

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

TERMS OF REFERENCE LOT 2

LONG TERM AGREEMENT FOR THE SUPPLY OF EVALUATION SERVICES IN THE THEMATIC AREAS OF FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION AND GENDER EQUALITY

INTRODUCTION

1. Evaluation at the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) serves three main purposes: (a) to demonstrate accountability to stakeholders on performance in achieving development results and on invested results; (b) to support evidence-based decision making; (c) to 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

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Joint evaluations with UNICEF on Female Genital Mutilation abandonment

2. In 2007, UNFPA organised a Global Consultation on Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) which led to the creation of the UNFPA - UNICEF Joint Programme on Eliminating Female Genital Mutilation. In line with the UN General Assembly Resolutions related to the abandonment of FGM as well as the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals, the joint programme directly contributes to the achievement of Goal 5, related to gender equality. Moreover, the joint programme addresses key results areas in both the strategic plans of UNFPA and UNICEF.
3. The joint programme is currently concluding its second phase of implementation and will launch the third phase in 2018. To date, there has been one evaluation conducted in 2012/2013 on the first phase of the joint programme.
4. In the effort to demonstrate accountability to partner countries, donors and other key stakeholders on the joint programme's performance in achieving results, to support evidence-based decision making, and to contribute to the learning and sharing of good practice, it is incumbent upon the Evaluation Office (EO) of UNFPA jointly with UNICEF EO to undertake evaluations of the joint programme contribution to FGM abandonment at key points of its implementation.
5. As part of its quadrennial budgeted evaluation plan for 2018-2021, the UNFPA EO foresees the conduct of the following joint evaluations on FGM abandonment:
 - J UNFPA and UNICEF Joint Evaluation of UNFPA/UNICEF Joint Programme on the Abandonment of Female Genital Mutilation: Accelerating Change Phase I and Phase II (to be launched early 2018 with a budget range of USD 440,000 - 470,000)
 - J UNFPA and UNICEF Formative Joint Evaluation of UNFPA/UNICEF Joint Programme on the Abandonment of Female Genital Mutilation: Accelerating Change Phase III (to be launched in 2020 with a budget range of USD 250,000 - 300,000)

¹ Cf. UNFPA Evaluation Policy – DP/FPA/2013/5

6. The main users of both evaluations include staff members at UNFPA and UNICEF (at the global, regional and country level), partner countries, the joint programme steering committee members, civil society (including non-governmental organizations, feminists and women's rights activists, gender equality advocates). In particular, both evaluations will provide useful information to the managers and the steering committee of the UNFPA/UNICEF joint programme on female genital mutilation.
7. The responsibility for the management and supervision of both evaluation will rest with the evaluation management group chaired by the UNFPA EO lead evaluation manager. The evaluation management group will be composed of staff members of the UNFPA and UNICEF EOs. The evaluation management group will have overall responsibility for the management of the evaluation process, including the managing the evaluation team. The evaluation management group are responsible for ensuring the quality and independence of the two respective evaluation assignments in line with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines. The progress of both evaluations will also be followed closely by the evaluation reference group consisting of members of UNFPA/UNICEF joint programme and relevant business units and other external stakeholders who are directly interested in the results of this evaluation.

Corporate thematic evaluation related to gender equality

8. The achievement of gender equality and women's empowerment, through a human rights based approach, is central to UNFPA's mandate and corporate strategy and aligns with the ICPD and SDGs. In UNFPA strategic plan 2018-2021, gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls is included as a stand-alone outcome and is also mainstreamed across all other outcomes. This was also the case in previous UNFPA strategic plans, including UNFPA SP 2014-2017 and mid-term review of SP 2012-2013.
9. In the effort to demonstrate accountability to partner countries and donors, to support evidence-based decision making, and to contribute to the learning and sharing of good practice, it is incumbent upon the Evaluation Office (EO) of UNFPA to evaluate UNFPA's support to the advancement of gender equality and women's empowerment.
10. As part of its quadrennial budgeted evaluation plan for 2018-2021, the UNFPA EO foresees the conduct the following thematic evaluation related to gender equality:
 -) Evaluation on UNFPA Support to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (to be launched in 2019 with a budget range of USD 400,000 USD 450,000)
11. The main users of the evaluation will include staff members at UNFPA (at the global, regional and country level), partner countries, civil society (including non-governmental organizations, feminists and women's rights activists, gender equality advocates), academia and other key stakeholders. In particular, the evaluation will provide useful information to the programme managers and technical specialists at UNFPA who will be involved in the implementation of an overall strategy on gender equality, which is currently being developed by the Gender, Human Rights and Culture Branch.
12. The responsibility for the management and supervision of the evaluation will rest with the UNFPA evaluation manager. The evaluation manager will have overall responsibility for the management of the evaluation process, including managing the evaluation team. The evaluation manager is responsible for ensuring the quality and independence of the evaluation in line with UNEG Norms and

Standards and Ethical Guidelines. The progress of the evaluation will also be followed closely by the evaluation reference group consisting of members from relevant UNFPA business units and other external stakeholders who are directly interested in the results of this evaluation.

13. In addition to conducting the evaluations in its quadrennial budgeted evaluation plan, the Evaluation Office may use the Long-Term Agreement to request other, smaller-scale evaluation related services at different points during the validity of the LTA. These services may include, participation in workshops or conferences, production of additional dissemination products (e.g. evaluation briefs; dissemination videos) related to but not included in the budget for evaluations.

OBJECTIVE AND SERVICES REQUIRED

14. The objective of the long-term agreement is to provide for a number of high quality evaluation services for specific evaluations related to this thematic area within the UNFPA quadrennial budgeted evaluation plan.

15. The supplier is responsible for delivering the evaluation and all associated products in line with the specific ToR for each evaluation and under the overall leadership from the evaluation management group, chaired by the lead evaluation manager of the UNFPA Evaluation Office. The evaluation process will unfold in the following four phases and will encompass (as a minimum) the following deliverables:

) **Inception phase** (covering a period of 2 to 3 months): The supplier will be expected to prepare an **inception report** (or methodological note as appropriate) as well as a work plan for data collection. Upon conclusion of this phase, the supplier will be expected to produce a final inception report (or methodological note) and a concrete work plan for the remaining phases of the evaluation. Please refer to annex for the structure of the inception report. For examples of inception reports, please refer to the UNFPA EO website: <http://www.unfpa.org/evaluation> ;

) **Data collection phase** (covering a period of 5 to 7 months): The supplier may be expected to undertake field and desk based country case studies which will require the preparation of **country case study evidence tables** (or some form of case study notes). Please refer to annex for the structure of the country evidence tables. Field-based case studies will require the supplier to undertake in-country missions. Detailed power point presentations on the preliminary findings should be prepared for the debriefing exit meeting in country.

- For the UNFPA and UNICEF Joint Evaluation of UNFPA/UNICEF Joint Programme on Female Genital Mutilation Phase I and Phase II to be launched in the first quarter of 2018, the following countries are proposed to be included as field-based case studies, but may be subject to change: Egypt, Senegal, Kenya, and Ethiopia.
- For the UNFPA and UNICEF Formative Joint Evaluation of UNFPA/UNICEF Joint Programme on Female Genital Mutilation Phase III to be launched in 2020, the countries to be included as field-based case studies for the evaluation of the third phase is yet to be determined.

- For Evaluation on UNFPA Support to Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment to be launched in 2019, the countries to be included as field-based case studies for the evaluation is yet to be determined.
-) **Analysis and reporting phase** (covering a period of 2 to 3 months): The supplier will be expected to prepare a draft evaluation report. During the revision process, the supplier will provide an audit trail of the responses to any comments made by the evaluation management group, evaluation reference group members. Upon conclusion of the revision process, the supplier will be expected to produce a final evaluation report. Please refer to annex for the structure of the evaluation report. For examples of evaluation reports, please refer to the UNFPA EO website: <http://www.unfpa.org/evaluation>;
-) **Dissemination and follow up phase** (covering a period of 1 to 3 months): The supplier will be expected to professionally copy edit, design and print the evaluation report in English. The supplier will also produce an evaluation brief (including the use of infographics), which includes the professional copy edit, design and print of the evaluation brief in English, and as appropriate, French and Spanish. As requested, the supplier may be expected to produce other dissemination products, attend and/or present at related dissemination event.
16. The production of each of the above listed evaluation deliverables may entail several revisions until the deliverable is considered final by the evaluation management group. For each deliverable – inception report/ methodological note; draft final evaluation report; final evaluation report, the supplier will also produce a powerpoint/ prezi presentation highlighting the main elements of the deliverable.
 17. 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.
 18. 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.
 19. The specific Terms of Reference for each evaluation will be provided to the LTA holder(s) with the secondary bidding request. It will provide key information for the each evaluation, including background information, the objectives and scope of the evaluation, the proposed methodological approach, including the sampling approach for the case studies, and the expected deliverables and indicative timeline.
 20. UNFPA Evaluation Office will notify the LTA holder(s) the planned start date of each evaluation at least 3 months prior to the expected start date. UNFPA will issue a secondary bidding request a minimum of three (3) weeks in advance prior to the expected start date. For more details on the secondary bidding procedure and the evaluation of secondary bids, please refer to Section 36.4 of the RFP document.
 21. 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.

22. **For the UNFPA and UNICEF Joint Evaluation of UNFPA/UNICEF Joint Programme on the Abandonment of Female Genital Mutilation: Accelerating Change Phase I and Phase II, the most current Terms of Reference (ToR) for the evaluation are attached to the Procurement Notice.** This joint evaluation is expected to start in March/April 2018. The ToR for the evaluation is for informational purpose for those applying to the LTAs and no action required at this point. UNFPA reserves the right to make minor adjustments to the ToR when issuing the secondary bidding request shortly after the awarded of the LTAs under this RFP.

QUALITY ASSURANCE

23. For each evaluation, the supplier will conduct the first level of quality assurance for all evaluation products prior to their submission to the UNFPA EO, or the evaluation management group in the case of joint evaluations.
24. 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 supplier must present the quality assurance mechanisms which will be applied throughout the evaluation process as part of the technical offer.
25. The UNFPA EO recommends that its evaluation quality assessment checklist (please refer to the Annex section 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.
26. The evaluation manager/ the evaluation management group for joint evaluations will provide a second level of quality assurance.
27. The evaluation reference group will provide a third level of quality assurance.
28. For corporate evaluations the Director of the Evaluation Office maintains an oversight and quality assurance of the final evaluation report.
29. In addition, the evaluation report for corporate evaluations will be subject to assessment by an independent evaluation quality assessment provider using an evaluation quality assessment grid (please refer to annex). The evaluation quality assessment grid will be published along with the evaluation report on the Evaluation Office website.

REQUIRED PROFILES

30. 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.
31. The evaluation team will collectively bring the below expertise and experience:
-) Extensive experience (as defined further down) in conducting complex global thematic/programmatic evaluations for international development organizations with a specific focus on gender equality and harmful practices.

-)] Demonstrable experience of ensuring a human rights based approach to evaluation as evidence by previous assignments
-)] In-depth knowledge of evaluation methodology and mix-method approaches
-)] In-depth knowledge of and expertise in the following areas: (i) Harmful practices and social norms; Human rights, including specifically gender equality and the rights of women and girls; Community based development and movement building for social change
-)] Strong ability to interact with a wide range of stakeholders, particularly on issues that are quite sensitive
-)] Understanding of ethical issues and approaches to informed consent with regards to collecting information on harmful practices such as FGM.
-)] Knowledge of the UN system, including reform processes, and UN programming at the country level, will bring additional points.
-)] Demonstrable analytical, communication and drafting writing skills in English.
-)] Fluency in French and Spanish (past work experience in French/ Spanish) will be required for the team members leading on the Francophone and /or Hispanophone country case studies.

32. The above description will be assessed using the profile requirements listed below. Further evaluation will be done during the secondary bidding where further details on the local experts' profiles will be provided.

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

A team leader or 2 co-team leaders (senior evaluator(s) with 10 + years of experience)

-)] Holding advanced degree in social sciences or related fields
-)] A minimum of 10 years of experience working in the development field.
-)] Out of this 10 years a minimum of 8 years of evaluation experience, conducting specifically evaluations for international organizations or development agencies.
-)] Conducting, as team leader/co-team leader, a minimum of 4 evaluations of similar size and complexity.
-)] Experience working with the United Nations, particularly UNFPA.
-)] Strong understanding of UNFPA's and UNICEF's policies and programming will bring additional points (in particular for the FGM joint evaluations).
-)] Demonstrable analytical and writing/drafting skills in English. The bidder should provide a work sample of a report written by the proposed team leader(s) as an annex to the technical proposal.
-)] Fluency in French and/or Spanish (past work experience in French/ Spanish) will bring additional points.

The primary responsibilities of the team leader or co-team leader will be:

-) overall responsibility for the output;
-) guiding and managing the team throughout the evaluation phases
-) setting out the methodological approach;
-) training the rest of the team to ensure that all team members have a common understanding of the exercise and methodology;
-) 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 evaluation management group 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 evidence tables or country notes, as required) in line with the requested outlines and quality standards.

Senior thematic expert in FGM and harmful practices (8 + years)

-) A minimum of 8 years of experience in women's human rights, gender equality and child protection, with a specific focus on FGM and harmful practices.
-) Previous direct experience working with a range of groups and movements to advance gender equality, child protection and tackle FGM, including community based organizations, non-profit organizations, and social movements will bring additional points.
-) Experience contributing to and/or exposure to thematic/ programme evaluations will bring additional points
-) Demonstrable analytical and writing/drafting skills in English. Bidder should provide work samples written by the proposed team member as an annex to the technical proposal.
-) Fluency in French and/or Spanish (past work experience in French/ Spanish) will bring additional points.

Senior thematic expert in gender equality and on social norm change (8 + years)

-) A minimum of 8 years of experience in women's human rights and gender equality, with a specific focus on social norm change and behaviour change programming.
-) Previous direct experience working with a range of groups and movements to advance gender equality and tackle underlying drivers for discrimination, including specifically community based organizations, will bring additional points.
-) Experience contributing to and/or exposure to thematic/ programme evaluations will bring additional points.
-) Demonstrable analytical and writing/drafting skills in English. Bidder should provide work samples written by the proposed team member as an annex to the technical proposal.

-) Fluency in French and/or Spanish (past work experience in French/ Spanish) will bring additional points.

The primary responsibilities of the 2 thematic experts will be to:

-) contribute to the design of the evaluation methodology
-) undertake in-depth document review
-) conduct field work to generate additional evidence from field visits and consultations of a wide range of stakeholders
-) conduct documentary review and remote interviews for the extended desk countries
-) contribute to the design and analysis of a survey (s)
-) participate in team meetings, including with stakeholders
-) prepare inputs and make contributions to the evaluation deliverables.

Local experts will complement the evaluation team. Required qualifications, skills and competencies 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:

-) 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.

34. 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.

35. For the first evaluation, the countries have been identified as per the ToR for information purposes attached under the Procurement Notice. For the second evaluation, the list will be provided at the secondary bidding stage.

TRAVEL AND SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS

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

ANNEXES FOLLOW

- Annex 1: Structure of evaluation report
- Annex 2: Structure of inception report
- Annex 3: Structure of the country evidence table
- Annex 4: Quality assurance checklist
- Annex 5: Evaluation quality assessment grid

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Structure of evaluation report (example)

I. 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: 7- 8 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/UNICEF support elimination of FGM

2 Methodology

Should include: overview of the evaluation process; methods and tools used in evaluation design; analysis of UNFPA/UNICEF strategic framework; evaluation questions and assumptions to be assessed; methods and tools used for data collection; desk review; survey; case studies; limitations to data collection; methods and tools used for data analysis; methods of judgment; the approach to triangulation and validation

3 Main findings and analysis

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: evaluation matrix; ex-post theory of change; portfolio of interventions; methodological instruments used (survey, focus groups, interviews etc.); bibliography; list of people interviewed; terms of reference; minutes of the ERG meetings.

(*) *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/UNICEF Evaluation Office in due course.

Annex 2: Structure of inception report (example)

I. 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

Should include: the global response/ normative on FGM related work based on official documentation; Joint Programme context; reconstruction of intervention logic (theory of change)

3 Methodology

Should include: Description and rationale for methodological choice and approach including methodology for data collection, analysis and validation techniques. Instruments of data collection such as: interview protocols per type of informant; protocol for focus groups; global survey outline. Description of how the data should be cross-checked and limitations of the exercise and strategies to mitigate them.

4 Proposed Evaluation Questions

Should include: detailed proposed evaluation questions (including: rationale; method/chain of reasoning; assumptions to be assessed and corresponding qualitative and/or quantitative indicators); coverage of issues stated in the ToR by each Evaluation Question. The questions should be presented in an evaluation matrix.

5 Next Steps

Should include: a detailed work plan for the next phases/stages of the evaluation, including detailed plans for the visits in programme countries, 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 national consultants and distribution of tasks; logistics for the field phase; the contractor's approach to ensure quality assurance of all evaluation deliverables.

6 Annexes

Should include: portfolio of interventions; evaluation matrix; stakeholder map; template for survey; bibliography; list of persons met; terms of reference

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

Annex 3: Structure of the country evidence table

COUNTRY NAME

Context	Document	Evidence	Interviews Evidence
<i>Interventions</i>			
<i>Expenditure</i>			
<i>Implementing partners delivering</i>			

EQ 1 – Relevance	Document	Evidence	Interview Evidence
Assumption 1			
...			
EQ 2 – Relevance	Document	Evidence	Interview Evidence
EQ 3 –Efficiency	Document	Evidence	Interview Evidence
EQ 4 – Efficiency and sustainability	Document	Evidence	Interview Evidence
EQ 5 – Effectiveness	Document	Evidence	Interview Evidence
EQ 6 – Effectiveness	Document	Evidence	Interview Evidence

EQ 7 – Effectiveness	Document	Evidence	Interview Evidence
EQ 8 – Coordination	Document	Evidence	Interview Evidence

Important issues not included in the Assumptions	
1	.
2	
3	
...	

CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE OVERARCHING GLOBAL THEMATIC LEVEL

Consideration 1.	
Consideration 2.	
...	
Interview respondents	
1	.
2	
3	
...	

Annex 4: Quality assurance checklist

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 5: Evaluation quality assessment grid

The evaluation quality assessment grid and the guidance note for the use of the grid are available here:

<http://www.unfpa.org/admin-resource/evaluation-quality-assurance-and-assessment-tools-and-guidance>