of a presentation of the final results and organizing a webinar 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft report submitted • Final report drafted • 4 two-page briefs (one per country) finalised in English (and Portuguese for Mozambique) finalized • One two-page summary brief finalised • Webinar organised 	15 days	Consultant

The final evaluation report should meet UNICEF evaluation standards, with focused and actionable recommendations. The report should include at minimum:

- Title page and opening pages
- Executive summary
- Programme description including reconstructed theory of change
- Purpose of Evaluation
- Evaluation criteria
- Objectives
- Evaluation design
- Methodology, including sampling strategy and methodological limitations
- Stakeholder participation
- Ethical issues and how they were addressed
- Major findings
- Analysis of results
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons learned
- Annexes TOR, tools of data collection used

To meet country specific needs of the evaluation, country specific reports should be produced, covering the same layout as the main report.

Time frame

	2017							2018									
	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct
Desk review, formulation of methodology																	
Inception report																	
Data collection/field work																	
Analysis/report writing																	
Production of final report																	
Dissemination																	

Desired competencies, technical background and experience:

To undertake this evaluation, UNICEF ESARO will engage services of an evaluation institution in collaboration with the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The selected evaluation institution will be responsible for the creation of an evaluation team. The evaluation team should consist of at least one senior evaluator to act as team leader, and one qualified national evaluator in each of the countries. The exact division of work will be decided by the institution, but in general, the team leader will be responsible for discussions, negotiations, final decisions, shape the evaluation, while further team members will be tasked with more technical issues (revision of technical reports, in-depth interviews with service providers, decision makers, parents, revision of existing research reports etc.).

Qualifications and skill areas required

Technical expert & team leader:

- Extensive evaluation expertise and experience, including expertise in data collection and analysis; demonstrated skills in similar evaluations; demonstrated technical report writing skills
- Demonstrated experience and expertise in designing and implementing multi- sectoral initiatives in partnership with a wide range of stakeholders including government and communities

- Experience working with/in the UN or other international development organizations in the social sector or application of UNEG evaluation standards.
- In-depth knowledge of social protection systems in sub-Saharan Africa.
- Advanced university degree in one or more of the disciplines relevant to evaluation (social policy, economics, demography, anthropology)
- Proven English report writing, presentation, facilitation skills

National Level Evaluators:

- Extensive evaluation expertise and experience, including data collection, analysis and reporting skills; demonstrated skills in similar evaluations.
- Demonstrated experience and expertise in evaluating multi- sectoral initiatives involving a wide range of stakeholders including government
- Understanding of technical aspects of social protection in the country will be an asset.
- Advanced university degree in one or more of the disciplines relevant to evaluation, social policy, economics and social sciences.

Evaluators should be sensitive to beliefs and act with integrity and respect to all stakeholders. Evaluators should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual interviewees.

Administrative Issues:

An evaluation reference group will be constituted to support the evaluation manager in overseeing this evaluation. In the four countries UNICEF country offices together with implementing ministries will:

- Facilitate contact between the evaluator and in-country stakeholders (beneficiaries, community workers, etc.) that will serve as sources for the data collection;
- Identify relevant sources of information for the evaluation;
- Validate the evaluation questions;
- Provide support in identifying local consultants
- Provide feedback on initial findings;
- Facilitate on-site presentation of draft conclusions and recommendations
- Support the development of follow-up action plans for each country

Conditions:

As per UNICEF DFAM policy, payment is made against approved deliverables. No advance payment is allowed unless in exceptional circumstances against bank guarantee, subject to a maximum of 30 per cent of the total contract value in cases where advance purchases, for example for supplies or travel, may be necessary.

The institute selected will be governed by and subject to UNICEF's General Terms and Conditions for institutional contracts.

Technical Evaluation Criteria and Relative Points:

Evaluation and selection criteria of the consultancy institution:

A two-stage procedure shall be utilized in evaluating proposals, with evaluation of the technical proposal being completed prior to any financial proposal being compared. A 70/30 assessment model for the technical and financial proposal respectively will be adapted. Cumulative weighted average methodology will then apply in determining the best value for money proposal.

Applications shall therefore contain the following required documentation:

- a. Technical Proposal:** Consultant institution should prepare a proposal based on the tasks and deliverables (as per the ToR). The proposal should include approach and methodology with detailed breakdown of inception phase, proposed scope and data collection methodology and approach that will be used by the consultant. The proposal shall also include a brief explanation of the data analysis and report writing and possible dissemination plan. Draft work plan and timeline for the evaluation should be included. The Technical Proposal shall also include updated CVs and list of previous evaluations conducted by the consultants.
- b. Financial Proposal:** Expected financial offer with cost breakdown of consultancy fee and daily subsistence allowance (DSA). The financial proposal shall be submitted in a separate file, clearly named financial proposal. No financial information should be contained in the technical proposal as this will lead to proposal cancellation.

Technical Criteria	Description of Technical Sub-criteria	Maximum Points %
Overall Response	Completeness of response	5
	Overall concord between RFP requirements and proposal	15
Maximum Points		20
Institution & Key Personnel	Range and depth of experience with similar projects	15
	Number of customers, size of projects, number of staff per project	10
	Client references	5
	Key personnel to be assigned: relevant qualifications & experience	20
Maximum Points		50
Proposed Methodology and Approach	Proposed Methodology for this project	15
	Proposed Work Plan to accomplish the Project	15
Maximum Points		30
Total Score for Technical Proposal		100
Minimum Acceptable Score for Technical Proposal		80

Weights: *Indicate 70% Technical vs. 30% Financial Offer*

