

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR SERVICE CONTRACTING (TOR)
LRPS No. 9140589 Annex- B

Assignment	Evaluation of the No Lost Generation (NLG) initiative
Location	Home based. Travel to MENARO – Jordan and 2 to 3 participating countries is expected.
Duration	65 days (over a period of 4 months, 15 th July – 15 th November 2018)
Estimate number of working days	65 days
Start date	15 th of July 2018
End date	15 th of November 2018
Reporting to	Regional Evaluation Advisor

1. JUSTIFICATION/BACKGROUND

The on-going humanitarian crisis in Syria continuously poses extreme challenges to people in the country, as well as to those who fled to neighbour countries, to exercise their human rights and to meet their basic needs.

Meanwhile, millions of vulnerable people in refugee-hosting communities in the host countries also require assistance. In this context, children – boys and girls alike - are among the most vulnerable as they are prevented from access to schooling, live in unsafe environments and are lacking opportunities to engage and network, in preparation for adulthood.

The No Lost Generation initiative is a concerted effort by donors, UN agencies, NGOs and governments advocating for intensified programme interventions that would ensure children and young people affected by the crises in Syria and Iraq have access to education, protection and opportunities to engage positively in their community and society. This global initiative was launched at the October 2013 side event to the Annual Meeting of the World Bank and IMF. Its scope in terms of development partners, donors, involved countries and programmatic coverage evolved over time.

The founding concept of No Lost Generation initiative is that Syrian children - both within the country and those who have fled to neighbour countries – should have access to education and a protective environment so that they are well equipped to eventually help rebuild their country and create an environment, conducive to sustainable peace and reconciliation¹. Although there is very little documentation relating to the inception or launch of the initiative, it is characterised by those involved

¹ No Lost Generation Concept Note, 2013.

at the time as a push for prioritisation of funding for education in the response to the Syria crisis, as well as for child protection, given the importance of this sector for attaining education results.

A Strategic Overview document, developed for the period October 2013 to December 2014, integrated programming elements, presented as a series of key actions in Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, Iraq and Egypt, in three programmatic areas with outreach targets that would be achieved with funding of 990 million USD. The programmatic areas are:

- Providing children with access to learning opportunities
- Providing children with access to a protective environment; and
- Providing children and adolescents with initiatives to broaden their opportunities.

The Strategic Overview document states that at that point nearly 60 per cent of the proposed actions and funding requirements it outlined were incorporated into the existing humanitarian response plans (the revised SHARP5 (Syrian Humanitarian Assistance Response Plan) and RRP6 (Regional Refugee Plan)). In subsequent years, the entirety of programmatic actions planned under the No Lost Generation umbrella were embedded in the relevant humanitarian plans. Thus, the intention from the beginning was to have no stand-alone No Lost Generation programming strategy outside of the regular humanitarian response plans. Equally, reporting on No Lost Generation is not stand alone; rather, the results of programmatic work that falls within the No Lost Generation programmatic areas, are extracted from the routine humanitarian reports of the involved countries. Similarly, for funding: there is no separate funding channel or pool of funds for No Lost Generation, and donors wishing to support the programming simply fund the relevant aspects of the humanitarian responses by partnering with operational organisations active in the respective area of the response.

Documentation on advocacy or communications activities undertaken under the No Lost Generation initiative during this first phase is not comprehensive, and an advocacy strategy reported to have been developed in 2014 is still being sought. A series of such activities - both agency-specific and joint - at country-, regional and global level, undertaken in 2013 and 2014, under the auspices of or with reference to the No Lost Generation initiative, highlighted the situation of children affected by the Syria crisis.

During this first phase, there was no dedicated coordination capacity for the initiative and the earliest record of the members of partnership indicates that there were five partners in August 2014, and that this number increased to 16 by sometime in 2015.

In May 2015, an NLG Advocacy, Strategy and Visioning Document was developed, outlining achievements to that date under the initiative and recommendations for going forward. Following this, a concept note was developed in late 2015 by No Lost Generation partners outlining a phase II of the initiative, set to start in 2016 and to last for 3-5 years. This concept note defined the initiative as a strategic framework and set out a series of programmatic shifts under each pillar for phase II of the initiative; this not only addressed partner/country level activities relating to specific programmatic approaches, but also set the frame for the inter-agency No Lost Generation activities to be undertaken jointly at regional and global level, including advocacy to maintain the same high level of visibility for the initiative and its objectives amongst global level decision-makers, as in phase I.

At country level, phase II saw an expansion of the scope of the initiative to include a third programmatic pillar: Adolescents and Youth. Whilst the countries covered by the initiative remained the same, phase II expanded the initiative to include the Iraq crisis in its own right (i.e. not just Iraq as

a country hosting refugees from Syria). Thus, programming in NLG areas in the Iraq HRP (Humanitarian Response Plan) was also considered to contribute to NLG goals and included in NLG reports, which continued to be generated by extracting relevant information from the existing humanitarian reporting systems.

At regional level, phase II saw establishment of a coordination mechanism through appointment of a dedicated coordinator (UNICEF staff member) in March 2016, establishment of three NGO co-leads (WVI, Save the Children and Mercy Corps), and establishment of a MENA-based No Lost Generation Working Group to steer the initiative, and agree and implement joint actions at regional level in support of No Lost Generation goals. The Working Group is open to UN Agencies and NGOs active in No Lost Generation areas in at least three of the countries covered by the initiative (Syria, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey and Egypt). In 2016 there were 20 partners in the Working Group; by Q1 2018 the number increased to 32 UN Agencies and NGOs².

An advocacy strategy, developed in early 2016, presented five advocacy priorities for NLG phase II, each with agreed key messages to support joint advocacy under the initiative, as follows:

- Parties to the conflicts inside Syria and Iraq end indiscriminate and targeted attacks on civilian areas that kill and maim children, as well as damage and destroy educational facilities.
- Strengthened protection of all children and youth affected by conflict, as well as enhanced and equitable access to services in safety and with dignity.
- Improved environment for adolescent and youth focused civic engagement and networking, as well as opportunities to influence decision making processes.
- Improved environment for livelihood opportunities for youth and refugee families.
- Accredited and certified safe formal and non-formal quality learning opportunities for children and youth across the sub-region, to develop and realize their full potential.

A series of advocacy events were held in 2017 and 2018, with involvement of various development partners and private-sector partners, aiming at improving cross-sectoral collaboration, knowledge sharing, building collective evidence for supporting programming in the NLG programmatic areas, as well as at formulating of specific projects addressing challenges faced by conflict-affected adolescents and youth, especially in the areas of education, livelihoods, participation and representation.

2. OBJECTIVE, PURPOSE AND EXPECTED RESULTS

To date, there has not been any evaluation or other assessment of the results achieved through the NLG initiative, or its contribution to the broader results of the overall response, in the context of the initiative's expansion in terms of partnerships, funds raised and programmatic evolving.

The purpose of the evaluation, which has been agreed to by the No Lost Generation partners in support of their collective planning for the future, is to objectively assess the achievements and merits of the No Lost Generation initiative, as a concept developed in late 2013 and implemented since then, to boost the response in countries affected by the Syria and Iraq crises in the areas of access to learning

² In addition to the co-leads (UNICEF, Mercy Corps, Save the Children and World Vision), No Lost Generation partners now include the following: ACTED, ActionAid, CARE, Dan Church Aid, the Danish Refugee Council, Finn Church Aid, Heartland Alliance, Human Rights Watch, ILO, International Medical Corps, Intersos, IOM, the International Rescue Committee, NetHope, The Norwegian Refugee Council, OCHA, Plan International, Relief International, Terre des hommes, UNHCR, UNDP, UNFPA, Un Ponte Per, UNRWA, UN Women, Warchild, WHO, WFP and Y-PEER.

opportunities and to protective environment, and broadening opportunities for children, adolescents and youth. The evaluation report is expected to inform senior managers' decision regarding the direction and any necessary changes in the design and implementation of the initiative in 2019 and beyond. Thus, the evaluation will have a strong utilisation focus, and is expected to capture forward looking lessons, conclusions and recommendations that will be used to strengthen the No Lost Generation initiative.

The Evaluation report will also serve accountability purpose. It will be used by NLG partners to demonstrate and communicate the added value of and learnings from the NLG initiative through sharing with a wider audience, including humanitarian and development donors, influencers and decision-makers at global, regional and country level.

To serve the purpose, the evaluation will include both formative and summative elements. It will focus on assessing the efficiency of multi-stakeholders' collaboration as well as the effectiveness of interventions at global, regional and country level. The evaluation will seek to generate evidence of NLG's contribution in addressing gaps in child rights implementation – particularly in the areas of access to learning opportunities, access to a protective environment and creating enabling environment for broader opportunities for adolescents and youth- both of girls and boys, in the Syria and Iraq crisis-affected countries.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSIGNMENT

3.1. SCOPE

Institutional scope

It is noted that the NLG initiative is multi-stakeholders' one. The evaluation will assess the multiple partnerships and their contributions to addressing the gaps of child rights implementation – with focus on access to learning opportunities, access to a protective environment and creating enabling environment for broader opportunities for adolescents and youth - both of girls and boys, in the Syria and Iraq crisis-affected countries.

Geographic coverage

The evaluation will cover the implementation of the NLG initiative at global, MENA regional and country level. For the latter, all countries participating in the initiative will be covered (i.e. Syria, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Egypt, Turkey); however, the level of detail in assessment the contribution of the initiative to accelerating programming and programme implementation under the three pillars may differ across countries.

Programmatic focus

At global and regional level the evaluation will focus on advocacy, expansion of partnerships and fund-raising. At country level the focus will be on assessment the contribution of NLG to accelerated programming and programme implementation in the areas that it covers, and their synergy.

Time frame

In terms of time coverage, the overall scope of the evaluation is from the inception of No Lost Generation initiative in 2013 until present, with focus on Phase II, during which NLG initiative has seen expansion and achievement of more tangible results. Evaluation of Phase I – from initiation in 2013 until 2015, will be done to the extent possible (in the absence of substantive documentation) in order to provide a basis for the more substantial evaluation of Phase II.

3.2. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

The evaluation will be framed using OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, as well as some additional criteria relevant to evaluation of humanitarian action. Impact of the initiative, as it is understood in the context of an evaluation, cannot be singled out and measured, as it has been launched in the course of and integrated into the overall response to the Syria and Iraq crises. The evaluation will seek however to generate some evidence of the intended and unintended results, to which it has substantially contributed, as a proxy of NLG initiative's impact on children and youth in the affected countries.

The key evaluation questions, listed below, will be further refined during the inception phase of the evaluation. The assessment will address the evaluation questions from human rights perspective, including child rights, as well as from equity and gender equality perspectives, in line with UNEG evaluation norms and standards.

Relevance

- How aligned are the stated or apparent intentions of the NLG multi-agency, multi-country and multi-sector initiative with the human rights of children and young people – girls and boys - affected by the Syria and Iraq crises?
- What gaps in the response to the crises did the initiative come to fill in?
- How far are the stated or apparent intentions of the NLG initiative aligned with partners' strategic objectives?

Effectiveness

- To what extent have the commitments, intended results, and/or articulated targets mentioned in the NLG vision and strategic documents been achieved in regards to:
 - Policy/legal framework changes in the affected countries to develop a protective and more enabling environment for children and youth,
 - Increasing funding levels for No Lost Generation programming over time,
 - Scope and quality of the humanitarian response under No Lost Generation pillars in No Lost Generation countries, and reaching the most vulnerable boys and girls with appropriate access to formal and non-formal learning opportunities, access to protective environment, broadening opportunities for adolescents and youth, and the intersection between these pillars.
- What were the major factors in each phase and at each level, which contributed to the achievements of the initiative's intents or hampered achieving of those intents?

Efficiency

- Considering the scope, objectives and composition of the NLG, was the chosen operational model the best fit to achieve change?
- How efficient was the NLG Secretariat chaired by UNICEF? What were the dedicated resources by the various agencies – members of the Secretariat? How efficient was the role of UNICEF as a lead? In what ways, could that role be made more efficient?
- Were efficiencies of scale reached by having a common framework (e.g. how much resources – human and financial – were put into NLG-specific activities and what were the immediate results from them)?

- At global and regional level - what were the advantages of agencies' collaboration as a NLG coalition, compared to individual agencies' responses to the crises as it affects children and young people in the affected countries – especially for advocacy and resource mobilization?
- At country level:
 - To what extent did being part of the initiative contribute to better programming and faster delivering of services to boys and girls in the programmatic areas under the three pillars, compared to other programmatic areas?
 - To what extent did NLG implementation promote synergy and facilitate cross-learning across the covered programmatic sectors?

Coordination

- To what extent did the NLG initiative contribute to foster synergies and avoid overlaps/incoherent approaches between different sectors and partners included in the initiative?
- What is the value added of the coordination mechanism?
- At country level – were there any NLG coordination mechanisms and if so – how efficiently did they work? If not – why not?
- To what extent was the NLG initiative's implementation coordinated with other relevant initiatives at all levels, such as Whole of Syria Forum for example? Are there any overlaps or existing gaps?

Intended and unintended results (potential impact)

- Is there evidence that NLG initiative contributed to increased funding, accelerated programming and scaled-up programme interventions in the three programmatic areas, in response to the Syrian and Iraqi crises?
- What changes, relevant to children and young people affected by the conflict, does NLG initiative appear to have contributed to?
- Were there any unintended positive or negative effects of the initiative, either on the response to the Syria and Iraq crises at country level or on NLG partners at global and regional level, and if so what were these?

Sustainability

- What measures have been built into the initiative at national and regional level to sustain any positive elements, including emerging positive outcomes of NLG, and how could these be strengthened?
- In the participating countries, to what extent did NLG contribute to (or impeded) transition to sustainable long-term solutions to meeting the educational, protection and participation needs of children and youth?
- Could other locations/countries/regions benefit from an extension, replication, or modification of NLG, and if so, what are proposed modalities for doing so?

3.3. METHODOLOGY

Overall approach and methods

The evaluation will follow human-rights responsive, non-experimental approach, using mainly qualitative methods for data collection and analysis. These will include but not limited to:

- A desk review of relevant published and unpublished documents – at global, regional and country level; this includes but is not limited to the following:
 - The NLG Strategic Overview (from the beginning of Phase I)
 - The NLG concept note for Phase II

- The NLG advocacy strategy for Phase II
 - The NLG workplan for 2018
 - The NLG evaluability assessment 2017
 - The ToRs for the NLG Working Group
 - NLG ToRs and SOPs (e.g. relating to champions, the use of the logo, etc.)
 - Financial records of NLG-related funding
 - NLG partner satisfaction surveys for 2016 and 2017
 - Financial records related to the cost of NLG events and related salaries
 - NLG products (reports, newsletters, updates)
 - Records on donor behavior (such as whether donors publicly / in bilateral documents identify their support as No Lost Generation and why)
 - HRPs and HNOs for Syria (2013 onwards), 3RP (2013 onwards) and Iraq (2016 onwards) which contain information on the needs for NLG target beneficiaries and information on the initiative.
 - Country-level reports on the emergency response in NLG-specific areas from the six participating countries
 - Other country-specific relevant documents
 - Key informant interviews at global, regional and country level:
 - with senior management staff of co-chair agencies
 - with donor representatives
 - with No Lost Generation champions,
 - with advocacy and programme staff involved in the NLG initiative (group interviews)
 - with humanitarian organisations, operational in the responses to the Syria and Iraq crises but not involved in the No Lost Generation initiative
 - Development of country case studies. These will include 2-3 countries involved in implementation of the programmatic aspect of the initiative. The selection of NLG countries case-studies and the focus of those studies, based on developed criteria, will be suggested by the manager of the evaluation and agreed with the Steering Committee. The respective (UNICEF) country offices will be requested to facilitate collection of the necessary information and submitting to the evaluation team.
- Analysis of the response under the three NLG pillars will be accompanied by analysis of the response in programmatic area, not covered by the initiative, to generate some evidence of the likely impact of NLG.
- Other data collection methods may be explored during the inception phase, as appropriate.

Limitations

The following limitations can be identified at this early stage:

- Theory of Change for the NLG initiative is inexistent. To mitigate this limitation, the evaluation expert/team will be asked to reconstruct it.
- Documentation of the initiative, especially of its first phase, is very limited. To mitigate this limitation, special effort will be paid to interview staff and other stakeholders who have been involved from the onset of the initiative.
- Access to some countries or areas of programme implementation of NLG initiative may be restricted/impossible. As an alternative to physical visits, in such contexts will be used available technologies for connection with stakeholders and getting their insights.
- Impact of the initiative, as it is understood in the context of an evaluation, cannot be singled out and measured, as it has been launched in the course of and integrated into the overall response to the Syria and Iraq crises. The evaluation will seek however to generate evidence of the intended and unintended results, to which it has substantially contributed, as a proxy of NLG initiative's impact on children and youth in the affected countries.

Ethical considerations

The evaluator (evaluation team) will strictly adhere to UN requirements for ethical behaviour of Evaluators, in line with UNEG norms and standards, and to UNICEF's procedure on ethics in research and evaluations.

The evaluator(s) will be required to clearly identify any potential ethical issues and approaches they will apply in this regard.

All approaches and methods proposed for this evaluation should be human-rights based and gender-sensitive. Data collection instruments and guidance will be subjected to a review by an Independent Ethical Review Board, before their administration for data collection.

3.4. MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

In line with the decentralised evaluation function in UNICEF and as the initiative is of a multi-country nature, the evaluation will be managed by UNICEF MENA Regional Office, more specifically by the Regional Evaluation Advisor. The Regional Office will contract external independent consultant(s) to undertake the evaluation. The Regional Evaluation Advisor will directly supervise the evaluation team, closely collaborating with its counterparts at country office level as appropriate.

A multi-stakeholder Steering Committee, chaired by UNICEF, will be established to provide oversight and ensure relevance, accuracy, and hence credibility and utility of the evaluation report through review of suggested processes and milestone products, contributing to development of the evaluation report, and of the draft evaluation report itself. The Steering Committee will be made up by:

- representatives from all four co-lead agencies
- representatives from 1-3 NLG donors
- representatives from other major stakeholders among UN agencies, international NGOs, and country offices of UNICEF.

The final composition of the steering committee will be determined by the NLG co-lead agencies.

4. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES

The final deliverable is the evaluation report.

Primary users of the evaluation report are the NLG co-leads (UNICEF, Save the Children, World Vision and Mercy Corps). In addition, over 30 partners in the No Lost Generation Working Group (UN agencies and NGOs operational in No Lost Generation programme areas in the Syria and/or Iraq crisis response) and supporters (including national NGOs, donors and governments in NLG countries) will use the evaluation report, and its recommendations in specific, to improve performance.

The final evaluation report, circa 50 pages without annexes, should follow the standards for UNICEF evaluation reports structure, including the following (detailed guidance in this regard will be provided to the consultant(s)):

- Executive summary
- Object of the evaluation
- Evaluation purpose, objectives and scope
- Evaluation methodology
- Findings
- Conclusions and lessons learned
- Recommendations

- Gender and human rights (The report illustrates the extent to which the design and implementation of the object, the assessment of results and the evaluation process incorporates a gender equality perspective and human rights based approach, including child rights)
- Annexes

All intermediate deliverables: Work plan, Inception report, First draft report, Second draft report, will be reviewed by the Steering Committee. Comments should be properly addressed by the evaluation consultant(s).

All deliverables are to be in English language. They will remain intellectual property of UNICEF and cannot be used for other purposes than the current assignment without written agreement by UNICEF MENARO.

UNICEF MENARO will ensure independent external technical quality assurance reviews and ethical approval, where necessary, of all intermediate products throughout the evaluation process.

5. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The list of deliverables and relative time line is estimated as per the list below:

Deliverable	Level of effort (days)	Due date ³
Detailed work plan	3	18 July 2018
Inception report, including: a/ reconstructed Theory of Change; b/ Time line of milestone events; c/ detailed methodology, methods for data collection, data collection tools, sampling approach(es) and representation of stakeholders in primary data collection	10	5 August 2018
Data collection	20	15 September 2018
Data analysis	10	30 Sept 2018
First draft evaluation report following UNICEF evaluation report structure (including case studies, without recommendations)	10	15 Oct 2018
Presentation of preliminary findings to the Steering Committee (via skype)		
Second draft evaluation report with suggested recommendations	5	30 Oct 2018
Presentation (ppt) at stakeholders' workshop for finalising recommendations	3	5 November 2018
Final evaluation report	4	15 November 2018
Total	65 days	

The reports will be submitted electronically in word format to the regional evaluation advisor and to the M&E specialist.

6. LOCATION AND DURATION

- Home based. Travel to MENARO – Jordan and 2 to 3 participating countries is expected
- *Starting period: 15th of July 2018 (indicative starting date for the assignment)*

³ Time for stakeholders' reviews and ethical approval of instruments are factored in.

- *Foreseen finishing period or duration: 15th of November* (the evaluation is expected to be carried out for 65 days within the period of four months)
- *Specific timelines and milestones for individual activities* (please see point 5 above)

7. OFFICIAL TRAVEL INVOLVED

The evaluator(s) will be responsible for organising all logistical arrangements needed to conduct this evaluation including international travel and in-country travel if/as necessary. Travel to MENA RO and to two of the participating countries may be necessary. UNICEF will be responsible for facilitating relevant contact and coordination with stakeholders and partners.

The vendor may be required to travel to conflict countries, in which case UNICEF will support with international transport means or internal transport within the CO under DSS rules.

8. ICT CONSIDERATIONS (PLEASE CHECK IF APPLICABLE):

- ☐ Access to electronic Information Resources
- ☐ UNICEF email ID
- ☐ ICT Hardware (please specify): _____

9. CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

Contract management focal points: regional evaluation advisor and M&E specialist (the e-mail addresses will be provided). Supply will remain the focal point for all administrative, financial and commercial queries and correspondence, including contract amendment.

10. FREQUENCY OF PERFORMANCE REVIEWS AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR EVALUATION OF RESULTS

A final evaluation (mandatory for any contract) will be completed. Evaluation criteria and indicators will be aligned with section 4.

11. DESIRED QUALIFICATIONS, SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE OR EXPERIENCE

Because of the complexity of the context and the innovative nature of the initiative, it is desirable to have a team of at least two evaluators (both expected to work 65 days each) – gender balanced and culturally diverse, as much as possible. Necessary qualifications and expertise of evaluation team members include as a minimum:

- At least a master's degree in social sciences;
- Complementarity of technical expertise in the related subject areas and evaluation experience;
- Team leader – at least 10 years of relevant evaluation experience; Team member – at least 8 years with relevant experience.
- Proven record of evaluation expertise, in both qualitative and quantitative methodologies;
- Knowledge of the programmatic areas covered by the evaluation is essential: education, child protection, adolescents and youth engagement; as well as of human rights, including child rights, and gender equality;

- Experience with evaluations of humanitarian response is desirable;
- Knowledge in the areas of communications, advocacy, fundraising is desirable;
- Experience and understanding of the sub-regional context is essential;
- Demonstrated ability to produce high quality evaluation reports;
- Fluency and excellent writing skills in English; knowledge of Arabic is an advantage;
- Excellent communication skills and demonstrated ability to facilitate group discussions.

12. PROPOSED PAYMENT SCHEDULE

Payment upon deliverables/milestones:

Inception report	30%
First draft evaluation report	30%
Final evaluation report	40%

13. STRUCTURE AND EVALUATION PROCESS OF THE PROPOSAL

The proposal should include:

- a) CVs of the evaluation team
- b) Overall description of how objectives will be met
- c) Proposed approach of work, outline of the methodology and draft workplan
- d) At least two samples of reports from previous work in areas, similar to the assignment
- e) Fees and payment schedule (including a budget breakdown)
- f) Kindly indicate where/how did you learn about this call for proposal

Each proposal will be assessed first on its technical merits (including by reference to legal requirements) and subsequently on its price. In making the final decision, UNICEF considers both technical and financial aspects. The Evaluation Team first reviews the technical aspect of the offer followed by the review of the financial offer of the technically compliant vendors. The proposal obtaining the overall highest score after adding the scores for the technical and financial proposals is the proposal that offers best value for money and will be recommended for award of the contract.

Financial Proposal

Bidders are expected to submit a lump sum financial proposal to complete the entire assignment based on the terms of reference. -All travel arrangements, including insurance and visas, will be managed and paid by the contractor. Therefore, expected travel costs must be included as a budget item in the financial proposal. However, the final travel component will be agreed based on the effective work calendar. Travel costs will be pre-approved and reimbursed by UNICEF as per the UNICEF rules and regulations for travel for consultants/non-staff.

Bidder shall be required to include the estimate cost of travel in the financial proposal. Please note that i) travel cost shall be calculated based on economy class travel, regardless of the length of travel and ii) costs for accommodation, meals and incidentals shall not exceed

applicable daily subsistence allowance (DSA) rates, as promulgated by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC). Details can be found at <http://icsc.un.org>.

14. UNICEF RECOURSE IN CASE OF UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE

In case of unsatisfactory performance, the payment will be withheld until quality deliverables are submitted. If the firm/individual is unable to complete the assignment, the contract will be terminated by notification letter sent 30 days prior to the termination date. In the meantime, UNICEF will initiate another selection process in order to identify appropriate candidate.

15. REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL EVALUATION WEIGHTING CRITERIA

The choice of a consultant firm or independent consultant(s) will be made on the basis of a competitive assessment in the following manner:

75% technical

25% financial

100% total

75% on the technical competency of the team-leader and team members divided as follows:

1. Relevant skills (25 points)
2. Approach and methodology (30 points)
3. Experience in delivering evaluations (20 points)

Minimum technical score: 70% of 75 points = 52.5 points

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; e.g.:

$$\text{Score for price proposal X} = \frac{\text{Max. Score for price proposal} * \text{Price of lowest priced proposal}}{\text{Price of proposal X}}$$

16. CONDITIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

- The contractor will work on its own computer(s) and use its/his/her own office resources and materials in the execution of this assignment. **The contractor's fee shall therefore be inclusive of all office administrative costs**
- Granting access to UNICEF ICT resources for consultants/non-staff is considered as 'exception,' and therefore shall only be granted upon authorization by the head of the office

on justification/need basis. This includes creation of a UNICEF email address, as well as access to ICT equipment such as laptops and mobile devices.

- All persons engaged under a UNICEF service contract, either directly through an individual contract, or indirectly through an institutional contract, shall be subject to the UN Supplier Code of Conduct: <https://www.ungm.org/Public/CodeOfConduct>
- Please also see UNICEF's Standard Terms and Conditions attached.