



TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR INSTITUTIONAL CONTRACTS.

Requesting Section: Lao People's Democratic Republic Country Office

TITLE: Terms of Reference for the Final Evaluation of the EU-UNICEF "National Information Platforms for Nutrition in Lao PDR, EU Grant No. FOOD/2017/391-182 – UNICEF: SC180-018 UNICEF Lao PDR "

1- Background to the program to be evaluated

Situation in country:

Post-MDG in Lao PDR, positive progress was realized in population' nutritional status as the earlier stagnant rate of stunting in children (48 percent in 2001; 44 percent in 2012) has declined by a quarter and reached 33% by 2017.¹ At province level, **stunting** prevalence (SDG indicator 2.2.1) is high - 11 provinces out of 18 continue to suffer from very high (>30%) levels of stunting in young children, with four other provinces exhibiting levels very close to 30%¹. Considerably other disparities are detected, with stunting lowest in Vientiane Capital (13.8%), yet, more than triple in Phongsaly province (54%).ⁱⁱ Children in rural areas without roads, those whose mothers have no education and from ethnic minorities and poorest quintile are 2-3 times more likely to suffer from stunting than children in urban settings, with educated mothers, and those from the richest quintile.¹ as a result of food insecurity and declining access to services caused by the on-going covid19 pandemic.

In Laos, stunting in children starts in utero – on average, 6.5% of babies are born with low birth weight but this figure is significantly higher in children born to young mothers, those living in urban areas, and some provinces (Xayaboury, Sekong). As one-third of babies are not weighed at birth and the weight of one-third is recorded based on the mother's recall, thus, prone to error, the true prevalence of low birth weight is expected to be significantly higher. Amongst the low-birth-weight babies, many will suffer from intrauterine growth retardation as nearly one-third to one-half of all growth failure by age two occurs in utero.ⁱⁱⁱ These data highlight the importance of maternal nutrition prior to and during pregnancy. Yet latest data (LSIS-II) shows that Laotian women enter pregnancy with poor preconception status - 14% have low BMI (MICS2006), with higher rate in ethnic groups (14.8%)^{iv} and least half of women suffer from micronutrient deficiencies.

Acute malnutrition, as manifested through **wasting** in young children (SDG combined indicator 2.2.2), is on the rise in Lao PDR, from 6 to 9.6% in 2017 and in excess of 15% in two northern provinces, Huaphanh and Xyaboury, as well as Attapeu in the south, followed by Savannakhet at 13%. Children younger than one year, born to mothers younger than 20yrs and with no education suffer from higher rates. Evidence from South Asia indicates that boys – particularly younger boys – are consistently more vulnerable than girls to both wasting and stunting and to concurrent wasting and stunting.^v Prevalence of wasting is expected to be influenced by high seasonality in food insecurity and disease patterns, as documented in other countries, but no conclusive data are available for Laos. The increase in the wasting rates in Laos from those during 2011-2017 indicates that unless rapid reverse is obtained, the country will not achieve the WHA and SDG target to reduce wasting to below 5 per cent.

Mineral and vitamin deficiencies are severe public health problems in Lao PDR. According to the latest available data, nearly half of children under five years of age, including about three out of four children

¹ 28.4% and higher

under one year of age², suffer from iron deficiency anaemia. Given that the most vulnerable groups are at higher risk of undernutrition, better targeting is needed to accelerate this area's progress.

Several information management systems exist in Lao PDR. These are used for storing administrative and population-based data. Some have in-built dashboards for visualizing performance and coverage indicators. For the purpose of nutrition monitoring, data is drawn from institutional databases such as DHIS for the health sector; ESMIS for the education sector, NSA for the agriculture sector. Access to the institutional database requires special permission (password). However, the Lao Statistics Bureau operates the LaoInfo platform that is used for disseminating socio-economic indicators and is accessible to the public. Despite having several government sectoral information systems and many credible sources of information on nutrition, the current information management system in the country is still weak and uncoordinated. There is no central repository for data from all sectors, and data are currently insufficiently analyzed and interpreted to guide and inform nutrition policy reviews and program planning.

The Action:

The European Union delegation and UNICEF in Lao PDR have a long-standing partnership on nutrition that was initiated in 2011 through the Joint European Union-UNICEF Maternal and Young Child Nutrition Security in Asia (MYCNSIA) Project.

The National Information Platforms for Nutrition (NIPN) is an international initiative of the European Commission with support from the Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO) of the UK Government and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. In Lao PDR, NIPN is implemented by the government with the support of the European Union Delegation (EUD) and UNICEF in the context of their Partnership for Improved Nutrition in support of the National Nutrition Strategy 2016-2025. NIPN was launched in October 2018 in Vientiane and has contributed to strengthening institutional capacity in generating evidence for nutrition as well as contributing to nutrition policy discourse in the country.

Overall Objective:

To contribute to the global reduction of stunting (chronic undernutrition) in alignment with the World Health Assembly 2025 targets.

Specific Objective:

To strengthen capacities in Lao PDR to monitor progress towards undernutrition reduction and implement more cost-effective and evidence-based policies.

The expected results are:

Result Area 1: Improved capacity within national institutions to operate and maintain a functional NIPN.

Result Area 2: Strengthened capacity to track progress in meeting national objectives to prevent undernutrition and monitor nutrition investments.

Result Area 3: Strengthened capacity of government staff to make better use of evidence and data to design and implement nutrition-related policies and programmes

Beneficiaries:

Pregnant and postpartum women

Children under five years of age

Caregivers of children under five years

Target Groups:

² 72.9% of children aged 6-8 months are anemic and amongst children aged 9-11 months the rate is 71.3%

- Policy and decision makers,
- Government ministries and departments,
- Universities/Academia,
- Development Partners,
- Civil Society Organizations

Recognizing the importance of program assessment to expand the program evidence base and to inform decision-making, the EU and UNICEF support an evaluation of this project.

2- Objectives, Purpose & Expected results of the evaluation

The evaluation's main objective is to yield results that will contribute to enhancing the program performance and strategies to deliver effective results through:

1. Assessing the progress made towards results, good practices, and lessons learned
2. Evaluating the program's relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability
3. Generating knowledge and providing recommendations for strengthening the data analysis to guide and inform nutrition policy reviews and program planning.

NIPN phase 2 will start in July 2022 till December 2025; the recommendations that the evaluation will deliver will be geared towards the design of phase 2, namely:

- Maximizing the analysis and interpretation of existing information and data on nutrition to improve understanding of the factors that influence it, both at national and sub national levels
- Improving the monitoring progress in preventing malnutrition at the national and sub-national levels
- Strengthening the accountability of government institutions and key stakeholders to meet their commitments to prevent malnutrition

Timeframe. The evaluation will focus on the NIPN action implemented by UNICEF. The timeframe to be evaluated is the 48 months of the program, from March 2018 to March 2022.

Location – coverage: the geographic emphasis of the evaluation will be at the national level. The evaluation will consult key stakeholders from national institutions, development agencies, implementing partners, and CSOs. Depending on COVID restrictions, the base of work will be done remotely, with fieldwork done as much as possible. National expert(s) can work in Lao PDR closely with the rest of the evaluation team.

Results levels: The evaluation is not an impact evaluation, and hence it does not require the definition and tabulation of impact level results achieved at the population level. This evaluation will not focus on the impact of the program, given the length of time passed to assess long-term effects and the methodological restrictions in terms of time available for the evaluation and data collection. The evaluation will concern itself with the contribution to the early impacts or immediate outcomes.

3- Description of the assignment

The evaluation prioritizes the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability. In addition to the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, the evaluation will prioritize EU value added and coherence. The evaluation criteria and questions will analyze the extent to which human rights, child rights, and gender equality and equity have been addressed within the program.

The evaluation will provide evidence-based analysis to answer the following questions.

Relevance

- To what extent has the program responded to the national context, needs and priorities, and global standards?
 - To what extent does the program meet the national capacities and the institutional framework?
 - How well did the project design meet the needs and priorities identified by the EU?
- To what extent have the NNIPN capacity development activities covered the institutional needs of the target organizations/institutions?
- Was the project's intervention logic adequate?
 - To what extent was the proposed intervention logic pertinent to the program objectives?
 - How realistic was the choice and quantity of inputs (financial, human, and administrative resources, etc.)
 - How comprehensive and adequate was the analysis of assumptions and risks

Efficiency

- What factors have contributed to increase/decrease the efficiency of the program?
- To what extent can the resources in terms of finance, human, and logistics be considered as:
 - Enough (in terms of quantity) concerning the identified needs and the expected results?
 - Adequate (in terms of quality) concerning the expected results?
 - Timely, Delivered in time?
- To what extent did the program activities reinforce synergies with other initiatives to achieve optimal utilization of available resources?
 - To what extent partnerships have been able to support delivery of the program results?
- Are program monitoring and reporting systems gathering credible evidence on progress and results?

Effectiveness

- To what extent have the expected results been realized through the program?
 - To what extent are the partners and intended beneficiaries satisfied with the results?
- What factors have contributed to the program results achieved?
 - What were the bottlenecks for the successful implementation of the NIPN objectives?
 - Assess the effectiveness of the various strategies and approaches employed by UNICEF and its partners during each stage of the programme life-cycle.
- What is the likely impact (positive or negative, intended and unintended) on partners and stakeholders?
- What lessons can be learned from the best practices achievements, challenges, and constraints of the program?

EU added value

- What is the strategic significance of the action in the field of nutrition?
- To what extent the EU adds benefits to what would have resulted from the Member States or other donors' interventions?
- What is the added value of this intervention compared to other EU funding and programs?

Coherence/connectedness

- To what extent is the program coherent with national and local authorities, the EU's external funding mechanisms, and other development partners' work in nutrition?
 - What was the degree of coherence of this Action related to EU and other donor support to nutrition? What was the overall integration and synergies between NIPN and other program projects?
 - Did the program complement other initiatives (by other NGOs, national organizations, local Government)?

Sustainability

- To what extent are the data systems, capacities and results likely to continue after the funding has been withdrawn?

- To what extent have institutions and stakeholders taken and shown ownership of the action objectives? To what extent are they actively engaged in the activities of the action?

Humans Rights approach, Gender equity

- To what extent human rights, child rights, climate change, DRR, and gender equality and equity have been addressed within the action?

4- Methodology³

Based on the objectives of the evaluation, this section indicates broad guidelines on methods and processes for the evaluation. Methodological rigor will be given significant consideration in the assessment of proposals. Hence bidders are invited to interrogate the approach and methodology proffered in the ToR and improve on it or propose an approach they deem more appropriate. In their proposal, the bidder should clearly refer to triangulation, sampling plan, ethical consideration, and methodological limitations and mitigation measures. Bidders are encouraged to also demonstrate methodological expertise in evaluating initiatives related to the focus areas.

This evaluation should follow a participatory, utilization-focused, and theory-based approach, with mixed methods (qualitative and quantitative) of data collection and analysis. Under a utilization-focused approach, the evaluation will facilitate senior management decision-making on developing future initiatives. Case studies may also be considered to understand recurrent patterns.

In consultation with the evaluation manager and reference group, the selected consultant(s) will develop a detailed methodology for the assignment, with prioritized evaluation questions from those in the framework above.

Multiple and high-quality data collection and analysis methods with a range of stakeholders should be used to facilitate triangulation of data. These may include document review, semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, a survey frontline workers/beneficiaries, and consultative workshops or focus group discussions. Key stakeholders to be involved in the data collection should be selected from UNICEF and other UN staff, the EU, key national and sub-national government agencies, private sector, and other relevant partners such as civil society organizations/NGOs.

The evaluation team will need to draw on available quantitative data from recent evaluations, reviews, research, studies, progress reports, situation reports, national datasets, surveys, and other sources. Bidders will be encouraged to propose any feasible stakeholder consultation approaches that could generate useful quantitative data on key issues and help form qualitative inquiry areas.

Data collection methods

At a minimum, the evaluation will draw on the following methods:

- **Comprehensive desk review** of available documentation – Description of the Action, annual reports, evaluation reports, mid-year and end-year reviews, datasets, and indicators such as MICS, researches, and studies. Key government documents also need to be reviewed.
- **Interviews and focus group discussion.** It is important to note that data collection might need to be done remotely in case of travel/ movement restrictions due to COVID-19. Innovative and appropriate remote data collection methods need to be proposed and considered from the onset. Given the Covid-19 context, the inception phase will occur without field visits from the evaluation team. According to the COVID19 situation evolution, the evaluation team might be able to access local areas during the data collection. In case that is not feasible, consultation with local stakeholders and beneficiaries shall be made remotely.

³ Bidders are required to present their best ideas as part of the technical proposal. The quality of the methodology section will, together with the quality of the proposed team, determine whether a bidder is deemed technically qualified. Consequently, this Methodology section is intentionally under-detailed.

- The evaluation team shall conduct individual key informant interviews with staff representatives of UNICEF and the EU, government officials, implementing partners, Civil society organizations, NGOs, and other humanitarian partners.
- A survey can also be launched to complement the evidence collected through the above-mentioned data collection tools and access stakeholders such as former staff.

Data collection and analysis should be human rights-based and gender-sensitive. Any data collected should be disaggregated by age, gender, state/region, disability, etc., where possible. Data triangulation will be of crucial importance. Data analysis should also include aspects of gender, equity, and human rights into consideration.

Sampling

A sampling strategy should be included in the Technical Proposal, setting out how institutions and organizations, and different stakeholder groups will be sampled. This applies to both quantitative and qualitative data collection. The evaluation team is required to develop and present their sampling strategy in the technical proposals. The sample sizes for each target data source should be sufficient to allow generalization of findings to larger population targeted by the program.

The Evaluation Team will be expected to conform to guidelines and standards set by the UN and UNICEF. The team will be guided by [UNICEF's revised Evaluation Policy](#) (2018), the [United Nations Evaluation Group \(UNEG\) Norms and Standards for Evaluation](#) (2016), [UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system](#) (2008), [UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](#) (2020), [UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator](#) (2018), [UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation](#) (2014), and [UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards](#) (2017).

Gender and Human Rights, Child Rights

Human Rights, child rights, and gender equality will be incorporated in the evaluation through a mainstreaming approach to these issues in the evaluation questions, data collection processes, and analysis. In the conclusions of the evaluation, the Evaluation Team will draw out specific findings and recommendations on human rights, child rights, and gender equity. The conduct of the evaluation will be guided by the [UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation](#) (2014).

Ethical considerations

The bidder will set out how they expect the evaluation process to be designed and undertaken in accordance with ethical guidelines as set out in [UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](#) (2020) and the [UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards and Research, Evaluation, and Data Collection and Analysis](#) (2015). During the evaluation process, full compliance with all UNEG and UNICEF ethical guidelines will be required. All informants should be granted full confidentiality for all methods used, informed consent procedures shall be observed, and risks/benefits shall be disclosed with informants. Dissemination or exposure of results and any interim products must follow the rules agreed upon in the contract. In general, unauthorized disclosure is prohibited. Any sensitive issues or concerns should be raised, as soon as they are identified, with the evaluation management team. (See annex 6 for Ethical Code of Conduct)

All evaluations shall have ethical clearance issued either by an external board of review, or by an internal one. In 2015 the UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation and Data Collection and Analysis was issued to guide UNICEF's evidence generation activities and to support the integrity of UNICEF's evidence base in order to ensure that UNICEF's programmes, policy and advocacy activities are grounded in ethical principles and practices. Under the UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards (2015) all proposals involving research, evaluations or data collection and analysis covered by this procedure, and meeting one or more of the following criteria must go through a relevant external ethical review board or panel:

- Evidence generation that involves vulnerable cohorts whose personal agency is limited due to age, situation or capabilities and for whom an additional duty of care is required. (includes all evidence generation involving children).
- Evidence generation involving primary data collection that has the potential to result in direct harm to the participant during the course of the programme
- Evidence generation that has the potential to compromise the privacy of subjects and the confidentiality of data
- Evidence generation that has the potential to compromise the safety and well-being of individuals in their context
- Evidence generation that involves non-universal distribution of resources (ie. RCTs involving the provision of cash transfers, or other goods and services, to one group and not to another group)

Where not required by National law or a partner institution to utilize a National or Institutional Review Board/Ethics Review Committee, use of a private ethics review vendor can be considered. Please see [UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](#) (2020) and the [UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards and Research, Evaluation, and Data Collection and Analysis](#) (2015).

5- Deliverables

- An inception report presents the complete methodology approach to conducting the work, with all tools fully drafted. All design issues under discussion to that point to be answered, any revisions to the issues and questions, and issues of reference group role and supervisory quality assurance.

The Inception Report will be key in confirming a mutual understanding of what is to be evaluated, including additional insights into executing the evaluation. At this stage, evaluators will refine and verify evaluation questions, confirm the scope of the evaluation, further improve on the methodology proposed in the ToR, and their own evaluation proposal to strengthen its rigor and develop and validate evaluation instruments.

The report will include, among other elements: i) evaluation purpose and scope, confirmation of objectives of the evaluation; ii) evaluation criteria and questions; iii) evaluation methodology (i.e., sampling criteria), along with a description of data collection methods and data sources (incl. a rationale for their selection), iv) an evaluation matrix that identifies descriptive and normative questions and criteria for evaluating evidence, data analysis methods and a data analysis plan, a discussion on how to enhance the reliability and validity of evaluation conclusions, a description of the quality review process, a discussion on the limitations of the methodology and ethical considerations; v) proposed structure of the final report; vi) evaluation work plan, and deliverables timeline; vii) detailed evaluation budget; viii) annexes (i.e., draft data collection instruments, for example, questionnaires, with a data collection toolkit, matrix for evaluation questions, data collection toolkit, data analysis framework); and vi) a summary of the evaluation process (evaluation briefing note) for external communication purposes. (Please refer to the annex 1)

Ethical clearance. Prior to data collection phase, the evaluation shall have an ethical clearance that can be issued either by an external board or an internal board, depending on the case (see ethical clearance section)

- Presentation with preliminary findings, conclusions, and recommendations. After the data collection process, the evaluation team shall present the preliminary findings, conclusions, and recommendations that can feed into the CP prioritization process. The presentation should include findings from the desk review and data collection (primary and secondary), with an initial attempt to triangulate findings. The presentation should also present a matrix of data collected for responding to each evaluation question and point to gaps that challenged the data collection phase.

- iii. Draft and final report. The report shall comply with the Global Evaluation Report Oversight System⁴ of ideally 45 pages but not more than 55 plus annexes (the Executive Summary both in English and Lao) that will be revised until approved. (Please see annex 2)
- iv. An Infographic with the main evaluation findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. That is distinct from the executive Summary in the evaluation report and it is intended for a broader, non-technical and non-UNICEF audience. The infographic shall be produced in both English and Lao.

Important notes:

- i. Monitoring deliverables about work progress are not listed but will be periodically required.
- ii. Page limits, if any, to be established during the inception period. In general, the report should not exceed 60 pages and should aim for conciseness, readability, and visual appeal.
- iii. Reports will be prepared according to the UNICEF Style Guide, UNICEF Brand Toolkit and UNICEF Publication Toolkit (to be shared with the winning bidder) and UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards as per GEROS guidelines (referenced before). All deliverables must be in professional-level standard English, and they must be language-edited/proof-read by a native speaker.

6- Location and Duration

The location of the service will be in Lao PDR. It is expected that the full evaluation process will last five months starting from 1 May 2021. Nevertheless, evaluation deliverables will be produced and available throughout the process:

Step	Timing	Due date (indicative)
Kick off telecon / video conference	As soon as possible after the team is contracted	30 April 2022
Desk review - Development of the draft inception report	Two weeks after kick-off	15 May 2022
Comments and QA on inception report draft (including ethical clearance for data collection tools)	One week after the draft submitted	21 May 2022
Final inception report with obtained ethical clearance	One week after the comments	30 May 2022
Data collection: KIIs, FGDs	1.5 months after inception report	15 July 2022
Presentation of preliminary findings	One week after data collection ended	21 July 2022
Draft evaluation report	Two weeks after data collection is finalized	1 August 2022
Comments and QA on draft	One week after submission of draft	7 August 2022
Final report produced	Two weeks after comments	21 August 2022
Infographic	Two weeks after comments	21 August 2022

⁴ UNICEF has instituted the Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS), a system where final evaluation reports are quality assessed by an external company against UNICEF/UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluation reports. The Evaluation Team is expected to reflect on and conform to these standards as they write their report. The team may choose to share a self-assessment based on the GEROS with the Evaluation Manager.

7- Qualification requirements or Specialized skills/experience Required:

This contract will be awarded to an organization and not to an individual or team of individuals not sponsored by an institution.

A consortium of 2 or more institutions may make a joint bid. In this case, there must be a lead institution named that will be the sole point of contact with UNICEF for contract management purposes.

The firm must have a history of working in Lao. If a consortium, at least one partner must have a history of working in Lao.

Team Leader

a) Mandatory requirements

- Master's degree in International Development, Public Administration, Development Programme & Evaluation, or any related social science discipline.
- A minimum of 15 years of professional experience
- Excellent understanding of evaluation principles and methodologies, including capacity in an array of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods
- A minimum of 7 evaluations led at the program and/or outcome levels with international organizations.
- Experience in conducting evaluations for UN agencies or major bilateral donor country programs, and familiarity with UNEG Norms and Standards
- Strong English report writing skills and a track record of producing high quality reports

b) Desirable requirements

- Experience in conducting project evaluations of UNICEF or other UN organizations is strongly preferred
- Previous experience of working in Lao PDR is strongly preferred
- Experience in leading and managing nutrition program evaluations of UNICEF or other UN organizations is strongly preferred
- The ability to communicate in Lao with professional standard is an asset, if not, the firm(s) shall provide a translator for interviews when needed

Team member

a) Mandatory requirements

- Master's degree in International Development, Public Administration, Development Programme & Evaluation or any related social science discipline.
- Minimum 5 years of technical expertise in the field of evaluation focused on international development, development programming, and implementation.
- Proven experience in conducting evaluations of programmes with international organizations.
- Experience in implementing a range of qualitative and quantitative data collection techniques and methods in programme evaluations.

b) Desirable requirements

- Preferably, the team member should be a national consultant based in Lao PDR. He/she needs to have a good command of Lao in both written and spoken communication.
- Knowledge of the United Nations System mandate and the political, cultural and economic contexts of the region and the country.

Given the COVID19 situation, it is desired that both team members are based in Lao, if not possible, at least one team member shall be based in Lao, and the technical proposal shall detail in the methodology how to conduct the process remotely.

In the review of the RFP, while adequate consideration will be given to the technical methodology, significant weighting will be given to the quality, experience and relevance of individuals who will be involved in the evaluation.

8- Evaluation process and methods

Each proposal will be assessed first on its technical merits and subsequently on its price. In making the final decision, UNICEF considers both **Technical and Financial Proposals**. The Evaluation Team first reviews the Technical Proposals followed by a review of the Financial Proposals of the technically compliant firms. The proposal obtaining the highest overall score after adding the Technical and Financial Proposals scores together that offers the best value for money will be recommended for the awarding of the contract.

The Technical Proposal should include but not be limited to the following:

a) Request for Proposals for Services Form

b) Presentation of the Bidding Institution or institutions if a consortium (maximum two institutions will be accepted as part of the consortium), including:

- Name of the institution;
- Date and country of registration/incorporation;
- Summary of corporate structure and business areas;
- Corporate directions and experience;
- Location of offices or agents relevant to this proposal;
- Number and type of employees;
- In case of a consortium of institutions, the above-listed elements shall be provided for each consortium members in addition to the signed consortium agreement; and
- In case of a consortium, one only must be identified as the organization lead in dealing with UNICEF.

c) Narrative Description of the Bidding Institution's Experience and Capacity in the following areas:

- CPEs or equivalent for UNICEF or other UN agency
- Strategic evaluations of complex programs for UN agencies or major bilateral donor Country Programmes
- Previous assignments in developing countries in general, but preferably in Lao PDR
- Previous and current assignments using UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluation.
- General work plan based on the one proposed in the ToR, with comments and proposed adjustments, if any; and
- Detailed timetable by activity (it must be consistent with the general work plan and the financial proposal).

d) Relevant References of the proposer (past and ongoing assignments) in the past five years. UNICEF may contact references persons for feedback on services provided by the proposers.

e) Samples or Links to Samples of Previous Relevant Work listed as reference of the proposer (at least three), on which the proposed key personnel directly and actively contributed or authored.

f) Methodology. It should minimize repeating what is stated in the ToR. There is no minimum or maximum length. If in doubt, ensure sufficient detail.

g) Work Plan, which will include as a minimum requirement the following:

- General work plan based on the one proposed in the ToR, with comments and proposed adjustments, if any; and
- Detailed timetable by activity (it must be consistent with the general work plan and the financial proposal).

h) Evaluation Team:

- Summary presentation of proposed experts against the required qualifications and experience described in section 11;

- Description of support staff (number and profile of research and administrative assistants etc.);
- Level of effort of proposed experts by activity (it must be consistent with the financial proposal); and
- CV of each expert proposed to carry out the evaluation.

The Technical Proposal will be submitted in hard copy and electronic (PDF) format.

Please note that the assignment's duration will be from May 2022 to September 2022, and it is foreseen that the Team Leader and the Team Expert/Team Members will devote roughly half of their time to the evaluation. The presence of a conflict of interest of any kind (e.g., having worked for or partnered with UNICEF in Lao on the design or implementation phase of the current Country Programme will automatically disqualify prospective candidates from consideration).

The Financial Proposal should include but not be limited to the following:

- Resource Costs:** Daily rate multiplied by the number of days of the experts involved in the evaluation.
- Conference or Workshop Costs (if any):** Indicate nature and breakdown if possible.
- Travel Costs:** All travel costs should be included as a lump sum fixed cost. For all travel costs, UNICEF will pay as per the lump sum fixed costs provided in the proposal. A breakdown of the lump sum travel costs should be provided in the financial proposal.
- Any Other Costs (if any):** Indicate nature and breakdown.
- Recent Financial Audit Report:** Report should have been carried out in the past two years and be certified by a reputable audit organization.

The financial proposal must be fully separated from the technical proposal. Costs will be formulated in US\$ and free of all taxes.

Each valid proposal will be assessed by an evaluation panel first on its technical merits and subsequently on its price. The weight allocated to the technical proposal is 70 % (i.e. 70 out of 100 points). To be further considered for the financial evaluation a minimum score of 49 points is required. Only proposals with a score of 49 or more points in the technical evaluation will be financially evaluated (i.e. the financial proposal will be opened). For further details and the distribution of points kindly refer to **table 1** below.

The weight allocated to the financial proposal is 30 % as per the following: the maximum number of 30 points will be allotted to the lowest technically compliant proposal. All other price proposals will receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest price. Commercial proposals should be submitted on an all-inclusive basis for providing the contracted deliverables as described in the TOR.

The proposal(s) obtaining the overall highest score after adding the scores for the technical and financial proposals is the proposal that offers the best value for money and will be recommended for award of the contract.

Table 1: Evaluation Criteria and distribution of points

CATEGORY	Max. Points
1. OVERALL RESPONSE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of and responsiveness to the requirements (5) • Understanding of scope, objectives, and completeness of response (10) 	15

2. METHODOLOGY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of the proposed approach and methodology (10) Quality of proposed implementation plan, i.e., how the bidder will undertake each task, and time-schedules (10) Risk assessment - recognition of the peripheral problems and methods to prevent and manage peripheral problems/quality controls (5) 	25
3. PROPOSED TEAM and ORGANISATIONAL CAPACITY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team members - relevant experience, skills & competencies (10) Professional expertise, knowledge and experience with similar projects, contracts, clients and consulting assignments (20) 	30
TOTAL POINTS FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSAL (min. passing score = 49 points)	70
4. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL – as per Annex C <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full marks are allocated to the lowest-priced proposal. The financial scores of the other proposals will be in inverse proportion to the lowest price. 	30
TOTAL POINTS	100

9- Administrative issues

- Bidders are requested to provide a detailed technical proposal in **Annex C** – Technical proposal response form.
- Bidders are requested to provide a detailed cost proposal in **Annex D** – Financial proposal response form.
- The bidder is requested to provide an all-inclusive cost in the financial proposal. The bidder is reminded to factor in all cost implications for the required service/assignment.
- The bidder is required to include the estimate cost of travel in the financial proposal noting that i) travel cost shall be calculated based on the most direct route and economy class travel, regardless of the length of travel and ii) costs for accommodation, meal and incidentals shall not exceed applicable daily subsistence allowance (DSA) rates, depending on the location, as promulgated by the International Civil Service Commission (<https://icsc.un.org/>).
- Unexpected travels shall be treated as above.

CONTRACT SUPERVISION

The following summaries set out the main roles and responsibilities for those involved in the evaluation.

The Evaluation Team (ET): leading role and responsibilities include:

Team Leader

- Delivering against the evaluation requirements set out in the ToR and ensuring these are compliant with UNICEF standards
- Ensuring deliverables (see above) are completed within agreed timeframes, budget, and quality standards
- Responding to, and factoring in, stakeholder feedback in redrafting deliverables

Team Member

- Contributing technical inputs to all deliverables and helping ensure requirements & standards are met
- Assuming a lead role in specific technical and / or cross-cutting areas as assigned by the team leader, and contributing analysis on these areas

The Evaluation Manager

This role would be taken up by the Multi-Country Evaluation Specialist, based UNICEF Lao CO, in conjunction with the LCO-based Social Policy, Planning, Monitoring and Reporting Chief. Primary responsibilities include:

- Help develop scoping for the CPE
- Set out and update a detailed plan for the process, and day to day management and communication of this process with stakeholders
- Leads on recruitment of the Evaluation Team, and provides supervision and support to the ET
- Day-to-day oversight and management of the evaluation process and budget, in coordination with EMG members and other key stakeholders. Leading on quality assurance throughout the process, assuring the quality and independence of the evaluation and guarantee its alignment with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines and other relevant procedures, managing stakeholder engagement in this (gathering and collating feedback), and ET performance against ToR deliverables

The Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)

An Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) should be set up and comprise the EUD, a small group of key UNICEF internal stakeholders led by the TCO CO Deputy Representative, and including the in-country Planning, Monitoring and Reporting Specialist, the Multi-Country Evaluation Specialist and members of the CMT. Primary responsibilities include:

- Make decisions on the scope, timing, and resourcing of the evaluation
- Conduct consultations with Government and partners as appropriate
- Contributions to, and approval of, the ToR (signed off by the Representative or Deputy)
- Select candidates for the ERG (see below)
- Ensuring lists of contacts, data and information is prepared for the ET, organising the in-country introduction of the evaluation team, arranging interviews, briefings, meetings
- Agreeing and scheduling field visits; providing logistical and admin support
- Contributing to Quality Assurance through comments and feedback on draft deliverables
- Develop the Evaluation Management Response in consultation with stakeholders, with the Representative signing off on this and monitoring progress in the coming two years

Quality Assurance

Quality assurance through the process will be undertaken by:

- **The Evaluation Manager**, leading on quality assurance of all deliverables, will provide quality assurance in line with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines and other relevant procedures checking that the evaluation methodologies, findings and conclusions are relevant and recommendations are implementable, and contribute to the dissemination of the evaluation findings and follow-up on the management response. S/he will review the initial deliverables (such as draft inception report, first draft of the final report) and work with ET on necessary revisions to ensure the deliverables meet minimum quality standards. Once the minimum standards are met, the Evaluation Manager requests feedback from stakeholders (country team, ERG, Evaluation Management Group), consolidates all comments from Reference Group, Regional Evaluation Advisor and other RO staff and key stakeholders on a response matrix and requests the ET to indicate actions taken against each comment in the production of the penultimate, and final draft.
- **ERG** provides provide comments and substantive feedback to ensure the quality – from a technical point of view – of key evaluation deliverables including the inception report and draft report.
- Regional advisors from each sectoral discipline will provide quality assurance inputs on technical areas of the evaluation
- **The Deputy Representative** is responsible for final quality assurance checking and final sign off on all deliverables of the evaluation

10- Any other Information

Annex 1: Inception Report structure

The Inception Report ensures that the evaluation team has a clear understanding of the TOR of the evaluation. It translates the TOR into an operational plan which determines how the evaluation will be carried out. The Inception Report forms the agreement between the Evaluation Manager and the Evaluation team on the operational plan for the evaluation. The structure for the inception report is:

- **Table of contents**
- **Abbreviations and acronyms**
- **Introduction**
 - Purpose of the Country Programme Evaluation
 - Scope of the evaluation
- **Country context**
 - Highlight key features of the country context which are relevant to children's rights, including national strategies and development challenges of particular relevance to UNICEF's mandate
 - Identify any key changes in context during the period being covered by the evaluation (eg any conflicts or disasters, major changes in policies affecting children etc)
- **UNICEF Country Programme**
 - UNICEF's programme in context of UN response
 - UNICEF's current (and, if applicable, previous) country programme – strategy, objectives, goals, reach and achievements
- **Stakeholder analysis**
 - Identify key stakeholders, their interests and how they will be involved in the evaluation
- **Evaluation Approach and Methodology**
 - State the evaluation approach and rationale for the approach with particular reference to the degree of stakeholder participation
 - State the evaluation questions which the evaluation will address; if these differ substantially from those noted in the Terms of Reference, indicate why they have been changed.
 - Indicators
 - Sources of data and data collection methods
 - Data analysis approach and tools to be used to answer the evaluation questions
 - (If applicable) Sampling strategy or plan and rationale for it
 - Limitations
- **Quality assurance**
 - Sets out the key quality assurance milestones, processes, and responsibilities for QA of the evaluation
- **Work Plan**
 - Indicate timing of key steps and deliverables for the evaluation
 - Outline responsibilities of each member of the evaluation team and level of effort
- **Annexes**
 - Terms of Reference
 - Bibliography
 - Evaluation matrix (evaluation questions, indicators, data sources and data collection methods)
 - Draft data collection tools/ instruments (e.g. Key Informant Interview protocols, draft survey instruments)

Annex 2: Evaluation Report Format

Report length: 45-55 pages excluding annexes

- **Executive Summary (up to 4 pages)**
- **Acknowledgments**
- **Table of contents**
- **Abbreviations and acronyms**
- **Map**
- **Introduction (6-7 pages)**
 - Purpose of the Evaluation
 - Scope of the evaluation
 - Methodology and approach to the evaluation
- **Country context and UNICEF's Programme (6-7 pages)**
 - Draw from the appropriate sections of the Inception Report, with relevant updates based on the subsequent fieldwork and analysis
- **Findings (30-35 pages)**
 - Answers to each of the evaluation questions
- **Conclusions (3 pages)**
- **Lessons learned (2 pages)**
- **Recommendations (3 pages)**
- **Annexes**
 - Terms of Reference
 - Inception Report including Evaluation Matrix
 - Bibliography
 - (As appropriate) methodological tools (including the reconstructed Theory of Change)

Annex 3: Assessing Risks and mitigating against these.

The table sets out some risks based on previous evaluation experience that need to be assessed and mitigation measures that the evaluation team need develop

Risk and implications	Mitigation measures
Covid-19 Virus spreading, or risk of spreading, results in restricted access and it is being impossible for evaluation country visit and meet stakeholders. Major impact on methodologies and/or timing	Delay implementation of the evaluation by an agreed period Consider options on ET working remotely through desk review and telecoms/video cons and surveys to engage with stakeholders (and include consideration of further reduction of scope) Consider delaying the timing of the start of the evaluation Build in regular review times (eg, at start and end of inception) to assess and decide on progressing, delaying or cancelling the process, and review proposed methodologies designed to cope with access constraints
The evaluation is over-ambitious in what it is attempting to cover or wrongly focused resulting in insufficient depth of analysis and/or missed opportunities on key areas	Use inception report to ensure relevance/responsiveness to stakeholder needs and to test feasibility, including assessing and factoring in where other evaluation processes already provide data and findings Reduce or change scope, clearly prioritise areas for CPE focus, and clarify areas deprioritised
Insufficient budget allocation	Set out in Costed Evaluation Plan, and review as scope and planning are refined
Insufficient time and attention paid to the evaluation at critical points in the process	Plan well in advance and ensure strong messaging by leadership. Ensure evaluation tasks incorporated into the team and key individual objectives Ensure other evaluation processes are scheduled outside the CPE implementation
Major crisis in the country, requiring response by UNICEF and	Delay implementation of the evaluation by an agreed period

partners leaving reduced capacity and attention on the evaluation	In case of a high-level crisis, postpone CPE to the next cycle or greatly reduce scope Allocate dedicated staff to be kept free from crisis response to focus on the evaluation
Poor performance by the Evaluation Team (ET) likely to result in poor timeliness and quality of deliverables and poor return on the CPE investment	Ensure due diligence in ET recruitment and onboarding Invest time in regular interaction with ET and closely monitoring progress in all phases of the process Monitor changes in team members and set requirements on like-for-like replacements Change evaluation team (or individuals) if necessary

Annex 4: UNEG Ethical Code of Conduct

UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

UNEG, March 2008

The Code of Conduct was formally approved by UNEG members at the UNEG Annual General Meeting 2008.

Further details of the ethical approach to evaluation in the UN system can be found in the *Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation in the UN System* (UNEG/FN/ETH[2008]).

UNEG/FN/CoC(2008)

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR EVALUATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

1. The conduct of evaluators in the UN system should be beyond reproach at all times. Any deficiency in their professional conduct may undermine the integrity of the evaluation, and more broadly evaluation in the UN or the UN itself, and raise doubts about the quality and validity of their evaluation work.

2. The UNEG⁵ Code of Conduct applies to all evaluation staff and consultants in the UN system. The principles behind the Code of Conduct are fully consistent with the Standards of Conduct for the International Civil Service by which all UN staff are bound. UN staff are also subject to any UNEG member specific staff rules and procedures for the procurement of services.

3. The provisions of the UNEG Code of Conduct apply to all stages of the evaluation process from the conception to the completion of an evaluation and the release and use of the evaluation results.

4. To promote trust and confidence in evaluation in the UN, all UN staff engaged in evaluation and evaluation consultants working for the United Nations system are required to commit themselves in writing to the Code of Conduct for Evaluation⁶ (see Annexes 1 and 2), specifically to the following obligations:

Independence

5. Evaluators shall ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.

Impartiality

Evaluators shall operate in an impartial and unbiased manner and give a balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the policy, program, project or organizational unit being evaluated. **Conflict of Interest**

7. Evaluators are required to disclose in writing any past experience, of themselves or their immediate family, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest, and to deal honestly in resolving any

⁵ UNEG is the United Nations Evaluation Group, a professional network that brings together the units responsible for evaluation in the UN system including the specialized agencies, funds, programmes and affiliated organisations. UNEG currently has 43 such members.

⁶ While the provisions of the Code of Conduct apply to all UN staff involved in evaluation, only UN staff who spend a substantial proportion of their time working on evaluation are expected to sign the Code of Conduct, including staff of evaluation, oversight or performance management units directly involved in the management or conduct of evaluations. All evaluation consultants are required to sign when first engaged by a UNEG member.

conflict of interest which may arise. Before undertaking evaluation work within the UN system, each evaluator will complete a declaration of interest form (see Annex 3).

Honesty and Integrity

8. Evaluators shall show honesty and integrity in their own behaviour, negotiating honestly the evaluation costs, tasks, limitations, scope of results likely to be obtained, while accurately presenting their procedures, data and findings and highlighting any limitations or uncertainties of interpretation within the evaluation.

Competence

9. Evaluators shall accurately represent their level of skills and knowledge and work only within the limits of their professional training and abilities in evaluation, declining assignments for which they do not have the skills and experience to complete successfully.

Accountability

10. Evaluators are accountable for the completion of the agreed evaluation deliverables within the timeframe and budget agreed, while operating in a cost effective manner.

Obligations to participants

11. Evaluators shall respect and protect the rights and welfare of human subjects and communities, in accordance with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other human rights conventions. Evaluators shall respect differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction, gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity, while using evaluation instruments appropriate to the cultural setting. Evaluators shall ensure prospective participants are treated as autonomous agents, free to choose whether to participate in the evaluation, while ensuring that the relatively powerless are represented. Evaluators shall make themselves aware of and comply with legal codes (whether international or national) governing, for example, interviewing children and young people.

Confidentiality

12. Evaluators shall respect people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality, while ensuring that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source.

Avoidance of Harm

13. Evaluators shall act to minimise risks and harms to, and burdens on, those participating in the evaluation, without compromising the integrity of the evaluation findings.

Accuracy, Completeness and Reliability

14. Evaluators have an obligation to ensure that evaluation reports and presentations are accurate, complete and reliable. Evaluators shall explicitly justify judgements, findings and conclusions and show their underlying rationale, so that stakeholders are in a position to assess them.

Transparency

15. Evaluators shall clearly communicate to stakeholders the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of findings. Evaluators shall ensure that stakeholders have a say in shaping the evaluation and shall ensure that all documentation is readily available to and understood by stakeholders.

Omissions and wrongdoing

16. Where evaluators find evidence of wrong-doing or unethical conduct, they are obliged to report it to the proper oversight authority.

(Each UNEG member to create its own forms for signature)

Annex 1: United Nations Evaluation Group – Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Evaluation Staff Agreement Form

To be signed by all staff engaged full or part time in evaluation at the start of their contract.

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Staff Member: _____

I confirm that I have received and understood, and will abide by the United Nations Evaluation Group Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at (place) on (date)

Signature: _____

(Each UNEG member to create its own forms for signature)

**Annex 2: United Nations Evaluation Group Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System
Evaluation Consultants Agreement Form**

To be signed by all consultants as individuals (not by or on behalf of a consultancy company) before a contract can be issued.

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organisation (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at (place) on (date)

Signature: _____

Annex 5 – Other resources for inception and evaluation reports

- United Nations Children's Fund. 2015. *UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection, and Analysis*
(<https://unicef.sharepoint.com/teams/OoR/Shared%20Documents/UNICEF%20Procedure%20on%20Ethics%20in%20Evidence%20Generation%20092015.pdf>).
- United Nations Children's Fund. 2015. *UNICEF Procedure for Quality Assurance in Research*,
(<https://unicef.sharepoint.com/teams/OoR/SiteAssets/SitePages/Procedures/UNICEF%20Procedure%20for%20Quality%20Assurance%20in%20Research.pdf>).
- Graham, A., Powell, M., Taylor, N., Anderson, D. & Fitzgerald, R. 2013. *Ethical Research Involving Children*, Florence: UNICEF Office of Research-Innocenti.
- The best UNICEF evaluation reports and good practices:
https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/index_60807.html
- Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System and handbook:
https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/index_GEROS.html

Other useful documents:

- United Nations Evaluation Group. 2008. *Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation in the UN System*,
(<http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/102>).
 - United Nations Evaluation Group. 2014. *Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations*,
(<http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1616>).
 - United Nations Evaluation Group. 2016. *Norms and Standards for Evaluation*,
(<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>);
 - United Nations Evaluation Group. 2018. *UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator - Technical Note and Scorecard*, (<http://www.uneval.org/document/download/2148>)
-

11- Estimated Cost of Contract

90.000 USD

12- Chargeable Budget Code for the activity

SC180018

13- Payment Schedule


No.	Payment	Tentative schedule	Remarks
1.	30%	One month from the start	upon approval of the inception report
2.	30%	Three months from the start	upon approval of draft report
3.	40%	Five months from the start	upon acceptance of all final deliverables

- The payment schedule must be based on completed deliverables.
- If the bidder wishes to propose an alternative payment schedule, it must be included in the financial proposal. The final payment schedule is to be reviewed and agreed with UNICEF.
- Payment terms 30 days net upon receipt of approved invoice.

14- Contract Supervisor

The service provider will be supervised by the UNICEF Chief of PME Section.

15- Signatures

TOR prepared by:	Endorsed by:	Reviewed by:	Approved by:
Oscar Huertas  Evaluation Specialist	Maryam Abdu SP Section Chief	Helena Soldatova Operations Manager	Beate Dastel Deputy Representative
Date: 1/4/2022	Date:	Date:	Date:

Requesting Section: -----

TITLE: Terms of Reference for.....

16- Background

The general information must describe the background of the requested services, in particular:

- Rationale and key aspects of the overall context of the assignment;
- History of activities to date;
- Project/assignment related data, e.g. relevant studies, geographical data target groups, category of services to be rendered and basic documents.

17- Objectives, Purpose & Expected results

- Specific details of the envisioned project/assignment; the framing and presentation of the objectives, purposes, expected outputs, and results to be achieved.

Objectives should be SMART, i.e.

Specific

Measurable

Achievable

Realistic

Time (Timed / time bound)

18- Description of the assignment

Presents the parameters of the requested services in terms of its scope and limits; what should be done and how will it be done? The scope should be specific and realistic given the time frame and resources available for the implementation. It should provide:

- Give concise description of the tasks to be performed and related results to enable the vendors provide detailed understanding of the assignment when submitting proposal
- Indicate the broad timeframe for the activities and actions
- Address any specific issues, including expected boundaries of the assignment.

19- Deliverables

Specific service / outputs to be delivered at a specific time as per stated objectives and performance / quality requirements.

20- Reporting requirements

Lists of the reporting guidelines and the reports to be prepared during the assignment as well as deadlines for submission; it includes requirements such as contents, number of copies, language, who should receive the reports and whether they should be submitted electronically (specify the file format; e.g. "pdf"), in hard copy, or both.

Examples of potential types of reports are:

- Inception Report
- Progress Reports and Minutes of Meetings
- Mission Reports
- Technical Reports
- Draft and Final Report
- Training material
- Presentation material
- Workshop/training evaluation report

21- Location and Duration

- Starting period: the indicative starting date for the assignment
- Foreseen finishing period or duration
- Indicative schedule of the assignment, activity schedule or project time frame
- Specific timelines and milestones for individual activities, and whether or not timeframes are negotiable - and if so under what circumstances
- Location(s) and schedule of the assignment: how many journeys/missions are anticipated throughout the contract duration (if required).

22- Qualification requirements or Specialized skills/Experience Required:

Specifies the professional requirements of the individual(s) and/or team(s) for the assignment including required experience, skills and qualifications; if applicable:

- Number of requested experts per category (e.g. team leader, supervisor...etc.) and number of man-days per expert
- Profile required (education, experience, references, category of each expert and working language(s))

23- Evaluation process and methods

- Describe the overall evaluation approach as per below example. The ratio between the technical and the commercial criteria established in the RFPS depends on the relative importance of one component to the other. e.g., 60/40 (technical/commercial) or 70/30 (technical/commercial). **Include minimum pass mark (usually 70% of total technical points). Sum of technical and commercial must always equal 100 points.**
- Breakdown of the total technical points according to the identified technical evaluation criteria – attached matrix for guidance purposes only.

Each valid proposal will be assessed by an evaluation panel first on its technical merits and subsequently on its price. The weight allocated to the technical proposal is xx% (i.e. 60 or 70 out of 100 points). To be further considered for the financial evaluation a minimum score of xx points is required. Only proposals with a score of xx or more points in the technical evaluation will be considered. For further details kindly refer to Table 1 below, and the technical response sheet.

The weight allocated to the financial proposal is xx% as per the following: the maximum number of xx points will be allotted to the lowest technically compliant proposal. All other price proposals will receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest price. Kindly refer to the financial response sheet.

The proposal(s) 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.

24- Administrative issues

- Interviews if necessary indicating for which experts/position (in general, the evaluation of experts is conducted on the basis of their CVs).
- Whenever possible, bidder should be requested to provide an all-inclusive cost in the financial proposal. Bidder should be reminded to factor in all cost implications for the required service / assignment
- When travel is expected as part of the assignment, it shall be clearly specified (e.g. location, duration, number of journeys ...etc.) in the TOR. Bidder shall be required to include the estimate cost of travel in the financial proposal. It is essential to clarify in the TOR 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).
- Unexpected travels shall also be treated as above.
- Resources and facilities to be provided by UNICEF; e.g. access to printer, office space...etc.

25- Estimated Cost of Contract (for internal purposes only)

26- Chargeable Budget Code for the activity (for internal purposes only)

27- Payment Schedule

Specifies the payment terms. In case of a progressive payment scheme is used, linking the payment schedule to each milestone/deliverable, it should be approved by the relevant authorized official at the planning stage.

28- Contract Supervisor

29- Any other Information

TOR prepared by:	Endorsed by:	Reviewed by:	Approved by:
Programme Officer/Specialist	Section Chief	Operations Manager	Deputy Representative
Date:	Date:	Date:	Date:

EVALUATION CRITERIA of TECHNICAL PROPOSAL FOR INSTITUTIONS

CATEGORY	MAX. POINTS
1. OVERALL RESPONSE *Understanding of, and responsiveness to, the requirements (x) *Understanding of scope, objectives and completeness of response (x) *Overall concord between UNICEF requirements and the proposal (x)	(xx)
2. METHODOLOGY *Quality of the proposed approach and methodology (x) *Quality of proposed implementation plan, i.e how the bidder will undertake each task, and time-schedules (x) *Risk assessment - recognition of the peripheral problems and methods to prevent and manage peripheral problems / quality controls (x)	(xx)
3. PROPOSED TEAM and ORGANISATIONAL CAPACITY * Team leader: Relevant experience, qualifications, and position with firm (x) * Team members - Relevant experience, skills & competencies (x) * Organization of the team and roles & responsibilities (x) * Professional expertise, knowledge and experience with similar projects, contracts, clients and consulting assignments (x)	(xx)
TOTAL MARKS FOR TECHNICAL COMPONENT	xx⁷
4. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL - PRICE Full marks are allocated to the lowest priced proposal. The financial scores of the other proposals will be in inverse proportion to the lowest price.	xx⁸
TOTAL MARKS	100

ⁱ Lao PDR Bureau of Statistics. LSIS II 2016/2017 Report. 2018. *Where not otherwise cited, data are from LSIS-II study report*

ⁱⁱ Boulom, S et al. Factors associated with child malnutrition in mountainous ethnic minority communities in Lao PDR, *Global Health Action*, 13:sup2, 2020. DOI: [10.1080/16549716.2020.1785736](https://doi.org/10.1080/16549716.2020.1785736)

ⁱⁱⁱ Dewey K and Huffman. 2009. Maternal, infant, and young child nutrition: combining efforts to maximize impacts on child growth and micronutrient status. *Food Nutr Bull*;32:S187-9

⁷ For this RFP, the **Technical Proposal** has a total weighting of [x%]. Bidders must score a minimum of xx points with minimum marks for category, to be considered technically compliant and in order for the Financial Proposals to be opened

⁸ For this RFP, the **Financial Proposal** has a total weighting of [xx%].

-
- ^{iv} Pengpid, S., Vonglokham, M., Kounnavong, S. *et al.* The prevalence of underweight and overweight/obesity and its correlates among adults in Laos: a cross-sectional national population-based survey, 2013. *Eat Weight Disord* **25**, 265–273 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40519-018-0571-5>
- ^v Harding KL, Aguayo VM, Webb P. Factors associated with wasting among children under five years old in South Asia: Implications for action. *PLOS ONE* 13(7): e0198749. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0198749>