



Evaluation Office

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL UNFPA/USA/RFP/17/035

TERMS OF REFERENCE LOT 1

LONG TERM AGREEMENT FOR THE SUPPLY OF EVALUATION SERVICES IN THE FIELD OF HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

9 NOVEMBER 2017

A. Introduction

1. Evaluation at the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) serves three main purposes: (a) demonstrate accountability to stakeholders on performance in achieving development results and on invested results; (b) support evidence-based decision making; (c) contribute key lessons learned to the existing knowledge base on how to accelerate implementation of the Programme of Action of the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD).¹

B. Background and context

2. Following the growing share of humanitarian assistance within the portfolio of activities of UNFPA, the Evaluation Office (EO) aims at developing its humanitarian evaluations.
3. As part of its quadrennial evaluation plan for 2018-2021, the EO foresees the conduct of the following humanitarian evaluations:
 -) Evaluation of UNFPA's capacity to respond to humanitarian crises (to be launched in 2018, with an estimated budget ranging between \$ 250,000 and \$ 350,000);
 -) Evaluation of UNFPA support to the use of population data in humanitarian preparedness and response (to be launched in 2020, with an estimated budget ranging between \$ 300,000 and \$ 450,000).

4. Other evaluations may be added to the EO quadrennial plan in the course of its implementation.
5. In addition to conducting the evaluations in its quadrennial evaluation plan, the Evaluation Office may use the Long-Term Agreement(s) to request other, smaller-scale evaluation services at different points during any given year. These services may include evaluability assessments, workshops or conferences related to but not included in the budget for evaluations, evaluation-related facilitation services and/or communication activities related to evaluation work.

C. Objective and services required

6. The objective of the long-term agreement(s) is the provision of a number of high quality evaluation services for specific evaluations within the Evaluation Office's quadrennial plan.
7. The LTA holder is responsible for delivering the evaluation and all associated products in line with the specific ToR for each evaluation and in line with the Evaluation Office guidance and standards, as well as those of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP). As per the EO standard practice, the evaluation process usually unfolds in four phases and encompasses (as a minimum) the following deliverables:
 - J **Inception phase** (covering a period of 3 to 5 months): the supplier will conduct the design of the evaluation in consultation with the EO evaluation manager. The inception phase will end with the production of an *inception report* (English; see annex 1 for an outline of the inception report).
 - J **Data collection phase** (covering a period of 5 to 7 months): Data collection will utilize a wide range of tools, including desk-based research and country (field) visits which may entail the production of *country notes* and/or *case study reports*. Each country visit will end with a detailed *powerpoint presentation* on preliminary findings, within the framework of a debriefing meeting.
 - J the **analysis and reporting phase** (covering a period of 3 to 4 months): will lead to the production of a *draft final report* (English) to be submitted to the evaluation manager for comments. Prior to submission, the evaluation team must ensure that the draft final report has undergone a rigorous internal quality control (see section D. below). Based on comments expressed by the evaluation manager and the evaluation reference group, the supplier will make appropriate amendments and submit the *final report* (see annex 2 for an outline of the final evaluation report).
 - J the **dissemination and follow up phase** (covering a period of 1 to 4 months): the supplier is expected to: (a) provide a *professionally copy edited report*; (b) translate the report *executive summary* in French and, as appropriate in Spanish; (c) draft the *Evaluation Brief* which consists in a short paper presenting (including the use of infographics) the main results of the evaluation; (d) produce *powerpoint presentations*. The supplier may also be expected to contribute to other dissemination products and will be requested to participate in dissemination events.

8. The production of each of the above listed evaluation deliverables may entail several revisions until the deliverable is considered final by the evaluation manager. For each deliverable, the supplier will also produce a powerpoint presentation highlighting the main elements of the deliverable. Please refer to the Evaluation Office webpage at <http://www.unfpa.org/evaluation> for examples of evaluation inception reports, country notes, final reports, briefs and translated executive summaries.
9. The LTA holder will be expected to submit professionally edited reports. Should translation/interpretation services be needed, the LTA holder will be expected to arrange and pay for such services. The rates for editing, translation, and interpretation must be included in the designated section of the Price Schedule Form.
10. In addition to the above, the supplier may also be expected to attend workshops and/or meetings at specific points in time during the evaluation process, as required by the specific evaluation.
11. The specific Terms of Reference for each evaluation will be provided to the LTA holder(s) with the secondary bidding request.
12. UNFPA will notify the LTA holder(s) the planned start date of the evaluation at least three (3) months in advance. UNFPA will issue a secondary bidding request a minimum of three (3) weeks in advance prior to the expected start date and the LTA holder(s) will submit both a detailed technical and a financial proposal within two (2) weeks. For more details on the secondary bidding procedure and the evaluation of secondary bids, please refer to Section 36.4 of the RFP document.
13. Provided that UNFPA has complied with this minimum advance notice, the supplier will be expected to have the requested resources available to begin work on the indicated start date and complete work within the agreed-upon timeframe. Team members who have started work on the project will be expected to stay on the project until its completion.

D. Quality assurance

14. For each evaluation, the supplier will conduct the first level of quality assurance for all evaluation products prior to their submission to the UNFPA Evaluation Office.
15. The supplier is expected to dedicate specific resources to quality assurance efforts that are independent from the evaluation team, and must consider all time, resources, and costs related to this in their technical and financial bid. The bidder must present the quality assurance mechanisms which will be applied throughout the evaluation process as part of the technical offer.
16. The Evaluation Office recommends that the evaluation quality assessment checklist (see annex 3 of this ToR document) is used as an element of the proposed quality assurance system for the draft and final versions of the evaluation report. The main purpose of this checklist is to ensure that the evaluation report complies with evaluation professional standards.
17. The UNFPA evaluation manager, with the support of the reference group, will provide a second level of quality assurance.

18. The Director of the Evaluation Office maintains an oversight of the final evaluation reports.
19. Finally, the final evaluation report will be subject to assessment by an independent evaluation quality assessment provider using an evaluation quality assessment grid (see annex 4) The evaluation quality assessment grid will be published along with the evaluation report on the Evaluation Office website.

E. Required profiles

20. Bidders are encouraged to present an offer with partners from both the global south and the global north. However, from a contractual perspective, the LTA will be awarded and signed with a single entity (the one submitting the bid) which will bear the full responsibility for delivering the services under the LTA.
21. For each evaluation, the evaluation team will collectively bring the below expertise and experience:
 -) Extensive (as defined further down) evaluation experience of humanitarian policies, strategies and programmes and of complex conflict situations, internal displacement, refugee programmes and transition settings;
 -) Demonstrable experience with and institutional knowledge of humanitarian UN and NGO actors, the inter-agency mechanisms, such as OCHA and CERF funding, and the IASC, as evidenced by previous work experience;
 -) Demonstrable familiarity with the Transformative Agenda (Leadership, Coordination, Accountability to Affected Populations, etc.), as evidenced by previous work experience;
 -) Demonstrable knowledge of humanitarian law and principles, and experience with using human rights and gender analysis in evaluations, as evidenced by previous work experience;
 -) Good understanding of UNFPA mandate and processes as demonstrated in the technical proposal;
 -) Demonstrable regional expertise and knowledge of the regional issues, as relevant for the evaluation considered, based on previous work experience;
 -) Demonstrable analytical, communication and drafting skills in English, as evidenced by previous work experience;
 -) Good communication skills (written, spoken) in languages spoken in the region and countries covered, as demonstrated by previous work experience, will bring additional points.
22. The above collective expertise and experience will be assessed using the profile requirements listed below. Further evaluation will be done during the secondary bidding where further details on local experts profiles will be provided.

23. The evaluation team will be composed of one or several of the following profiles, with associated qualifications, skills and competencies:

) **Team leader**, holding advanced degree in social sciences or related fields, with at least 10 years of experience working in the humanitarian sector and 8 years of evaluation experience, including experience of leading (at least) 4 major evaluations of humanitarian assistance. The team leader should have demonstrated expertise (as evidenced by previous work experience) in (at least) one of the thematic areas directly relevant to the evaluation considered. He/she must possess excellent analytical, communication and writing/drafting skills in English. Fluency in French or Spanish will bring additional points. Supplier should provide work samples (including sample of a report drafted by the proposed team leader) as an annex to the technical proposal.

The primary responsibilities of the team leader will be:

- guiding and managing the team throughout the evaluation phases
- setting out the methodological approach
- leading the first (pilot) field mission
- reviewing and consolidating the team members' inputs to ensure quality and timeliness of the evaluation deliverables
- liaising with the UNFPA Evaluation Office and representing the evaluation team in meetings with stakeholders
- delivering the inception report and the draft final and final evaluation reports (as well as other deliverables, such as country notes and/or country case study reports, as required) in line with the requested outlines and quality standards.

) **Evaluator(s)**, holding a diploma in social sciences, with at least 8 years of experience working in the humanitarian sector, as well as significant evaluation experience (5 years minimum). Each evaluator should have a demonstrated expertise (as evidenced by previous work experience) in (at least) one of the thematic areas directly relevant to the evaluation considered. These include: (i) sexual and reproductive health; (ii) gender equality; (iii) population dynamics; (iv) adolescents and youth. Evaluators must possess demonstrable analytical and writing/drafting skills in English, as evidenced by previous work experience. Fluency in French or Spanish will bring additional points. Bidders should provide work samples written by each proposed evaluator as an annex to the technical proposal.

The primary responsibilities of evaluators will be to:

- contribute to the design of the evaluation methodology
- undertake in-depth document review

Terms of reference – Long term agreement for humanitarian evaluations

- conduct field work to generate additional evidence from field visits and consultations of a wide range of stakeholders
- participate in team meetings, including with stakeholders
- prepare inputs and make contributions to the evaluation deliverables.

) **Data analyst(s)/researcher(s)**, capable of organizing and analyzing large sets of data in support of the rest of the evaluation team. The data analyst(s)/researcher(s) should have at least 5 years of experience in the field of data analysis and/or research.

) **Organization and logistics assistant**, capable of providing administrative and logistical support to the rest of the evaluation team.

24. **Local experts** will complement the evaluation team. Required qualifications, skills and competencies for local experts are:

) Knowledge of national/regional/local context as required by each evaluation.

) Technical knowledge in related thematic area as required by each evaluation.

) Demonstrable analytical skills in English. Supplier should provide work samples as an annex to the technical proposal.

) Fluency in the local languages (past work experience in local languages).

) Administrative and logistical experience.

The primary responsibilities of the local experts are:

) Support the core team on the preparation, conduct of the field missions as well as reporting;

) Contribute to various tasks related to the evaluation, which may include: desk review, stakeholder mapping, mission planning, including the mission agenda preparation, conduct interviews and interview/group discussions, draft interview logbooks, and prepare country evidence tables.

Interpretation services to local languages that are not UN languages may be required. Such requirements will be specified at the secondary bidding stage. The LTA holder will be expected to arrange and pay for such services. The cost of local-language interpretation is not included in this RFP, but will be included in secondary bidding.

F. Travel and security arrangements

Please refer to the Special Conditions of Contract section in the RFP document.

ANNEXES FOLLOW

Annex 1: outline of the inception report

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms

List of Tables (*)

List of Figures

1 Introduction

Should include: objectives of the evaluation; scope of the evaluation; overview of the evaluation process; purpose of the inception report

2 Background and context

Should include: a description of the context (e.g. key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors) as well as the main programmes and interventions constituting the UNFPA response. Information on any relevant reviews, assessments, audits and/or evaluations previously conducted should be mentioned.

This section should detail strategies or approaches to programming as well as discuss cross-cutting issues, including particularly issues relating to human rights and gender equality.

3 Intervention logic

Should include: an in-depth analysis of the intervention logic, i.e., assumptions, causality links and risks underlying UNFPA interventions.

4 Methodology

Should include: rationale for methodological choices description of the methods and tools for data collection, analysis, as well as validation techniques. Detailed information on the instruments for data collection and analysis such as: interview protocols per type of informant; protocol for focus groups; structure and lines of enquiries for the case studies; etc. Description of how the data should be cross-checked and limitations of the exercise and strategies to mitigate them.

5 Proposed Evaluation Questions

Should include: a set of evaluation questions with explanatory comments (rationale; coverage of the issues raised in the ToR); detailed approach to answering the evaluation questions (including assumptions to be assessed, indicators, sources of information and associated data collection methods and tools) in the form of an evaluation matrix (cf. annex 2)

6 Next Steps

Should include: a detailed work plan for the next phases/stages of the evaluation, including detailed plans for the field visits, including the list of interventions for in-depth analysis in the field (explanation of the value added for the visits); team composition for the cases studies including distribution of tasks; logistics for the field phase; the contractor's approach to ensure quality assurance of all evaluation deliverables.

8 Annexes

Should include: portfolio of relevant interventions; evaluation matrix; stakeholder map; interview and focus group protocols; detailed structure of the case studies; bibliography; list of persons met; terms of reference

() Tables, graphs and diagrams should be numbered and have a title.*

Annex 2: Outline of the final report

Number of pages: 70-80 pages without the annexes

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms

List of Tables (*)

List of Figures

Executive Summary: 3-5 pages: objectives, short summary of the methodology and key conclusions and recommendations

1 Introduction

Should include: purpose of the evaluation; mandate and strategy of UNFPA in the response to the Syria crisis

2 Methodology

Should include: overview of the evaluation process; methods and tools used for data collection and analysis; evaluation questions and assumptions to be assessed; limitations to data collection; approach to triangulation and validation

3 Findings

Should include for each response to evaluation question: evaluation criteria covered; summary of the response; detailed response

4 Conclusions

Should include for each conclusion: summary; origin (which evaluation question(s) the conclusion is based on); detailed conclusion

5 Recommendations

Should include for each recommendation: summary; priority level (very high/high/medium); target (business unit(s) to which the recommendation is addressed); origin (which conclusion(s) the recommendation is based on); operational implications. Recommendations must be: linked to the conclusions; clustered, prioritized; accompanied by timing for implementation; useful and operational

Annexes shall be confined to a separate volume

Should include: country notes; case study reports; evaluation matrix; portfolio of interventions; methodological instruments used (survey, focus groups, interviews etc.); bibliography; list of people interviewed; terms of reference.

() Tables, Graphs, diagrams, maps etc. presented in the final evaluation report must also be provided to the Evaluation Office in their original version (in Excel, PowerPoint or word files, etc.).*

The final version of the evaluation report shall be presented in a way that enables publication (professionally designed and copy edited) without need for any further editing (see section below). Please note that, for the final report, the company should share the files in Adobe Indesign CC software, with text presented in two columns with no hyphenation. Further details on design will be provided by UNFPA Evaluation Office in due course.

Annex 3: Evaluation quality assessment check-list

1. Structure and Clarity of the Report
To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.
2. Executive Summary
To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section including key elements of the evaluation, such as objectives, methodology and conclusions and recommendations.
3. Design and Methodology
To provide a clear explanation of the methods and tools used including the rationale for the methodological choice justified. To ensure constraints and limitations are made explicit (including limitations applying to interpretations and extrapolations; robustness of data sources, etc.)
4. Reliability of Data
To ensure sources of data are clearly stated for both primary and secondary data. To provide explanation on the credibility of primary (e.g. interviews and focus groups) and secondary (e.g. reports) data established and limitations made explicit.
5. Findings and Analysis
To ensure sound analysis and credible evidence-based findings. To ensure interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions; contextual factors are identified; cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained.
6. Validity of conclusions
To ensure conclusions are based on credible findings and convey evaluators' unbiased judgment of the intervention. Ensure conclusions are prioritised and clustered and include: summary; origin (which evaluation question(s) the conclusion is based on); detailed conclusion.
7. Usefulness and clarity of recommendations
To ensure recommendations flow logically from conclusions; are targeted, realistic and operationally-feasible; and are presented in priority order. Recommendations include: Summary; Priority level (very high/high/medium); Target (administrative unit(s) to which the recommendation is addressed); Origin (which conclusion(s) the recommendation is based on); Operational implications.
8. SWAP - Gender
To ensure the evaluation approach is aligned with the SWAP.

Annex 4: Evaluation quality assessment grid



Organizational unit:

Year of report:

Title of evaluation report:

Overall quality of report:

Good

Date of assessment:

Overall comments:

[insert text]

Assessment Levels

Very good:

strong, above average, best practice

Good:

satisfactory, respectable

Fair:

with some weaknesses, still acceptable

Unsatisfactory:

weak, does not meet minimal quality standards

Quality Assessment Criteria	<i>Insert <u>assessment level</u> followed by main <u>comments</u>. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)</i>		
1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Undefined
<i>To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly</i>		Comment:	
1. Is the report easy to read and understand (i.e. written in an accessible language appropriate for the intended audience) with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors?	<Select one>		
2. Is the report of a reasonable length? (maximum pages for the main report, excluding annexes: 60 for institutional evaluations; 70 for CPEs; 80 for thematic evaluations)	<Select one>		
3. Is the report structured in a logical way? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?	<Select one>		
4. Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography; a list of interviewees; the evaluation matrix; methodological tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys) as well as information on the stakeholder consultation process?	<Select one>		
<i>Executive summary</i>			
5. Is an executive summary included in the report, written as a stand-alone section and presenting the main results of the evaluation?	<Select one>		
6. Is there a clear structure of the executive summary, (i.e. i) Purpose, including intended audience(s); ii) Objectives and brief description of intervention; iii) Methodology; iv) Main conclusions; v) Recommendations)?	<Select one>		
7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	<Select one>		

2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Undefined
<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>		Comment:	
1. Does the evaluation describe the target audience for the evaluation?	<Select one>		
2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	<Select one>		
3. Does the evaluation report describe the reconstruction of the intervention logic and/or theory of change, and assess the adequacy of these?	<Select one>		
<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>			
4. Is the evaluation framework clearly described in the text and in the evaluation matrix? Does the evaluation matrix establish the evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data sources and methods for data collection?	<Select one>		
5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	<Select one>		
6. Is there a comprehensive stakeholder map? Is the stakeholder consultation process clearly described (in particular, does it include the consultation of key stakeholders on draft recommendations)?	<Select one>		
7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	<Select one>		
8. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? (Does the report discuss how any bias has been overcome?)	<Select one>		
9. Is the sampling strategy described?	<Select one>		
10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	<Select one>		
	Yes		

11. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights)?		
--	--	--

3. Reliability of Data	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Undefined
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>		Comment:	
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	<Select one>		
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	<Select one>		
3. Did the evaluation make explicit any possible limitations (bias, data gaps etc.) in primary and secondary data sources and if relevant, explained what was done to minimize such issues?	<Select one>		
4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	<Select one>		

4. Analysis and Findings	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Undefined
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>		Comment:	
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	<Select one>		
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	<Select one>		
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	<Select one>		
4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?	<Select one>		

5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	<Select one>	
6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	<Select one>	
7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	<Select one>	
8. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?	<Select one>	

5. Conclusions	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Undefined
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>		Comment:	
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	<Select one>		
2. Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the programme/initiative/system being evaluated?	<Select one>		
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	<Select one>		

6. Recommendations	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Undefined
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>		Comment:	
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	<Select one>		
2. Are the recommendations clearly written, targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	<Select one>		

3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial?	<Select one>	
4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed?	<Select one>	
5. Are the recommendations prioritised and clearly presented to facilitate appropriate management response and follow up on each specific recommendation?	<Select one>	

7. Gender	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level:	Undefined
<i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)</i>		Comment:	
1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?	<Select one>		
2. Do evaluation criteria and evaluation questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved?	<Select one>		
3. Have gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques been selected?	<Select one>		
4. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	<Select one>		

(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted (in correlation with the calculation in the tool and totalling the scores 11-12 = very good, 8-10 = good, 4-7 = Fair, 0-3=unsatisfactory).

(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).

0 = Not at all integrated. Applies when none of the elements under a criterion are met.

1 = Partially integrated. Applies when some minimal elements are met but further progress is needed and remedial action to meet the standard is required.

2 = Satisfactorily integrated. Applies when a satisfactory level has been reached and many of the elements are met but still improvement could be done.

3 = Fully integrated. Applies when all of the elements under a criterion are met, used and fully integrated in the evaluation and no remedial action is required.

Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment

	Assessment Levels (*)			
Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*)	Very good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
1. Structure and clarity of reporting, including executive summary (7)				
2. Design and methodology (13)				
3. Reliability of data (11)				
4. Analysis and findings (40)				
5. Conclusions (11)				
6. Recommendations (11)				
7. Integration of gender (7)				
Total scoring points				
Overall assessment level of evaluation report				
	Very good very confident to use	Good confident to use	Fair use with caution	Unsatisfactory not confident to use

(*) (a) Insert scoring points associated with criteria in corresponding column (e.g. - if 'Analysis and findings' has been assessed as 'Good', enter 40 into 'Good' column.

(b) Assessment level with highest 'total scoring points' determines 'Overall assessment level of evaluation report'. Write corresponding assessment level in cell (e.g. 'Fair').

(c) Use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour.

If the overall assessment is 'Fair', please explain

- How it can be used?

- What aspects to be cautious about?

Where relevant, please explain the overall assessment Very good, Good or Unsatisfactory

Consideration of significant constraints

The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances:

Yes

No

If yes, please explain: