**TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR INSTITUTIONAL CONTRACTORS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PART I** | | |
| Title of Assignment | Evaluation of the revised community-led total sanitation protocol in pastoralist communities of arid and semi-arid lands | |
| Purpose of Assignment | To evaluate the effectiveness and applicability of the revised community-led total sanitation approach, Kenya Rural Sanitation and Hygiene Protocol, contextualized for Kenya's arid and semi-arid lands (ASAL). | |
| Location of Assignment | Home-based with travel to selected counties in Kenya as requested | |
| Duration of contract | 8 months | |
| Start date | From: December 1, 2024 | To: July31, 2025 |
| Reporting to: | Evaluation Specialist | |
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# Background

Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) Target 6.2 calls for ensuring adequate and equitable access to safely managed sanitation and hygiene for all and ending open defecation by 2030, paying particular attention to the needs of women, girls, and those in vulnerable situations. Despite steady progress over the past ten years, Kenya is among 26 countries responsible for 90 percent of open defecation globally (UNICEF, 2017). The 2019 census shows that open defecation declined from 13.6 percent in 2009 to 7.4 percent in 2019, representing a significant step towards achieving SDG Target 6.2 by 2030. However, 4.7 million people practice open defecation, with a disproportionate burden in rural areas (11.5 percent against only 0.8 percent in urban areas) (KNBS, 2019). Challenges persist in providing access to safe sanitation, particularly in rural communities of Arid and Semi-arid Lands (ASALs), where almost 85 percent of open defecation in Kenya takes place, and low-income urban areas where poor access is attributed to the broken sanitation service chain and lack of coherent regulations for non-sewered sanitation services.

Reductions in open defecation are not accompanied by increased basic or safely managed sanitation. Only 35.2 percent used at least basic sanitation in 2020, which increased by only 2.6 percent from 2015. Many households are replacing open defecation with unimproved sanitation or limited services shared with other households, which are insufficient to interrupt disease transmission and mitigate public health risks.

Equity and sustainability remain key challenges in sanitation interventions – in some contexts, people from marginalized groups build less-durable toilets than others, or are reliant on others for repair and replacement, which increases sustainability problems. Gender is also an important issue, with women and girls often facing higher burdens related to sanitation and hygiene practices (e.g. related to collection of water for flushing and washing) but having less decision-making power within many rural households (e.g. to encourage construction of facilities that are appropriate, inclusive, and easy to maintain).

Recognizing the importance of galvanizing environmental sanitation and hygiene, the Government of Kenya has committed to the Kenya Vision 2030 and SDG Target 6.2, aiming to achieve universal access to safely managed sanitation and eliminate open defecation by 2030. The 47 county governments of Kenya are responsible for delivering basic services, including sanitation. The 2016-2030 Kenya Environmental Sanitation and Hygiene Policy (KESHP) further emphasized the need for safe and hygienic practices. Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) has been adopted as the core strategy for implementing the Open Defecation Free (ODF) Rural Kenya initiative to achieve ODF Kenya by the end of 2020 based on the 2014 CLTS Protocol. Through implementing the CLTS protocol, 28,804 of 82,539 rural villages in Kenya (35%) were certified as ODF.

UNICEF works with the government at all levels to scale up CLTS. With UNICEF support, over 13,000 villages were certified as ODF in the last five years, representing an additional 3.25 million people living in clean and safe environments, and 0.8 million people gained access to at least basic sanitation services.

In 2023, with technical and financial support from UNICEF, the Ministry of Health (MoH) developed a new Kenya Rural Sanitation and Hygiene Protocol (RUSH Protocol) through extensive consultation with key stakeholders at national and county levels. The protocol was designed to build on previous sanitation policies, such as the 2014 CLTS Protocol and KESHP. It forms part of a comprehensive guidance package that includes Implementation Guidelines and a Monitoring Framework, providing practical guidance and tools on implementation and monitoring to accelerate and enhance rural sanitation and hygiene services across Kenya. It aligns with UNICEF’s programming shift on sanitation, aims at a higher level of services, supporting communities in moving from open defecation or limited service to basic and safely managed sanitation services, according to the UNICEF Sanitation Gameplan to Reach Safely Managed Sanitation (https://www.unicef.org/documents/sanitation-game-plan).

The RUSH protocol provides a comprehensive framework to guide the achievement of the government's strategic objectives. It builds upon the CLTS approach and incorporates additional outcome targets and sustainability indicators to address the diverse challenges faced by different rural communities. The phased approach outlined in the protocol aims to break down rural sanitation and hygiene's implementation and sustainability challenges into manageable phases. It sets specific outcomes for each phase, requiring verification of additional milestones to achieve higher service levels for toilets and handwashing. The three grades – ODF (G1), Safe and Sustainable (G2), and Clean and Healthy (G3) - provide a roadmap for communities to progress towards improved sanitation and hygiene practices. These outcomes are disaggregated based on various vulnerability criteria, including gender, age, disability, and health statuses. The RUSH protocol has paved the way for developing the Real-time Monitoring Information System (RTMIS) based on a graded system aiming to safely manage sanitation and hygiene services in rural and urban areas. The RTMIS allows the capture of progress beyond ODF status, monitoring other environmental health outcomes, and providing household-level sanitation and hygiene data across Kenya. The RTMIS provides disaggregated data on access to sanitation and hygiene services based on various vulnerability criteria. It supports evidence-based policymaking, regulations, planning, and investments at all administration levels. The RTMIS aggregates county and national-level data based on the M&E framework validated by stakeholders and facilitates data analysis, report generation, and visualization. The RTMIS, with the mobile data collection application, was developed and handed over to the National MoH.

The MoH and UNICEF aim to roll out the RUSH Protocol and RTMIS across Kenya by building the capacities of the national and subnational governments and other sector partners to accelerate progress toward achieving the Kenya Vision 2030 and SDG Target 6.2. It is critical to generate evidence on the effectiveness of the RUSH Protocol and RTMIS in eliminating open defecation and safely managing sanitation and their applicability in Kenya's ASALs. Such evidence is needed to propose a way forward to ensure its scale-up and inform UNICEF’s next Country Development Programme (CPD) to strengthen sanitation programming.

In partnership with MoH, UNICEF will pilot the RUSH Protocol and RTMIS in 3 selected counties for 6 months from late 2024 to mid-2025. The focal points from the selected counties will be trained on the RUSH Protocol and RTMIS by a national master trainer. The County Department of Health will implement the RUSH Protocol and RTMIS at the county level.

UNICEF is looking to hire the services of an institutional consultant with solid expertise in evidence generation to examine the effectiveness and adaptability of the RUSH Protocol and RTMIS in eliminating open defecation and safely managing sanitation and their applicability in the given contexts to facilitate the effective implementation and operationalization of the RUSH Protocol and RTMIS. The consultant is expected to deliver the agreed deliverables in 8 months.

# Purpose

This summative evaluation was planned as part of the WASH Programme’s strategy towards eliminating open defecation (OD) and was thus included in the Costed Evaluation Plan, 2022-2026 of UNICEF Kenya country Office. The main purpose of the evaluation is to generate substantive evidence on the effectiveness of the RUSH Protocol and RTMIS in eliminating open defecation and safely managing sanitation based on the result from the small-scale pilot (6 months) in 3 selected counties which represent different contexts and sanitation statuses in Kenya. It will thus contribute to inform the scale up of the RUSH protocol to other counties in the country.

# Objectives

The evaluation will help to identify factors of success or failure for implementing the RUSH protocol and the RTMIS as a strategic option for eliminating Open Defecation in the country. The conclusions drawn along with good practices and pitfalls in designing and implementing protocol would inform relevant authorities and donor partners on scaling or implementing the strategy and in strengthening the related M&E at national and county levels.

The evaluation's specific objectives are to

1. Examine the effectiveness of the RUSH Protocol and RTMIS in accelerating the elimination of open defecation and access to higher levels of sanitation and hygiene services, improving optimal behavioural change, and addressing cross-cutting issues such as gender equity, human rights, climate adaptation, environmental health, and enabling environment by collecting primary data and undertake any complementary secondary analysis of existing data in areas where, and when the pilot was implemented.
2. To undertake a process review of the implementation focusing on the following areas:
   1. Adequacy of technical capacity building provided to implementors and service providers in relation to program goals and modifications required to enhance the capacity building of the program if needed.
   2. Sufficiency of the service provision (incorporating both right holders’ and duty barriers perspectives including equity specific requirements) in relation to achieving the pilot goals among the target population and determining if needed the modifications which can enhance the service provision.
   3. Appropriateness of the M&E system in monitoring the program’s desired impact among communities; identify modifications that can be made to enhance the program’s M&E and the existing sector-specific MIS on WASH (CLTS and RUSH RTMIS)
   4. Report on its acceptability and Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) in the given contexts during the implementation process, synthesize the lessons learned and make strategic recommendations for scaling up nationwide.

The evaluation will mainly be based on the following directions.

* *Looking back:* Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the RUSH Protocol and RTMIS based on the small-scale pilot. The evaluation will also be used to assess the challenges, best practices, and the outputs and outcomes of the interventions.
* *Looking forward:* Identify key lessons and potential practices for learning to inform roll out nationwide in counties with different contexts. From the findings, lessons will be drawn, and context-specific recommendations will be made to improve future rollout and inform new UNICEF CPD and projects.

# Scope of the Evaluation

The programmatic scope of the evaluation covers the RUSH Protocol and the RTMIS system, focusing on their effectiveness in improving sanitation and hygiene status, as well as the related processes, including equity and inclusion. It will not cover the impact on overall health outcome of the beneficiaries in view of the short implementation timeframe of the RUSH Protocol and RTMIS.

Over the period of the six-month pilot phase, focusing on stages of baseline and endline, the geographic coverage spans the three selected pilot counties (tentatively Turkana, Kitui, and Nairobi) representing different geographic features of the country. The evaluation will engage all relevant stakeholders, including MoH, UNICEF, key donors, CSOs, other UN agencies, and key implementing partners.

Suitable sub-county administrative units will be selected in consultation with UNICEF, MoH, and County Governments during the inception phase.

**Primary users**

The primary target audiences of the evaluation include the UNICEF Kenya Country Office, the Government of Kenya, and particularly relevant line ministries such as the MoH, the Ministry of Water, Sanitation, and Irrigation (MoWSI), County Governments, implementing partners, and development partners. The final report will be shared with the line ministries, implementing partners, and other stakeholders.

# Evaluation criteria and key questions

The objective of this evaluation is to assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact of the project. The evaluation will be guided by the OECD DAC and UNICEF evaluation criteria. In addition, the human rights and gender equality criteria is included as a cross-cutting category to emphasize the equity lens in this assessment. These criteria are defined in the table below, and more specific evaluation questions are proposed that will need to be further refined during the inception phase.

Table 1: Evaluation criteria and key questions

| **OECD DAC**  **Criteria** | **Evaluation questions (to be refined during inception phase)** |
| --- | --- |
| Relevance | The extent to which the projects design and implementation was relevant to national/county priorities and needs of participants in terms of achieving expected results across all socio- cultural groups including the vulnerable in the targeted communities. |
| 1. How well did the project addressed the specific sanitation and hygiene needs of various-cultural groups, including vulnerable populations?  2. To what extent was the project aligned to UNICEF country strategy? How complementary is it with other UNICEF and downstream partners’ existing projects in the areas of operation? |
| Coherence | To what extent are the interventions consistent and synergistic with other interventions carried out by UNICEF, Government, and other partners, as well as with relevant international norms and standards. |
| 1. How well does the project align with existing national and county level sanitation policies, such as the 2014 CLTS Protocol and KESHP, and other sector strategies?  2. To what extent does the project complement other ongoing UNICEF’s broader sanitation programming, and SDG Target 6.2? |
| Effectiveness | The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups. |
| 1. How well did the chosen implementation strategies improved access to safely managed sanitation services and higher sanitation service levels (ODF, Safe and Sustainable, Clean and Healthy) in the pilot counties? Can it be replicated or scaled to other similar counties?  2. What are the challenges faced in the implementation process impacting the effectiveness of the strategies. How are they addressed locally and are there better strategies? |
| Efficiency | The extent to which the outputs of the intervention has been achieved (in terms of quality and quantity) with the allocated resources/inputs (such as funds, time, and procedures). |
| 1. How optimally have resources (financial, human, and technical) been utilized in the project?  2. What changes/adjustments would be needed to ensure optimal use of resources to achieve the broader objective of ending open defecation? |
| Sustainability | The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue. |
| 1. To what extent are the outcomes of the project likely to be sustained? What are the technical, financial, institutional, environmental, and social factors that could enable or constrain the sustainability of the RUSH strategy. |
| Impact | The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects. |
| 1. What measurable impact did the project had on sanitation and hygiene practices in the targeted communities during the pilot phase? |
| Human rights and gender equality | The extent to which the intervention incorporated human rights principles, including child rights, gender equality, and equity/inclusion. |
| 1. How have gender rights and gender equality specifically conforming to Convention of the Rights of the Child (CRC) and Core Commitments for Children (CCCs) been incorporated in the RUSH design and its implementation?  2. Has the Project made sufficient provision for disability inclusion in implementation strategies? |

Besides detailed conclusions and recommendations, for each criterion, the evaluation shall include an overall performance rating rubric for each of the above evaluation criteria, based on the following scale:

* + Highly satisfactory (In most cases exceeded the plan).
  + Satisfactory (on balance according to plan, positive aspects outweighing negative aspects).
  + Less than satisfactory (not sufficiently according to plan, taking account of the evolving context; a few positive aspects, but outweighed by negative aspects):
  + Highly unsatisfactory (seriously deficient, very few or no positive aspects).

The above ratings scales are for general reference and the consultants may propose an alternative rating approach. Each rating should be stated as part of the conclusions for each of the criteria.

# Evaluation Approach

A mixed methods methodology could be used involving quantitative and qualitative data guided by the objectives and the evaluation questions that allows triangulation of findings from the quantitative methods for validity or credibility of the findings and comparing information obtained from different methods of other data collection. Further, the complementarity of the methods should strengthen the comprehensiveness of the findings, broadening and deepening the understanding reached, including for example regarding the mechanisms and pathways of perceived impact.

The evaluation process will involve a short inception phase, information collection and analysis, validation of findings, and reporting at baseline and the endline of the pilot. It is planned to be accomplished within a period of eight months (December 2024 to July 2025) which includes the pilot phase of six months.

## **Methodology**

The overall methodology will be participatory and involve various social groups, including the most marginalized, key informants from the national and subnational governments, and sector partners to capture their insights benchmarked against any existing sectoral frameworks and scale-up/scalability frameworks.

While a real-time longitudinal approach seems appropriate, an initial proposal for a more detailed methodology is to be submitted by the applicants at the time of submission of the technical proposal which will be used as a basis for proposal assessment by the recruitment team. Afterward, the contracted consultancy firm will be required to develop a more holistic evaluation plan in consultation with UNICEF, the MoH, and implementing partners during the inception phase. It will contain a work plan, a detailed description of a specific methodological approach, a design for the evaluation with a list of questionnaires, and information collection and analysis methods and tools, including sampling plans, as necessary. The Theory of Change (TOC) on the RUSH protocol will be constructed consultatively as part of the inception phase as currently it does not exist.

The key data sources and data collection method that may come in use include the following depending on the logic of results:

* **Desk review of secondary data/documents:** including national and global sanitation policies and guidelines, UNICEF project documents, annual reports, progress/completion reports, best practice documentation, key meeting notes and field monitoring visits reports, past surveys, and evaluations, assessments undertaken by the line ministries and sector partners, etc. As the pilot phase unfolds, progress data would be available from the RTMIS system.
* **Key informants’ interviews**. Key informants include UNICEF WASH projects staff, line ministry representatives at national and county levels, partners such as NGOs, Water & Sanitation Services Providers, donors, academia and research institutions, field workers, and community-based organizations.
* **Field visits** to a representative sample of communities targeted by the project – to observe infrastructures and behaviours and collect primary information from communities in 3 target counties, especially from women and children in person. Observation checklists and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) will be designed to ensure the accuracy of data collected, minimization of bias, and triangulation between various data sources and categories of respondents.
* **A knowledge, attitude, and practices (KAP) survey** will be conducted in sampled households and communities. The survey will be conducted using a questionnaire administered by trained enumerators.

The agency will carry out the tasks as per the following:

**Inception phase:**

* The consultant will design an evaluation plan that is aligned with the plan for the small-scale pilot in 3 selected counties, which UNICEF and MoH will develop.
  + Based on the existing data, UNICEF and MoH will strategically select three counties to represent Kenya’s diverse contexts (i.e., open defecation, climate conditions, and poverty rate). Turkana, Kitui, and Nairobi were tentatively selected but are subject to change. An example of the categorization is available in Kenya Rural Sanitation and Hygiene Roadmap (pp. 5-7; <http://guidelines.health.go.ke:8000/media/COSTED_NRS_AND_HHR_2023-2030...MoH.pdf>)
  + Vendors can suggest any methodological design in the technical proposal; however, a randomized control study is not recommended during this pilot due to the resources and time required; non-experimental or observational study designs (e.g., Cohort, cross-sectional, and case-control studies) are recommended.
* The consultant will conduct an in-depth desk review of major relevant data sources and develop a methodology for the exercise, including tools for primary data gathering and a data analysis plan for both secondary and primary data.
* Develop a Theory of Change (ToC) for the RUSH Protocol and RTMIS
* Submit an Inception report (as per Annex 4)

**Data collection and Assessment phase:**

* Undertake primary data collection encompassing both qualitative and quantitative data at a desired time (e.g., baseline and endline at the 6th month).
* Analyze, review, and synthesize both secondary and primary data to address the core objectives of the exercise.
* Develop and validate the initial draft of findings with stakeholders in the WASH sector.

**Reporting and dissemination phase:**

* Produce relevant knowledge management products as defined in the deliverable and clarified during the inception phase.
* Validate the Baseline and the final report with the UNICEF WASH team and key stakeholders.
* Support the dissemination of the findings nationally and globally by developing a 2-pager advocacy briefing paper and publishing a research article in a peer-reviewed journal.

## **Limitations to the evaluation**

Potential risks include limited access to target areas, data collection challenges, political and social instability, data privacy and security, and delays in project implementation. Bidders are expected to provide mitigation measures regarding these risks and any other potential risks expected.

Table 2: Possible risks or limitations

| **Risk** | **Details** | **Possible Mitigation Measures** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Limited Access to Target Areas | Difficulties in reaching remote and rural areas, especially during adverse weather conditions. | Schedule visits during dry seasons, collaborate with local authorities for safe access, use reliable transportation. |
| Data Collection Challenges | Challenges in gathering accurate and comprehensive data from remote and hard-to-reach areas. | Train local enumerators, utilize mobile data collection tools, plan for additional time for comprehensive data collection. |
| Political and Social Instability | Potential disruptions due to political unrest or social conflicts in the target areas. | Monitor political climate, maintain flexible scheduling, have contingency plans for rescheduling or relocating activities. |
| Data Privacy and Security | Risks associated with unauthorized access to, and misuse of sensitive data collected during the project. | Implement robust data protection protocols, ensure encrypted data transmission, obtain necessary ethical clearances and informed consent. |
| Delays in Project Implementation | Potential delays due to unforeseen challenges, logistical issues, or administrative hurdles. | Develop a detailed project timeline with buffer periods, conduct regular progress reviews, have contingency plans for potential delays. |

# Deliverables, timelines, and payment schedule

The assignment is to be undertaken over a period of eight months, starting in November 2024. The table below presents the main activities to be undertaken, deliverables, duration, and tranches of payment. Payment will be made on the submission of a detailed invoice and acceptance of satisfactory deliverables by UNICEF.

Table 3: Deliverables, timeline, and payment schedule

| **Tasks** | **Deliverables** | **Timeline** | **Payment Schedule** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Inception phase** | | | |
| Organize inception meetings with UNICEF | **Deliverable 1)** Inception report including methodology and detailed work plan endorsed by UNICEF | Month 1  (10 days) | 30% |
| Develop inception report covering desk review and stakeholder consultation, proposed methodology, dissemination/advocacy plan and timelines |
| Conduct consultations to construct Theory of Change (ToC) for the RUSH protocol | **Deliverable 2)** ToC for RUSH protocol | Month 2  (5 days) |
| Ethical Clearances with local IRB and NACOSTI[[1]](#footnote-2) research permits | **Deliverable 3) Ethical Clearances** | Month 2-3  (5 days) |
| **Assessment phase** | | | |
| Training of enumerators and pre-testing | **Deliverable 4)** Training and pre-testing report including final data collection tools, final field work plan developed | Month 2-3  (15 days) | 40% |
| Data collection and data entry | **(Deliverable 5)** Baseline Report and draft final Report including raw organised primary qualitative and quantitative data as well as synthesised secondary data | Month 3-6  (50 days) |
| Prepare Baseline and final report deliverables |
| **Reporting and dissemination phase** | | | |
| Organize validation workshops of the Baseline and final reports with UNICEF WASH team and key stakeholders | **Deliverable 6)** Stakeholder’s consultations minutes | Month 3 & 7  (5 days including preparation) | 15% |
| Submit Final pilot assessment report, advocacy brief and journal manuscript for large dissemination | **Deliverable 7)** Final pilot assessment report (within 50 – 70 pages), advocacy brief, and journal manuscript endorsed by UNICEF | Month 7  (15 days) |
| Submit Final copy-edited report documenting the details of the project achievements, lessons learned, best practices, challenges, and key recommendations | **Deliverable 8) Final report.** The report structure, format and quality should adhere to the [UNICEF Evaluation Report standards](https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/UNICEF_adapated_reporting_standards_updated_June_2017.pdf) and the [GEROS Quality Assessment System](https://www.unicef.org/media/54781/file). | Month 8  (10 days) | 15% |

## **Reporting Requirements**

The following reports are expected as part of the deliverables for this assignment.

1. **Inception report** detailing the implementation plan, with activities, targets, indicators (means of verification), key milestones, timelines, and budgets. The inception report will include a pre-intervention situation analysis as well as detailed methodology for data collection and ToC of the RUSH Protocol.
2. **Baseline Report** based on both primary and secondary sources of data, including the RTMIS, for selected target communities in the three pilot counties.
3. **Draft Endline Report** based on both primary and secondary data analysis and synthesis detailing progress against the implementation plan, achievements, best practices, challenges, and way forward.
4. **Relevant knowledge management products** from the assessment (i.e., questionnaires, transcripts, data set, etc)
5. **Final Endline Report** adhering to the [UNICEF Evaluation Report standards](https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/media/1421/file/UNICEF-Adapted%20UNEG%20Standards.pdf) and the [GEROS Quality Assessment System](https://www.unicef.org/media/54781/file), captures the details of the project start-up, achievements, lessons learned, best practices, challenges, and key recommendations for scaling up the RUSH Protocol and RTMIS in Kenya including stakeholders’ consultation on the main findings and accompanying PowerPoint presentations.
6. Short 2-pager **advocacy briefing paper** summarizing findings and recommendations.
7. A **research article** in a peer-reviewed journal
8. A **dissemination and advocacy plan** outlining strategies and any products in addition to the above listed reports.

All the reports will be submitted electronically.

# Dissemination and Advocacy Plan

For effective influence and uptake of the evaluation findings and recommendations, reports and policy products should be made public in forms that are usable by decision-makers tailored to their specific needs. The evaluation team should design dissemination products which includes visual summaries of the main results/findings/recommendations suitable to various stakeholders. The dissemination and advocacy plan will be reviewed and endorsed by ERG and UNICEF during the inception phase; and validated once evaluation results are available during evaluation reporting phase. The following guidelines may be useful and followed:

* [UNICEF Style Guideline](https://unicef.sharepoint.com/teams/ESARO-Evaluation/DocumentLibrary9/Forms/AllItems.aspx?id=%2Fteams%2FESARO%2DEvaluation%2FDocumentLibrary9%2F14%5FEvaluation%20Resources%20%26%20Documents%2F140%5FTemplates%20internal%2FUNICEF%20Style%20Book%202022%2Epdf&parent=%2Fteams%2FESARO%2DEvaluation%2FDocumentLibrary9%2F14%5FEvaluation%20Resources%20%26%20Documents%2F140%5FTemplates%20internal&p=true&ga=1)
* [UNICEF Brand book](https://unicef.sharepoint.com/teams/ESARO-Evaluation/DocumentLibrary9/Forms/AllItems.aspx?id=%2Fteams%2FESARO%2DEvaluation%2FDocumentLibrary9%2F14%5FEvaluation%20Resources%20%26%20Documents%2F140%5FTemplates%20internal%2FUNICEF%20BrandBook%203%2E2%2Epdf&parent=%2Fteams%2FESARO%2DEvaluation%2FDocumentLibrary9%2F14%5FEvaluation%20Resources%20%26%20Documents%2F140%5FTemplates%20internal&p=true&ga=1)
* [UNICEF Infogram Guidelines](https://unicef.sharepoint.com/teams/ESARO-Evaluation/Test/Forms/AllItems.aspx?id=%2Fteams%2FESARO%2DEvaluation%2FTest%2FEvaluation%20Kit%2FUNICEF%5FInfogramGuideline%2Epdf&parent=%2Fteams%2FESARO%2DEvaluation%2FTest%2FEvaluation%20Kit&p=true&ga=1)

UNICEF will provide the relevant logos and authorized pictures, and the evaluation team must ensure that all visual products need to be approved by UNICEF before final publishing.

# Budget and Payment

The total estimated budget for this institutional consultancy is USD 70,000 from Other Resources (OR) which is committed within the WASH Programme. The payments as per the payment schedule specified in section 7 (above) will be issued after the products are quality assured by the ERG, UNICEF CO, and RO.

# Management and Quality Assurance Arrangements

The Evaluation Specialist will assume the overall role of the Evaluation Manager under guidance of the Chiefs of WASH and PME sections of UNICEF Kenya Country Office supported by WASH Specialist on technical issues relating to WASH and CLTS strategies. UNICEF and the selected contractor will always coordinate with both County and national Government agencies to ensure compliance with government directives. The contractor’s work needs to be declared as essential services by the Government of Kenya and be in close contact with local and national authorities to gather updated information and adapt accordingly.

The KCO Research and Evaluation Committee (REC) as the key internal quality assurance mechanism will provide the technical oversight. A Reference Group will be formed comprising of members from UNICEF KCO, UNICEF RO (WASH/Evaluation Unit), relevant GOK ministries. This reference group will guide the research and oversee issues such as data ownership and intellectual property. Beyond the national level, quality assurance mechanism also includes the Evaluation Unit and the WASH Advisors of the ESARO, and the ESARO facilitated external reviewer throughout the evaluation process.

# Ethical Considerations

Depending on the suggested methodology, the evaluation firm, in consultation with the Reference Group, is to decide whether ethical clearance needs to be sought (and budgeted accordingly). In general, the evaluation consulting firm should comply to UN and UNICEF norms and standards and is expected for the consulting team to clearly identify any potential ethical issues and approaches, as well as the processes for ethical review and oversight of the evaluation process. The following general considerations apply:

* Participation in any interview should be voluntary and based on informed consent. Prior to conducting any interviews/discussion written and/or oral consent must be obtained from all respondents, after the purpose of the evaluation has first been explained to respondents in a language of their understanding.
* In the case of child participants, consent is to be sought from either the parents or guardians prior to selecting for any interviews – where such consent is not deemed to be contrary to the best interests of the child.
* Participants/respondents will be informed of their right not to answer any questions they are not comfortable with and to terminate the interview at any time they deem fit.
* Confidentiality and anonymity regarding the data collected from the participants must be ensured through the following means: safeguards to ensure confidentiality during data processing and reporting which means not making or implying precise references to study participants or statements made by any participants.

Below are the links to some of the relevant documents that can be referred to on the guiding principle and ethical considerations.

* [United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2613)
* [UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/3625)
* [UNICEF procedure for ethical standards in research, evaluation, data collection and analysis](https://www.unicef.org/media/54796/file)
* [UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards](https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/media/816/file/UNICEF-Adapted-UNEG-Evaluation-Report-Standards.pdf)
* [GEROS Quality Assessment System](https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/media/2571/file/2020%20GEROS%20Handbook.pdf)
* [UNICEF guidance on external academic publishing](https://www.unicef-irc.org/files/upload/documents/UNICEF-External-Publishing.pdf)

Specific to Kenya, any research or data collection involving human subject requires to secure following permits[[2]](#footnote-3).

1. Ethics approval by an accredited IRB[[3]](#footnote-4),
2. National research permit from the National Commission on Science, Technology, and Innovation (NACOSTI), and
3. Local research permit from the counties involved as relevant.

# Qualification Requirements

UNICEF is looking for a consulting firm with excellent track record of conducting projects/project evaluations for development in the WASH Sector. Proven experience and track record in conducting project evaluations in related areas is a must (i.e. primary education, WASH/health education, climate resilience, emergency response). Strong analytical, facilitation, writing and communication skills in English is needed. The Firm should have the ability and commit to meeting the assignment’s deadlines. Knowledge of the Kenyan social and development context (especially in low-income areas) is an added advantage.

Institutions based within and outside Kenya are welcome to apply. Some part of the assignment can be done remotely but at least one mission in Kenya is required. Gender balance in the team is desired.

The institution is expected to propose a team with expertise in project evaluation. The Evaluation team led by a team leader should include team members with the below specified requirements. The International firms/bidders should take note of the requirement of national team members as specified below in the team:

1. At least five (5) years of experience in undertaking project evaluations, particularly WASH/health education, climate resilience and emergency response with proven track record of evaluating similar multisectoral and multi-stakeholder programmes supported by UN or UNICEF. Evidence on record of top ranked evaluation reports by GEROS may be provided.
2. A track record of evaluation work in Eastern and Southern Africa and with experience in Kenya. Knowledge of the social, economic, and political context of Kenya will be an advantage.
3. Good communication skills, sensitivity to work in a multicultural environment and excellent writing skills, including proficiency in English. Working knowledge in Kiswahili will be of added value. Should have experience of effective interaction with local and national organizations, government institutions and marginalized communities in rural settlements.
4. Advanced skills in evaluation methodologies including theory-based evaluation, policy and strategy evaluation, quality-at-entry assessment, portfolio analysis, case studies, and capitalization of lessons learned.
5. Proven experience with Strong quantitative and qualitative analytical skills and participatory methods, and knowledge of latest methods and approaches of development evaluation integrating humanitarian-development-peace nexus and climate action lens.
6. Excellent command of English, with a proven ability to prepare high-quality reports (in line with UNICEF/UNEG standards) including attractive evidence products that present complex information via infographics and other engaging and concise communication means.
7. A team lead who has held a lead role in evaluations of similar scope/complexity both at national and international level, ensuring at least two national experts in the team.
8. The team must consist of competent evaluation specialists, gender and equity specialists, researchers, and data specialists. Areas of expertise should cover child rights and participation, equity, gender equality, emergency response, climate action/environmental sustainability, water, sanitation and hygiene, or other relevant disciplines.
9. The National Team members should have experiences and skills in environmental management or social sciences, Development studies, Gender Studies, Law, Economics, or other relevant disciplines with excellent writing skills, including proficiency in English and Swahili. A minimum of five years of experience is required in evaluating water related projects in rural areas or at the community level.
10. Demonstration of capacity to carry out the evaluation and complete deliverables under possible travel restrictions and social distancing measures.

# Requirements for Technical and Financial Proposals

The technical bid is evaluated based on its responsiveness to the Terms of Reference and the evaluation criteria. The Financial Bid will only be evaluated if the Technical Bid achieves a minimum score of 70% of the points and is considered qualified through the supplier qualification process. Proposals failing to obtain this minimum technical threshold or those which will not be considered qualified through the evaluation process will not be eligible for further consideration.

The following is an outline of what is expected.

## **Technical Proposal (70%):**

* Introductory note
* Evaluation experience of the evaluation firm in low and middle-income countries, especially related to WASH: max 3 pages.
* Experience and qualifications of lead evaluator (principal investigator) and lead experts for both quantitative and qualitative components (include CVs as Appendix): max 3 pages.
* Brief profile and/or experience (evaluation, research and in concerned sectors) of the firm and local evaluation partner or team member: max 3 pages.
* Proposed approach to meeting the deliverables in the ToR (methodology and implementation plan): max 5 pages.
* Description of other key personnel (include CVs as appendix): max 2 pages.
* List of full reports (preferably with links to full reports) as examples of relevant past and on-going assignments of the proposer (at least 3), on which the proposed key personnel directly and actively contributed or authored.
* Any other issues relevant to the TORs: max 2 pages.

## **Financial Proposal (30%):**

The financial proposal will be all-inclusive and will provide a detailed budget covering consultant fees, travel and subsistence costs, fees and related charges for Kenyan ethical and research clearances, and other expenses to be incurred for this assignment to complete the entire assignment. Note that UNICEF will cover the workshop costs for validation, and this should not be included in the financial proposal. However, the consultant should include costs for training of enumerators and pretesting. The institution selected for this assignment must provide their own computers, communication, internet connections and workspaces. Contractors will be responsible for their own bookings and travel to and from the mission locations.

The proposal will be evaluated as follows:

## **Technical Assessment (70 points):**

Table 4: Technical Assessment

| **Technical criteria** | **Sub-criteria** | **Max points** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Key Personnel** | Number of similar assignments carried out by the institution in the past 10 years and client satisfaction (provide references as well as certificate of completion from former clients) | 15 |
| Qualifications and experience of proposed consultants and team (as per TOR requirements) | 10 |
| Quality of sample reports (provide at least 2 reports from a similar assignment (co)authored by the proposed consultant) | 10 |
| *Maximum Points for Key Personnel* | | *35* |
| **Proposed Methodology and Approach** | Understanding of the TOR objectives and quality of the comments and suggestions made by the bidder | 5 |
| Proposed methodology | *20* |
| Comprehensiveness and feasibility of the proposed work plan and timeline | *10* |
| *Maximum Points for Proposed Methodology and Approach* | | *35* |
| **TOTAL Maximum** | | **70** |

## **Financial Assessment (30 points):**

Only those financial proposals for bidders which have been technically accepted according to the above criteria will be opened. The Financial proposal will be weighted based on the clarity and appropriateness.

The price should be broken down for each component of the proposed work. The total amount of points allocated for the price component is **30**. The maximum number of points will be allotted to the lowest price proposal that is opened and compared among those invited firms/institutions which obtain the threshold points in the evaluation of the technical component. All other price proposals will receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest price.

The contract shall be awarded to a bidder obtaining the highest combined technical and financial scores. Proposals not complying with the terms and conditions contained in this ToR, including the provision of all required information, may result in the proposal being deemed non-responsive and therefore not considered further.

# Administrative issue

As per UNICEF 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.

UNICEF will arrange logistics related to training (conference packages, allowance and transport costs for participants, materials, etc.). However, consultants' travel costs should be covered by the vendor and considered in the financial proposal.

# Annex 1: General conditions: Procedures and logistics

1. No lodging or meals will be provided to the consulting firm.
2. The consulting firm will not work from UNICEF office. It must use its own office facilities.
3. DSA will not be paid to the consulting firm by UNICEF. All such costs should be included in the price quotations.
4. The consulting firm should use its own materials such as computers and printers, etc.
5. The consulting firm is not authorized to use UNICEF’s vehicles. Local transport costs should therefore be part of the price quotation.
6. Payment will be made upon delivering of the deliverables listed above that meet UNICEF quality standards.
7. Flight costs will not be covered by UNICEF. Such costs must be included in price quotations for the bid.
8. Translations of evaluation deliverables and interpretation services are the responsibility of the consulting firm and should be included in the bid.

# Annex 2. Policy both parties should be aware of

1. Under the consultancy agreements, a month is defined as 21 working days, and fees are prorated accordingly.  Consultants are not paid for weekends or public holidays.
2. Consultants are not entitled to payment of overtime.  All remuneration must be within the contract agreement.
3. No contract may commence unless the contract is signed by both UNICEF and the consultant or Contractor.
4. For international consultants outside the duty station, signed contracts must be sent by fax or email.  Signed contract copy or written agreement must be received by the office **before Travel Authorization is issued.**
5. No consultant may travel without a signed travel authorization prior to the commencement of the journey to the duty station.
6. Unless authorized, UNICEF will buy the tickets of the consultant.  In exceptional cases, the consultant may be authorized to buy their travel tickets and shall be reimbursed at the “most economical and direct route”, but this must be agreed to beforehand.
7. Consultants will not have supervisory responsibilities or authority on UNICEF budget.
8. Consultant will be required to sign the Health statement for consultants/Individual contractor prior to taking up the assignment, and to document that they have appropriate health insurance, including Medical Evacuation.
9. The Form 'Designation, change or revocation of beneficiary' must be completed by the consultant upon arrival, at the HR Section.

# Annex 3. Intellectual property rights

All intellectual property rights in the work to be performed under this agreement shall be vested in the Government of Kenya and UNICEF, including without limitations, the right to use, publish, translate, sell, or distribute, privately or publicly, any item or part thereof. The Government of Kenya and UNICEF hereby grants to the Recipient Organization a non-exclusive royalty-free license to use, publish, translate, and distribute, privately or publicly, any item or part of the work to be performed under this Agreement for non-commercial purposes. Neither the Recipient Organization nor its personnel shall communicate to any other person or entity any confidential information made known to it by the Government of Kenya and UNICEF during the performance of its obligations under the terms of this Agreement nor shall it use this information to private or company advantage. This provision shall survive the expiration or termination of this Agreement.

Further analysis of data collected in the evaluation will appear as Kenya-UNICEF Country Programme Evaluation. Once the official report is cleared consultants will be free to work further on those papers for publication in peer reviewed journals, acknowledging UNICEF2. Consultants will provide the ESARO Evaluation Section with raw data, corrected/verified data once cleaned and programming files that permit replication of results from core evaluation reports.

Data collected for the evaluation is the property of UNICEF Kenya Country Office (KCO). Master versions of the data, coding protocols and programming code permitting replication of results of core evaluation reports will be kept by KCO. Copies of the data will be distributed to researchers with the permission of the KCO Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) Section with a view to helping to disseminate learning derived from the data sets.

# Annex 4. Inception report outline

**CONTENTS**

**Acronyms**

**Executive summary**

**1. INTRODUCTION\***

1.1. Objective of the evaluation

1.2. Background and context

1.3. Scope of the evaluation

**2. METHODOLOGY**

2.1. Evaluation criteria and questions

2.2. Conceptual framework

2.3. Evaluability

2.4. Data collection methods

2.5. Analytical approaches

2.6. Risks and potential shortcomings

**3. PROGRAMME OF WORK**

3.1. Phases of work

3.2. Team composition and responsibilities

3.3. Management and logistic support

3.4. Calendar of work

**ANNEXES**

1. Terms of reference of the evaluation
2. Evaluation matrix
3. Stakeholder map
4. Tentative outline of the main report
5. Interview checklists/protocols
6. Theory of change / outcome model
7. Detailed responsibilities of evaluation team members
8. Reference documents
9. Document map
10. Project list
11. Project mapping
12. Detailed work plan

The structure of inception reports may be adjusted depending on the scope of the evaluation.

# Annex 5. UNICEF quality review checklist for inception reports

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **UNICEF Evaluation Inception Report**  **Quality Review Checklist** | | |
|  | | |
|  | | |
|  | | |  |  |  |
| **IDENTIFICATION OF DELIVERABLE** | | | | |  |
|  | | | |  |  |
| **Title of Report** | | |  | **Management of Evaluation** *(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)* |  |
| **Region** | | |  | **SPOA Correspondence** *(Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities)* |  |
| **Year of Report Completion** | | |  | **Evaluation Object** |  |
| **Office** | | |  | **Evaluation Type** |  |
| **Country** | | |  | **Evaluation Strategy** |  |
| **TOR present** | | |  | **Evaluation Design** |  |
| **Date of Review** | | |  | **Evaluation Level** |  |
| **Date of 2nd review** | | |  | **Geographic Scope** |  |
| **Initials Reviewer** | | |  | **Primary SDG(s) Covered** *(Number)* |  |
| **Initials Reviewer 2nd Review** | | |  | **Every child survives and thrives** |  |
|  | | |  | **Every child learns** |  |
|  | | |  | **Every child is protected from violence and exploitation** |  |
|  | | |  | **Every child lives in a safe and clean environment** |  |
|  | | |  | **Every child has an equitable chance in life** |  |
|  | | |  | **Gender equality (cross-cutting)** |  |
|  | | |  | **Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)** |  |
| **RATING SCALES** | | | |  |  |
| **Individual Rating Criteria Guide** | | | **Rating** | **Explanation** |  |
| Yes | Criterion is addressed. |  |
| Partially | Criterion is only partially addressed, one or more important elements are missing or incorrect. | |
| No | Criterion is not addressed or is inadequately addressed, all important elements are missing or incorrect. | |
| Not rated | Criterion could not be rated, reasons are provided. | |
| **RATING SCALES** | | | |  |  |
| **Section Rating Criteria Guide** | | | **Rating** | **Explanation** | |
| Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 100%) | Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation inception reports. | |
| Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%) | Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation inception reports. | |
| Fair (35% - 62.49%) | Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation inception reports in some regards, but not all. | |
| Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%) | Does not sufficiently meet UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation inception reports. | |
| **INCEPTION REPORT REVIEW** | | | |  |  |
| **SECTION A: OPENING PAGES AND INTRODUCTION (weight 5%)** | | | | **Rating** | **Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.** |
| **Question 1.** | **Do the opening pages and introduction of the Inception Report contain all the relevant information?** | | | | |
| 1.1 | The introduction contains a short description of the purpose and content of the IR, the key activities undertaken for its preparation and its place in the evaluation process. | | |  |  |
| 1.2 | The introduction highlights any emerging issues that have arisen during the inception phase (if applicable). | | |  |  |
| 1.3 | Basic elements in the opening pages are presented (evaluation title, country, years covered by the evaluation, name(s) and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), and commissioning organization on cover page, list of acronyms, table of contents, including list of tables and figures). | | |  |  |
| **Feedback on Section A - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.** | | | | **Overall rating for Section** | **Score** |
|  | | | | **#DIV/0!** | **#DIV/0!** |
|  | | | | Weighting |  |
|  | | | | 0.05 |  |
|  | | |  |  |  |
| **SECTION B. CONTEXT AND DESCRIPTION OF THE OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION (weight 10%)** | | | | **Rating** | **Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.** |
| **Question 2.** | **Are the context and description of the object of the evaluation clearly presented?** | | | | |
| 2.1 | Clear and relevant description of the context of the object of the evaluation (i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the object of the evaluation. | | |  |  |
| 2.2 | Linkages are drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated. | | |  |  |
| 2.3 | The object of the evaluation is briefly and clearly explained (its objectives, stakeholders involved and their roles, contributions, and stakes, right holders/beneficiaries and their status and needs, time period, budget, geographic scope, phase of implementation). | | |  |  |
| 2.4 | The description of the object of the evaluation makes adequate references to human rights, gender, and equity/inclusion. | | |  |  |
| 2.5 | The logic model or the theory of change (ToC) of the object being evaluated is described to some extent, with the assumption that it will be further refined or finalized in the Evaluation Report. | | |  |  |
| **Feedback on Section B - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.** | | | | **Overall rating for Section** | **Score** |
|  | | | | **#DIV/0!** | **#DIV/0!** |
|  | | | | Weighting |  |
|  | | | | 0.1 |  |
| **SECTION C: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION (weight 10%)** | | | | **Rating** | **Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.** |
| **Question 3.** | **Are the purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation clearly presented?** | | | | |
| 3.1 | The evaluation purpose is clearly presented, including the rationale behind the evaluation, its intended use and what this use is expected to achieve, its primary intended users and how they stand to gain or lose from the results of the evaluation. | | |  |  |
| 3.2 | The evaluation objectives are clearly presented with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the TOR. | | |  |  |
| 3.3 | The scope of the evaluation is clearly defined (includes: what will and will not be covered, the geographic location, period, thematic field(s) of intervention/interventions to be evaluated, levels (regional, country, municipal). Changes from ToR are clearly indicated and justified. | | |  |  |
| **Feedback on Section C - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.** | | | | **Overall rating for Section** | **Score** |
|  | | | | **#DIV/0!** | **#DIV/0!** |
|  | | | | Weighting |  |
|  | | | | 0.1 |  |
|  | | |  |  |  |
| **SECTION D: EVALUATION FRAMEWORK (weight 20%)** | | | | **Rating** | **Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.** |
| **Question 4.** | **Are the evaluation criteria and questions clearly presented?** | | | | |
| 4.1 | All of the evaluation criteria and questions are listed as per ToR. If criteria/questions differ from ToR, the Inception Report justifies the changes, e.g., efforts to prioritize questions and reduce number of questions to address should be noted in the report. | | |  |  |
| **Question 5.** | **Are evaluation findings derived from the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence.** | | | | |
| 5.1 | The Inception Report links the evaluation criteria and questions to the chosen methodology through an evaluation matrix that includes indicators, benchmarks, assumptions and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based and conclusions drawn, referring to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), Leave No one Behind (LNOB), and disability inclusion as appropriate. | | |  |  |
| 5.2 | Iindicators, data sources, and data collection and methods are identified for each question. | | |  |  |
| 5.3 | The indicators chosen are specific, easily measurable, and relevant to the corresponding evaluation questions and ToC | | |  |  |
| 5.4 | The evaluation questions and indicators include reference to human rights, gender, and equity dimensions. | | |  |  |
| **Feedback on Section D - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.** | | | | **Overall rating for Section** | **Score** |
|  | | | | **#DIV/0!** | **#DIV/0!** |
|  | | | | Weighting |  |
|  | | | | 0.2 |  |
|  | | |  |  |  |
| **SECTION E: METHODOLOGY (weight 30%)** | | | | **Rating** | **Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.** |
| **Question 6.** | **Is the methodology clearly presented, technically sound, logistically feasible, and appropriate considering the evaluation framework?** | | | | |
| 6.1 | Clear and complete description of a relevant and robust methodological design and set of methods that are suitable for the evaluation's purpose, objectives, and scope. Any adaptations to the methods proposed in the ToR are explained and justified. | | |  |  |
| 6.2 | If the evaluation asks attribution questions (outcome or impact level), an appropriate evaluation design (qualitative or quantitative) to reliably measure attribution is proposed. | | |  |  |
| 6.3 | Key data sources are clearly presented and appropriate (includes: list of documents for desk review, the group of stakeholders to be interviewed, available databases, data gaps), and appear comprehensive and reliable. | | |  |  |
| 6.4 | Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes. | | |  |  |
| 6.5 | The sampling methods described for **qualitative** data collection are appropriate and adequate (includes ALL of the following: sample size, the geographic area(s), specific populations, sampled site/country visits, the rationale/criteria for selection, how participants/interviewees will be selected, and criteria for selection of countries to be visited/studied (if applicable)). | | |  |  |
| 6.6 | The sampling methods described for **quantitative** data collection are appropriate and adequate (includes ALL of the following: sample size, the geographic area(s), specific populations, sampled site/country visits, the rationale/criteria for selection, how participants/interviewees will be selected, and criteria for selection of countries to be visited/studied (if applicable)). | | |  |  |
| 6.7 | The data collection tools are linked to the specific evaluation questions (the way in which the tools are designed should facilitate capturing the information needed to answer the evaluation questions). | | |  |  |
| 6.8 | Questions in interview protocols, discussion guides and questionnaires are robust, focused, linked to the evaluation matrix and avoid leading questions. | | |  |  |
| 6.9 | The Inception Report describes relevant methodological limitations to the evaluation. | | |  |  |
| 6.10 | Clear and complete description of evaluation limitations, potential biases and constraints faced by the evaluation team, and mitigation strategies to be used. | | |  |  |
| 6.11 | The Inception Report specifies that the evaluation will follow the UNEG Norms and Standards as well as the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.  weblinks: http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines | | |  |  |
| 6.12 | Explicit and contextualized reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) in accordance with UNEG ethical standards. | | |  |  |
| 6.13 | Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues described (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups (i.e. adherence to ethical principles and procedure, do no harm, confidentiality and data collection). For those cases where the evaluation will involve interviewing children, explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children. | | |  |  |
| **Feedback on Section E - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.** | | | | **Overall rating for Section** | **Score** |
|  | | | | **#DIV/0!** | **#DIV/0!** |
|  | | | | Weighting |  |
|  | | | | 0.3 |  |
| **SECTION F: EVALUATION WORKPLAN (weight 20%)** | | | | **Rating** | **Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.** |
| **Question 7.** | **Is the workplan complete and containing relevant information?** | | | | |
| 7.1 | The evaluation phases are clearly described, including a timeline with associated activities, number of days for each team member, locations and deliverables. | | |  |  |
| 7.2 | The roles and responsibilities of each member of the evaluation team are clearly described. | | |  |  |
| 7.3 | If the evaluation requires official ethical approval, the process to be followed is clearly described. | | |  |  |
| 7.4 | The Inception Report describes the evaluation quality assurance process. | | |  |  |
| 7.5 | The logistics of carrying out the evaluation are discussed (e.g. assistance required from UNICEF for interview arrangements, field visits, etc.) and the expected roles and responsibilities from the commissioning organization(s) or oversight committee are adequately explained. | | |  |  |
| **Feedback on Section F - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.** | | | | **Overall rating for Section** | **Score** |
|  | | | | **#DIV/0!** | **#DIV/0!** |
|  | | | | Weighting |  |
|  | | | | 0.2 |  |
| **SECTION G: INCEPTION REPORT STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)** | | | | **Rating** | **Constructive Criticism (1-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.** |
| **Question 8.** | | **Do the annexes contain all the relevant elements?** | | | |
| 8.1 | | The evaluation ToR are included in the annexes. | |  |  |
| 8.2 | | The following elements are annexed to the Inception Report: logic model/ToC, evaluation matrix, bibliography, data collection tools (draft interview protocols, survey, case study formats), list(s) of people to be interviewed, if applicable and available ethical review board approval form and/or informed consent form. | |  |  |
| **Question 9.** | | **Is the Inception Report coherent and logical?** | | | |
| 9.1 | | Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles, well formatted). | |  |  |
| 9.2 | | Inception Report is easy to understand (written in an accessible way for intended audiences and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors), and conveys key information through the use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) which are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced in text. | |  |  |
|  | | **Feedback on Section G - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.** | | **Overall rating for Section** | **Score** |
|  | | | | **#DIV/0!** | **#DIV/0!** |
|  | | | | Weighting |  |
|  | | | | 0.05 |  |
|  | | | ***Weighting checksum (should equal 1)*** | **1** | ***Weighting checksum (should equal 1)*** |
|  | | |  |  |  |
| **#DIV/0!** | | | **OVERALL SCORE** | **#DIV/0!** |  |
| **Overall suggestions for improvements, suggestions made throughout the review should be listed clearly and succinctly, referring both to pages as well as individual criterion. (5-10 sentences)** | | | | |  |
|  | | | | |  |
|  | | |  |  |  |
| **#DIV/0!** | | | **OVERALL SECOND REVIEW SCORE** | **#DIV/0!** |  |
| **Second Review Overall suggestions for improvements, suggestions made throughout the review should be listed clearly and succinctly, referring both to pages as well as individual criterion. (5-10 sentences)** | | | | |  |
|  | | | | |  |

# Annex 6. UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standard

1. The **title page** and opening pages provide key basic information.
2. Name of the evaluation object
3. Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report
4. Locations (country, region, etc.) of the evaluation object
5. Names and/or organizations of evaluators
6. Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
7. Table of contents which also lists Tables, Graphs, Figures and Annexes
8. List of acronyms

1. **Executive Summary** is a stand-alone section of 2-3 pages that includes:
2. Overview of the evaluation object
3. Evaluation objectives and intended audience.
4. Evaluation methodology
5. Most important findings and conclusions
6. Main recommendations

1. **Annexes** increase the credibility of the evaluation report. They may include, inter alia:
2. ToRs
3. List of persons interviewed, and sites visited.
4. List of documents consulted.
5. More details on methodology, such as data collection instruments, including details of their reliability and validity.
6. Evaluators biodata and/or justification of team composition
7. Evaluation matrix
8. Results framework

1. **Object of Evaluation**

The report presents a clear and full description of the ‘object’ of the evaluation.

1. The **logical model and/or the expected results chain** (inputs, outputs, and outcomes) of the object is clearly described.
2. The **context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors** that have a direct bearing on the object is described. For example, the partner government’s strategies and priorities, international, regional, or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency’s corporate goals and priorities, as appropriate.  Scale and complexity of the object of the evaluation are clearly described, for example:
3. **The number of components**, if more than one, and the size of the population each component is intended to serve, either directly or indirectly

* **The geographic context and boundaries** (such as the region, country, and/or landscape and challenges where relevant).
* **The purpose and goal, and organization/management of the object**
* The **total resources** from all sources, including human resources and budget (s) (e.g., concerned agency, partner.

1. The key stakeholders involved in the object implementation, including the implementing agency (s) and partners, other key stakeholders, and their roles.
2. The report identifies the implementation status of the object, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time and explains the implications of those changes for the evaluation.

1. **Evaluation Purpose, Objective(s), and Scope**

The evaluation’s purpose, objectives and scope are fully explained.

1. The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used by different intended audiences.
2. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover.
3. The report describes and provides an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators.
4. As appropriate, evaluation objectives and scope include questions that address issues of gender and human rights.

1. **Evaluation Methodology**

The report presents transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve evaluation purposes.

1. The report describes the data collection methods and analysis, the rationale for selecting them, and their limitations. Reference indicators and benchmarks are included where relevant.
2. The report describes the data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations. The report includes discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure data accuracy, and overcome data limits.
3. The report describes the sampling frame – area and population to be represented, rationale for selection, mechanics of selection, numbers selected out of potential subjects, and limitations of the sample.
4. The evaluation report gives complete description of stakeholder’s consultation process in the evaluation including the rationale for selecting the particular level and activities of consultation.
5. The methods employed are appropriate for the evaluation and to answer its questions.
6. The methods employed are appropriate for analysing gender and human rights issues including child rights issues identified in the evaluation scope.
7. The report presents evidence that adequate measures were taken to ensure data quality, including evidence supporting the reliability and validity of data collection tools (e.g., interview protocols, observation tools etc.)
8. The evaluation design was ethical and included ethical safeguards where appropriate, including protection of confidentiality, dignity, rights, and welfare of human subjects particularly children, and respect of the values of the beneficiary community.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Findings**   Findings respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report are based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report.   1. Reported findings reflect systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data. 2. Reported findings address the evaluation criteria (such as efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact, and relevance) and questions defined in the evaluation scope. 3. Findings are objectively reported on the evidence. 4. Gaps and limitations in the data and/or unanticipated findings are reported and discussed. 5. Reasons for accomplishments and failures, especially continuing constraints, were identified as much as possible. 6. Overall findings are presented with clarity, logic, and coherence. |
| 1. **Conclusions and Lessons Learned**   Conclusions present reasonable judgements based on findings and substantiated by evidence and provide insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.   1. The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgements relating to key evaluation questions. 2. Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings. 3. Stated conclusions provide insights into the identification and/or solutions of important problems issues pertinent to the prospective decisions and actions of evaluation users. 4. Conclusions present strengths and weaknesses of the object (policy, programmes, projects, or other intervention) being evaluated, based on the evidence presented in taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders. 5. Lessons learned, when presented, were generalized beyond the immediate intervention being evaluated to indicate what wider relevance there might be. |
| 1. **Recommendations**   Recommendations are relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation, are supported by evidence and conclusions, and were developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders.   1. The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendation including consultation with stakeholders. 2. Recommendations are firmly based on evidence and conclusions. 3. Recommendations are relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation. |

1. National research permit from the National Commission on Science, Technology, and Innovation (NACOSTI) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Costs or fees as applicable should be included in the financial bid. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. [AMREF ESRC](https://esrc.amref.org/), [KEMRI SERU](https://www.kemri.go.ke/scientific-ethics-review-unit-seru/) and [KNH-UoN ERC](https://erc.uonbi.ac.ke/) are just to mention a few. Normally ethics review process takes at least a month, however, there is an option of applying for an expedited review at an extra cost. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)