

## Section II: Schedule of Requirements

eSourcing reference: RFQ/2018/7000

### **Title: Consultancy services for carrying a Strengthening Humanitarian Preparedness and Response (SHPR) Program Mid-term Evaluation**

#### **UNOPS Background Information**

UNOPS mission is to expand the capacity of the UN system and its partners to implement peacebuilding, humanitarian and development operations that matter for people in need.

Working in some of the world's most challenging environments, UNOPS vision is to always satisfy partners with management services that meet world-class standards of quality, speed and cost effectiveness. UNOPS Operational Hub in Nepal provides technical, operational and administrative support to 5 countries in the South Asia region: Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka. UNOPS' work in this region focuses on the construction and operation of high-quality sustainable infrastructure as well as sustainable procurement, program management, fund management, organizational capacity development, timely provision of services, and the use of most relevant technologies. Such programs provide social and economic benefits to vulnerable populations across the country and contribute to poverty eradication. These include construction of schools, hospitals, water networks, urban sewerage and drainage facilities, harbours and anchorages, waste management facilities, climate change mitigation related to resilient infrastructure, as well as a range of "soft" support in capacity building, operations and maintenance of public assets, local governance, etc.

#### **1. Bangladesh Context:**

Bangladesh is highly disaster prone. More than 80% of the population (>128 million people) can be exposed to floods, earthquakes, and droughts, and more than 70% to cyclones. Data from the World Bank shows that since independence in 1971, cyclones alone have caused nearly 450,000 deaths – although cyclone related mortality has declined markedly since the 1970s. Women and girls bear the brunt of disasters in Bangladesh. The disaster risk assessment index Inform ranks Bangladesh 20th out of 190 countries most at risk of a disaster of a scale likely to overwhelm national coping capacity. Over time the frequency and intensity of climate shocks and stresses will change due to climate change. According to the Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) peak intensity of cyclones may increase by 5-10%. The IPCC also predicts more erratic patterns in rainfall, with raised risk of drought and impact on agricultural livelihoods.

The Rohingya refugee situation in Bangladesh is one of the most prolonged in the world. An estimated 700,000 Rohingya live in Bangladesh, the vast majority existing on the margins of society and lack formal recognition of their presence in the country. Conditions for Rohingya remain extremely poor and the need for humanitarian assistance is considerable. For example, rates of global acute malnutrition are almost double agreed emergency thresholds, the nutritional status of children aged 6-59 months is at almost "critical" levels, and the UN predicts that nearly all women in the formal camps have been subject to domestic violence. Since August 2017, more than 700,000 Rohingya refugees were forced to leave their homes in Myanmar to escape violence and discrimination. The concentration of refugees in Cox's Bazar is amongst the densest in the world. Forcibly Displaced Myanmar Nationals (FDMN) arrived in Bangladesh mostly women and children are traumatized, and some have arrived with injuries caused by gunshots, shrapnel, fire and landmines.

## **2. Background of the SHPR Programme**

The Strengthening Humanitarian Preparedness and Response (SHPR) a DFID funded programme which is managed and administered by UNOPS as the fund manager. As the fund manager, UNOPS is tasked with contracting implementing partners, providing programmatic, budgetary and the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) oversight. The SHPR started in 2017 and will run until 2020. Since inception the programme has provided grant management support directly to 22 organizations who are implementing 53 programs under three pillars which are;

Pillar 1: Augment disaster preparedness and disaster risk reduction including for large-scale catastrophic emergencies and recurrent, predictable events;

Pillar 2: Respond to the impact of disaster events through the provision of predictable, timely and high-quality humanitarian support;

Pillar 3: Deliver urgent humanitarian support to Rohingya refugees and needy host communities as well as creating an enabling environment for Rohingya related relief agencies.

At the onset of the programme, all the pillars had almost equal weight but since the influx of the Rohingya refugees in August 2017, Pillar 3 increased in response to the humanitarian needs of the Rohingya. This was a major shift in the programme as there was a refocus of human and financial resources on pillar 3 and relatively lower focus on the other pillars. The programme M&E system has been tracking the progress against the set goals, check programme quality and make recommendations. The programme also regularly conduct desk review of partner reports, monitor partner logframe which contributed to the overall SHPR logframe. The SHPR partners submitted quarterly, end of program and annual reports which contributed to bi-annual and annual reports submitted to DFID. SHPR is also providing M&E support to the Start Network which is responding to the recurring hazards faced by the communities. The Start Fund Bangladesh is a £10 million rapid emergency response fund set up by the Start Network with support from UK aid. Modelled on the successful Start Fund that activates funding within 72 hours of a crisis alert, the fund is accessible to both national and international member NGOs operating in Bangladesh to respond early and fast to under the radar emergencies in Bangladesh.

As part of program quality assurance and adaptive programme management approach, the SHPR intends to conduct a mid-term evaluation (MTE). The MTE will assess progress towards the achievement of the program objectives and outcomes, assess early signs of program success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the program on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTE will also review the program's strategy its risks to sustainability and Value for Money. It will also help to identify, and document lessons learnt and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the programme. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The MTE provides the opportunity to assess early signs of program success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

## **3. Purpose and Scope of Assignment**

The purpose of the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) will be both accountability and learning.

**Accountability:** The evaluation will seek to establish the extent to which the programme has been effective, i.e. producing the results anticipated, and efficient, i.e. the least costly resources possible have been used to produce these results.

**Learning:** The evaluation will identify programme and non-programme related explanations for success and failure that could be “translated” into more effective, efficient and sustainable programme interventions.

The overall goal for the MTE is to evaluate the contribution of the SHPR programme to the overall humanitarian preparedness and response in Bangladesh with a view to improve the current and future processes, systems and approaches. Findings from the MTE will be used to update the program logic, processes and overall approach. The immediate output of this MTE will be an action plan with clear deadlines and roadmap which will be followed by the program.

### **3.1 General Responsibilities:**

The MTE will examine the progress and performance of the program since the start of its implementation. The MTE will include the evaluation of both the progress in program implementation by the implementing partners (IPs), measured against planned outputs and outcomes set forth in their program documents as well as agreed in the SHPR logframe. The MTE is intended to identify weaknesses and strengths of the program design, and to develop recommendations for any necessary changes in the overall design and orientation of the program by evaluating the adequacy, efficiency and effectiveness of its implementation, as well as assessing program outputs and outcomes to date. Consequently, the MTE mission is also expected to make detailed recommendations on the work plan for the remaining program period. It will also provide an opportunity to assess early signs of program success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments. The MTE mission will also identify lessons learnt and best practices from the programs that could be applied to current program and inform the design of the DFID new business case currently under development.

### **3.2 Detailed scope of the MTE**

This section presents the evaluation questions for the SHPR programme.

1. How relevant is the SHPR programme to the humanitarian response and preparedness in Bangladesh? Does it employ an effective approach to improving humanitarian response and preparedness? How can the SHPR programme be aligned to Bangladesh priorities? Does the program require any re-orientation/changing? Is the program doing the right things? Is the program doing things, right?
2. To what extent is the program on track to achieve its output, outcome and impact indicator targets? What are the significant issues and risks to achieving the intended results? What would be done differently? To what extent are the program’s logframe indicators and targets “SMART” (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and what specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators are necessary? How relevant is the theory of change developed at the inception stage? Is there need to review the current theory of change to be more responsive to the community needs and government priorities? How did the Rohingya influx affect the program structure and implementation? How effective were the accountability mechanisms implemented by the IPs? Did it help improve program performance?
3. How coordinated were the three SHPR pillars? What did the program learn from implementing each pillar? How can the pillars’ coordination be enhanced? How effective has been the overall coordination of the program?
4. To what extent are the SHPR implementation partners, donors and other stakeholders satisfied with the performance of UNOPS as the fund manager? How did the approach add value? What lessons can be drawn from this mechanism? How can UNOPS improve its fund management role in the second half of the program?

5. What are the significant issues and risks? What has been learnt from implementing the first half of the SHPR? How can these lessons be used to improve the current program? What are the recommendations that the program should consider for the second half of implementation?
6. To what extent does DFID's investment in the SHPR represent good value for money (VFM)? How well was the value for money (VFM) integrated across the program? What can be done to improve the integration of the VFM approach?
7. How did the implementation of the START Fund and the Emergency Relief and Recovery Fund (ERRF) work? To what extent did the two funds meet their set targets? What can be done to ensure that the funds are more geared to the emergency needs of the Bangladesh community?

The questions above are expanded in **Annex-1**. These questions will be finalized and prioritized at the inception stage. Note that the OECD DAC criteria<sup>1</sup> should be considered across all the sections on the MTE.

### **Target audiences**

The target audience for these findings are DFID, UNOPS, IPs and the government of Bangladesh. It is expected that the findings will inform the DFID business case under development and will also inform UNOPS and IPs on areas of improvement.

### **4. Methodology**

The Mid-term Evaluation will employ a mixed-methods approach to collect quantitative and qualitative data using both primary and secondary data sources. SHPR proposes the use of the methods below but also appreciates individual consultants' expertise in developing a comprehensive methodology that will help respond to the evaluation questions.

The following are the proposed methods;

- Desk Review of program documents which include SHPR Technical Proposal, logframes, donor reports, program reports, SHPR dashboards, success stories, IPs' program documents, outputs, monitoring reports (such as, program Quarterly Reports, Minutes of program meetings, other relevant meetings notes, program Final Reports and other internal documents including consultant and financial reports);
- Interviews with the Senior Management and other program staff in the program Management Unit and consultants involved in implementation;
- Consultations and/or interviews with relevant stakeholders involved, including DFID representatives, programs and programmes focal persons as relevant;
- Field visits to at the programs location-Several participatory methods like focus group discussions, transect walks, social mapping among relevant approaches.
- Presentation of a draft report

The consulting firm should propose a comprehensive methodology as part of the bidding process. UNOPS will work with the successful firm to refine the research questions and finalise methodology at the inception stage. UNOPS will avail all project data to the selected firm and will conduct briefing meetings to explain the program and clarify any issues with the selected firm.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dacriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

## 5. Evaluation Deliverables, Reporting Requirements and Payment modality

The selected consulting firm is expected to deliver the following deliverables/outputs, for which they will get a **lump sum payment as agreed on the following deliverables:**

Scope of Work	Expected Deliverables/Outputs	Indicative duration (max.)
Workplan, Desk Review and Finalization of Evaluation Methodology (20%)	Evaluation work plan and evaluation design	10 days
	Desk review of IPs' program documents, outputs, monitoring reports (such as, among others, program Quarterly Reports, Minutes of program meetings, other relevant meetings notes, program Final Reports and other internal documents including consultant and financial reports);	
	Review of specific products including, datasets, management and action plans, publications and other materials and reports;	
	Finalization of evaluation methods and tools and agreed with UNOPS and DFID and submit inception report	
Data Collection and Interviews with stakeholders (45%)	Data collection from the field as agreed in the methodology	25 days
	Interviews with the Senior Management and other program staff and consultants involved in program implementation;	
	Consultations and/or interviews with relevant stakeholders involved, including DFID representatives, programs and programmes focal persons;	
Draft and final report submission (35%)	Prepare draft evaluation report	10 days
	Presentation of a draft report	1 day
	Submit final evaluation report with all the annexes	5 days

This evaluation will be implemented under the supervision and guidance of the M&E Specialist, SHPR Programme, UNOPS. Contract for the Consultancy will be provided by UNOPS. The Consultant team/Consulting firm will therefore report directly to FMO, UNOPS. The consultancy firm would be expected to commence the evaluation assignment in January 2018.

The following must be performed by the Team Lead:

- The Evaluation consultant will organize and lead the work and coordinate all technical inputs, approvals etc with UNOPS. Regular technical coordination meetings to be established and chaired by the Lead Consultant. Content, attendance and frequency to be established in the Work Plan.
- The Consultancy Team Lead will be responsible for controlling and managing the Consultancy Team. The details of the team management strategy to be outlined in the work plan.

- Producing all products as outlined in this TOR and the agreed work plan.
- The Evaluation consultant will be responsible to provide with the required tools to carry the tasks, i.e. Laptops, phones, stationary and transportation.
- The evaluation will be the sole property of UNOPS. The Evaluation consultant will submit all products, reports and etc. for review and acceptance to UNOPS at the end of the evaluation assignment.

A detailed mission schedule will be drafted with the logistical assistance by the SHPR FMO Office and inputs from the consultant once the consultant is selected.

## 6. Qualifications and experience consulting firms

This MTE is open to consultancy firms with experience conducting similar exercises. The consultancy firm should demonstrate expertise in the area through the CVs of the staff who will lead this evaluation. The expected minimum requirements for the team leader are detailed below. Firms can also propose other team members based on their methodology.

- Bidder should have valid Business registration;
- The prospective bidder should be in continuous business of supplying similar services, minimum of two (2) satisfactory completed contracts for the last Three (3) years on/before the closing date of this EOI. Experience in Bangladesh. (In case of Joint Venture/Association/Consortium, this requirement shall be met by any of partner of the Joint Venture/Association/Consortium combined).
- Good track record and reputation of conducting similar study for reputed national and international organization.
- Experience conducting evaluations for DFID and or DFID funded programs is a distinct advantage

The consultancy firm should demonstrate expertise in the area through the CVs of the staff who will lead this evaluation. The expected minimum requirements for the team leader and any proposed technical team members are detailed below.

Position	Qualification and years of relevant experience
<b>Team Leader</b>	<p>A minimum of 10 years' relevant experience is required for the evaluation lead</p> <p>Master's degree in social sciences, program evaluation or a related field;</p> <p>Experience applying mixed-methods to evaluate multi-sectoral programs developing country contexts;</p> <p>Experience in grant management and evaluation of emergency response programs;</p> <p>Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar technical assistance programs, preferably those involving United Nations agencies and/or other major donors including DFID Clear, concise report writing and effective presentation of qualitative analyses.</p> <p>Excellent communications skills and computer literacy; Strong analytical and planning skills;</p> <p>Experience and knowledge on different policies and guidelines related to humanitarian response in Bangladesh</p> <p>Experience working in Bangladesh or the region is required.</p> <p>Excellent English writing and communication skills and demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues and draw well supported conclusions;</p>

<b>Technical Advisors</b>	Minimum Master’s degree in thematic area to be focused on during the MTE At least 5 years of professional experience in at least one of the required technical sectors; Demonstrated experience successfully applying qualitative evaluation methods in developing countries. Experience working with DFID or DFID funded programs? Experience working in Bangladesh Fluency in English is a requirement, knowledge of local language is an asset.
<b>Field Assistants</b>	Minimum bachelor’s degree in a relevant field of study Minimum two years’ experience in conducting similar activities Able to speak local language and english

Firms can also propose other team members based on their methodology

### 7. Submission of Proposal

The financial proposal should clearly identify, item wise summary of cost for the assignment with detail breakdown.

**8. Confidentiality:** All information collected by the consultant team/consultancy firm will remain the property of SHPR, UNOPS Bangladesh and shall not be published or shared with a third party without a written and prior permission of UNOPS Bangladesh. For any use not stated here requires explicit permission by SHPR, UNOPS Bangladesh.

## **Annex-1: Evaluation questions to be explored (to be finalized with the contractor and included in the final evaluation plan).**

### **Overall SHPR Programme Management**

- Is the program design clear, logical and commensurate with the time and resources available? Is the theory of change still relevant?
- To what extent is the SHPR, its objectives and activities relevant to the current context in general and to the overall humanitarian interventions in specific?
- What are the major components undertaken to date and what progress toward achievement of its overall objectives has been made?
- Are the overall objectives and expected outputs of the program likely to be met?
- Does the program require any adjustment in targets, approaches and strategies?
- What are the lessons learned and best practices during implementation which would benefit the SHPR portfolio;
- What are the recommendations regarding any necessary corrections and adjustments to the overall program work plan and timetable for purposes of enhancing the achievement of objectives and outcomes?
- What have been the major challenges and constraints affecting the SHPR in delivering its objectives?
- What have been its major achievements and its failures?
- What has been the short and long-term impact of the SHPR activities? How could these results be sustained?
- What has been the impact of the SHPR partners' activities on the current context and to the needs of the key stakeholders?
- How effective were the SHPR accountability mechanisms? Which one was the most favored accountability mechanism and why? What could be done differently?
- How effective is the SHPR M&E approach (i.e. Monitoring Plan including data quality assurance for Regular programmes and Monitoring Plan for Emergency Programme);
- How well did UNOPS perform as the fund manager for this program? (Assess the contracting, grant agreement, implementation and grant closure processes)?
- How effective is UNOPS in fulfilling their roles and responsibilities in terms of managing and executing capacities in the program implementation through its implementing partners (IPs).
- What should they do differently? What should they continue doing?

### **Value for money**

- Effectiveness: Are interventions being implemented in an effective way to reach the program outcomes? Are resources well leveraged through partners?
- Efficiency: Are the costs of activities appropriate for achieving the outputs, with productivity of resources maximized?
- Economy: Are the costs of activities appropriate for achieving the outputs, with costs of inputs minimized? How were costs controlled?
- How best can the program mainstream the VFM? What should be done?

### **Monitoring and evaluation**

- How effective is the SHPR M&E system? How has the system been able to provide robust data for decision making?
- How did the system ensure quality data and programming?
- To what extent did the M&E system evolve with the changing program context especially the Rohingya influx?
- What can be done to improve the M&E system for the program?
- How effective were the accountability mechanisms implemented by SHPR partners? Which one was the most favored accountability mechanism and why? How well did feedback from the system influence program quality? What could be done differently?

## Specific SHPR Pillars

### ***Pillar-1: Preparedness and Coordination***

- How has the SHPR contributed to the overall humanitarian coordination, preparedness and response in Bangladesh?
- How well was this pillar linked to the government and other stakeholder priorities?
- What have been its major achievements, challenges and failures?
- What has been the short and long-term impact of the activities under this Pillar?
- What can be done to improve performance?

### ***Pillar-2: Emergency programme<sup>2</sup>***

#### *Emergency Response and Recovery Fund (ERRF)*

- How well did SHPR (ERRF) respond to emergencies that occurred during its implementation (Cyclone Mora, Haor Floods and Monsoon Floods)?
- How relevant was ERRF response in addressing the immediate life-saving needs (food and non-food needs) of the affected population?
- How appropriate and timely was the ERRF response to immediate needs of the affected population?
- How appropriate and effective was the selection criteria for beneficiary targeting for emergency intervention?
- What measures did ERRF implement to avoid duplication with other stakeholders including UN agencies and NGOs? What could have been done differently?
- What are beneficiaries' views, perceptions and experiences of feedback mechanisms and participation in this program?
- What are the achievements, challenges, failures and lessons learned for the ERRF?
- What can be done to improve the performance of the ERRF?

#### ***Start Fund Bangladesh***

- How relevant is the Start Fund Mechanism to the humanitarian preparedness and response?
- Is the fund on track to achieve its set targets? Were the interventions implemented in line with the needs on the ground?
- How effective was the fund in responding to community needs?
- What have been the major achievements, challenges, failures and lessons from implementation?
- What can be done to improve this funding mechanism?
- How satisfied are the Start Fund partners with this mechanism and what can be done to improve it?
- How effective is the Start fund M&E? what can be done to improve the overall M&E?

### ***Pillar-3: Rohingya Responses***

- To what extent is the response relevant?
- Is the program on track to achieve its set objectives?
- How well coordinated is the response? To what extent did the coordination limit duplication of initiatives? Were there service gaps within the spectrum of services being delivered such as lack of follow up when services were delivered?
- How did the Rohingya influx affect this pillar and overall program structure? How can the program adapt to this change?
- What are the major achievements, challenges and lessons learnt from the implementation?
- What can be done to improve the performance of the response?

## ***Assessment of UNOPS as a fund manager.***

---

<sup>2</sup> These are two funds within the bigger fund and will need to be assessed separately although they fit into the broader scope of the program. The finer details will be discussed with the selected contractor.

- How did UNOPS perform against the set key performance indicators?
- How satisfied are the partners with the role of UNOPS as a fund manager?
- What can be done to improve efficient and effective fund management?
- What are the challenges, lessons learnt and recommendations from the implementation?

NB: SHPR team will work with the consulting firm to prioritize these questions and design an appropriate methodology.

## Annex-2: Sample Outline for Mid-Term Evaluation Report

Table of contents

Acronyms

### 1. Executive summary (including an overall rating of the program using the rating scale)

- Brief description of program;
- Context and purpose of the evaluation;
- Main conclusions, rating of progress towards objectives as well as rating of progress on implementation, recommendations and lessons learned.

### 2. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation;
- Key issues addressed;
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation.

### 3. The program and its development context

- Program start and its duration;
- Problems that the program seeks to address;
- Immediate and development objectives of the program;
- Main stakeholders;
- Results expected.

### 4. Findings and conclusions

- 4.1 Program Formulation
- 4.2. Program Implementation
- 4.3. Results

Results should be analyzed by pillar and their implications on the overall program.

### 5. Recommendations

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the program. Recommendations should be specific and clearly justified in relation to the achievement of the program objectives.
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the program.
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives.
- Changes to program strategy, including the logframe indicators and targets.

### 6. Lessons learned

This should highlight the 'best' and 'worst' practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.

### 7. Annexes to the Evaluation Report

- Evaluation TORs
- Itinerary, List of persons interviewed,
- Summary of field visits, issues raised and recommendations by different stakeholders
- List of documents reviewed, Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)