

Country Programme Evaluation of the 2019-2022 & 2023–2025 UNICEF South Sudan Country Programmes of Cooperation

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Summary

Type of Contract	Institutional Contract
Title of the Evaluation	Evaluation of the UNICEF South Sudan Country Programmes of Cooperation (2019 – 2022 & 2023-2025)
Purpose	• The purpose of the evaluation is with evidence (that is impartial and independent) to make course correction to the 2023-2025 UNICEF Country Programme Document (CPD) as well as inform the design of the next CPD. • Promote forward leaning, effective decision-making based on the lessons learnt and recommendations, generated by the evaluation. • Reinforce the accountability of UNICEF to key internal and external stakeholders, including the UNICEF Executive Board, international donors, and the government of the Republic of South Sudan.
Objectives	• <u>To assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, sustainability, connectedness, coverage, and orientation towards impact of the previous and current South Sudan Country Programmes</u>, with particular focus on the programme and operational strategies and UNICEF’s positioning within the development community; with national partners, and field presence to respond to South Sudan’s development and humanitarian needs. • <u>To identify and document key lessons from the 2019-2022 and 2023-2025 Country Programmes</u> to make the best use of UNICEF’s change strategies, good practices, and innovations. • <u>To provide a set of forward-looking and actionable recommendations</u> to contribute towards course correction of the current Country Programme, strengthen programmatic and operational strategies in the design of the next South Sudan Country Programme, taking into consideration national and regional development priorities and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in the country.
Expected cost	<u>\$400,000</u>
Location	Juba, South Sudan, with travel to selected States and administrative areas if possible
Duration	9 months
Start Date	February 2024
Reporting to	UNICEF Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office (ESARO)
Grant reference	Non-Grant
Activity and WBS details	4040/OA/04/880/007/002

1 Introduction

In accordance with the coverage norms of UNICEF's Evaluation Policy 2018, every UNICEF Country Programme must be evaluated at least once in every two country programme cycles. Such Country Programme Evaluations (CPEs) are managed by the Evaluation Section of the respective UNICEF Regional Office, with the support and close collaboration of the Country Office.

As the Government of the republic of South Sudan and UNICEF Country Programme (2023-2025) draws near to its mid-term of implementation, and the completion of the 2019 – 2022 Country Programme, a CPE will be conducted to capture and provide evaluative evidence of UNICEF's contributions to the development results at the country level, as well as the effectiveness of UNICEF's strategy in facilitating and leveraging national efforts for achieving development results, while meeting humanitarian needs. CPE purpose is to:

- Inform the design of the next Government of the Republic of South Sudan and UNICEF Country Programme.
- Promote evidence informed, effective decision-making based on the lessons learnt and recommendations, generated by the evaluation.
- Reinforce the accountability of UNICEF to key internal and external stakeholders, including the UNICEF Executive Board, international donors, and the national government.

The CPE will be managed by the Evaluation Section of UNICEF's East and Southern Africa Regional Office (ESARO), under the overall oversight of the ESARO Regional Director, and in close collaboration with the UNICEF South Sudan Country Office (SSCO), Government of the Republic of South Sudan and development partners. The CPE will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of UNICEF's 2023 Evaluation Policy and the norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) - Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and the Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA).

The terms of reference present a brief description of the Country Programme; the scope, objectives, and key questions of the evaluation; evaluation methodology; stakeholder involvement; roles and responsibilities; evaluation process; deliverables; timelines and evaluators' qualifications.

2 National Context

Situation of Children in South Sudan

The Republic of South Sudan, which became an independent state on 9 July 2011 following protracted conflicts with Sudan, is navigating a complex journey towards peace and sustainable development. Despite the signing of the Revitalized Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in South Sudan (R-ARCSS) - recently extended to February 2025 - and a reduction in direct confrontations, the country faces significant challenges. These include persistent sub-national and localized violence, conflict-related sexual violence, and the deliberate destruction of land and property.

South Sudan, with an estimated population of 12.4 million, has an estimated 9 million people in need of humanitarian assistance (4.9 million Children, 2.2 million Women, 0.6 million elderly and 1.4 million

people with disability¹). The situation is further complicated by the presence of approximately 2 million internally displaced persons (IDPs)² and 501,943 returnees and refugees primarily from Sudan³. The Revised-National Development Strategy (R-NDS) 2021-2024 of South Sudan recognizes these challenges and aims to build resilience while consolidating peace, reducing humanitarian needs, stabilizing the economy, and setting a path towards sustainable development.

Despite its considerable economic potential, including oil and mineral wealth and a vital agricultural sector, South Sudan's development has been significantly hindered by a history of conflict, political and tribal divisions, corruption, and lack of transparency. Progress towards all 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in South Sudan is severely compromised, in 2023 South Sudan ranked 166 with a very low score of 38.68 progress toward achieving all 17 SDGs. A slight drop in ranking from 163 in 2022⁴. The national economy faces challenges like rising debt and potential hyperinflation, making it vulnerable to external shocks. The country's young population, with 57% under 18 years and a low life expectancy of 58 years, faces numerous adversities. Ranked 185th out of 189 countries on the Human Development Index in 2020, South Sudan is one of the world's poorest countries. Its economy is highly susceptible to macroeconomic shocks and is dependent on oil and remittances. Children in South Sudan continue to face deteriorating conditions, with endemic conflict and violence, and increasing frequency and severity of climatic shocks. South Sudan ranks high on the UNICEF Children's Climate Risk Index, and the impact of climate change is profound, with a significant portion of the population depending on climate-sensitive livelihoods.

The social protection system in the country, governed by the National Social Protection Policy Framework established in 2015, faces significant sustainability challenges due to its heavy reliance on donor funding. This dependence on external sources hinders long-term stability. Coordination within the social protection sector is fragmented, marked by the absence of a unified information management system. Furthermore, government investment in critical areas such as education, health, nutrition, child protection, and addressing gender-based violence (GBV) remains inadequate and is often marked by inefficiencies. For instance, the combined budgetary allocations for health, education, and the social and humanitarian pillar declined from 27.9% in FY2022/2023 to 10.8% in FY2023/2024, far below the international standard.

South Sudan faces severe and complex health challenges. Alarming, one out of every ten children is not expected to survive until their fifth birthday, with higher mortality rates among boys than girls⁵. Neonatal deaths, which have not decreased in the last decade, account for more than 40% of children's deaths under the age of five, primarily due to preventable diseases such as diarrhea, malaria, and pneumonia. However, there is some good news as vaccination rates have increased after a period of decline. With, 82% of children under one year receive the diphtheria, pertussis, and tetanus (DPT) vaccine, and 69% are vaccinated against measles.⁶

¹ South Sudan_HNRP_2024

² OCHA, South Sudan: Humanitarian Snapshot, August 2023

³ OCHA, South Sudan Humanitarian Snapshot, December 2023

⁴ <https://dashboards.sdindex.org/rankings>

⁵ United Nations Inter-Agency Group for Child Mortality estimations, 2020

⁶ National Routine Expanded Programme on Immunization Database, December 2021

Maternal health is a critical concern, as the country has one of the highest maternal mortality rates globally, at more than 1,150 per 100,000 live births⁷. Adolescent pregnancies, poor health and nutritional status of mothers, and limited access to quality sexual and reproductive health services are major contributing factors. Skilled birth attendance and antenatal care attendance have improved but remain insufficient, rising from 22% to 40% and from 20% to 29%, respectively, from 2011 to 2020⁸. HIV remains a significant public health challenge, with an adult prevalence rate of 2.5%. The healthcare infrastructure is critically inadequate. About half of the region's 1,981 health facilities are non-functional, and nearly 60% of the operational ones rely on support from humanitarian and development organizations⁹.

The nutritional situation in South Sudan is extremely challenging, with widespread issues of malnutrition, particularly among children and women. Around one third of children under five years old are stunted, a condition that has not improved over the past decade¹⁰. The 2023-2024 Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) statistics indicate that 5.83 million individuals, constituting 46% of the population, are facing severe acute food insecurity, ranking at or above IPC Phase 3 (Crisis level or worse). Among them, 1.64 million are in IPC Phase 4 (Emergency category). In the period from July 2023 to June 2024, it is projected that around 1.65 million children aged 6-59 months will experience acute malnutrition. This includes approximately 480,000 children anticipated to suffer from Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) and 1.16 million expected to encounter Moderate Acute Malnutrition (MAM). Gender disparities further exacerbate the situation. Women and girls face unequal access to food and resources, and cultural norms often lead to early marriage and pregnancy, perpetuating the cycle of malnutrition.

The country's Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) infrastructure is critically inadequate, contributing to the prevalent poor health and nutrition conditions. A staggering 86% of the population lacks access to safely managed water, and 63% of household drinking water is contaminated with E. coli. Furthermore, only 2% of households have access to a protected water source. Sanitation facilities are equally dire, with 75% of households practicing open defecation. Only 10% have improved sanitation facilities, and a mere 6% have a designated handwashing area with soap and water¹¹. South Sudan frequently faces environmental challenges such as extensive flooding and droughts. Flooding is a yearly occurrence, especially in flood-prone states such as Jonglei, Lakes, Warrap, Northern Bahr el Ghazal, Unity, and Upper Nile. The impact of these floods on agriculture is severe, with the 2021 FAO assessment revealing significant damage to crops and livestock. Droughts also pose a significant problem, affecting water availability and agriculture. The National Household Health Survey 2020 underscored the lack of improvement in WASH indicators.

Educational progress in the region has been limited, with a concerning number of children out of school. In 2020, an estimated 59% (2.8 million) of children aged 3–17 years were not attending school, a

⁷ United Nations Maternal Mortality Estimation Inter-Agency Group, September 2019

⁸ Republic of South Sudan, National Household Health Survey, 2020

⁹ South Sudan Ministry of Health, Health Management Information System/District Health Information System-2, 2022

¹⁰ UNICEF/WHO/World Bank, Joint Child Malnutrition Estimates: Country-level stunting estimates

¹¹ South Sudan Ministry of Health, National Household Health Survey, May 2021.

significant increase from 2.2 million in 2016, exacerbated by COVID-19 school closures. Of these, 53% are girls, who face greater barriers to education due to factors like child marriage and increased care responsibilities. The dropout rate is significant, with 24% of girls and 21% of boys enrolled in school leaving before completion¹². Early childhood education is notably neglected, with only 37% of pupils attending preschool before entering Class 1¹³. Children with disabilities, those in remote areas, affected by conflict, overage for their grade, involved in child labor, living in street situations, or from pastoralist communities are particularly likely to be out of school. Although primary education is nominally free, indirect costs often make it unaffordable. Safety concerns and inadequate school infrastructure, including 40% of classrooms functioning outdoors, further hinder school attendance¹⁴. Data on learning outcomes is scarce, but a 2016 study indicated that most primary students in early grades failed to achieve basic literacy, numeracy, or life skills. The COVID-19 pandemic has likely worsened this situation, leading to significant learning losses and an increased risk of dropout among students lacking basic literacy skills¹⁵.

The National Ministry of Gender, Child and Social Welfare (MGCSW) oversees child protection, gender equality, social justice, and the rights of women, persons with disabilities, and other vulnerable groups, in coordination with state-level MGCSWs. However, the MGCSW faces significant challenges, including limited financial and human resources, and a lack of technical expertise among staff. State-level MGCSWs are responsible for coordinating child protection activities with the help of social workers, partner staff, and community structures such as community-based child protection networks, foster parents, and Parent-Teacher Associations. Despite these structures, there is no consistent, functional, and sustainable government-led national child protection system to prevent and respond to violence against children. The financing and resources for child protection mainly come from the international humanitarian community, resulting in ad hoc service provision in response to crises rather than as part of a national system.

In 2023, over 3 million children and adolescents (2 million between 6-17 years and 1 million between 3-5 years) in South Sudan were at risk of violence, abuse, and exploitation, marking an 3% increase from 2022¹⁶. In the same year, 196 grave violations were reported, including the recruitment of 129 children (5 girls) by armed groups. Of the 6,237 GBV incidents reported between January and September 2021, 28% involved survivors under 18 years of age. Alarming issues include a high rate of child marriage, with half of all girls married or engaged by age 18, only 25% receiving secondary education, and 97% of GBV survivors being female. Conflict-related sexual violence and other forms of GBV are widespread, exacerbating the vulnerability of women and girls. Displacement has led to a rising number of children separated from their families, often without documentation like birth certificates, and there is a critical shortage of core child protection services and mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS) for affected children and families.

¹² Ministry of General Education and Instruction, Preliminary Report: Nationwide Out of School Children Catchment Mapping in South Sudan, May 2020

¹³ Mott MacDonald, "Assessment of Early Grade Learners in Literacy and Numeracy in South Sudan: End-line report", August 2020

¹⁴ Ibid

¹⁵ Montrose, "South Sudan Early Grade Reading and Mathematics Assessment Report", September 2016

¹⁶ South Sudan Humanitarian Needs and Response Plan, 2024

3 UNICEF Programme in South Sudan

The UNICEF Country Programme for 2023-2025 focuses on addressing multiple crises and challenges in a complex environment, guided by evaluations and key recommendations. It aims to integrate conflict-sensitivity and peacebuilding approaches, remain agile in crisis response, and tackle child deprivations effectively. The programme operates in a context of disease outbreaks, food and nutrition crises, conflict, economic issues, gender inequality, climatic shocks, and limited government resources. Its primary implementation methods include working with civil society organizations and direct implementation through flexible approaches like static, outreach, and rapid response programming.

The programme's goal is that all children – including children with disabilities – adolescents and women, particularly the most vulnerable, are safer and enjoy their rights, with systems strengthened to ensure that they have access to high quality and resilient services; and that humanitarian assistance and development cooperation address the structural causes of fragility and vulnerability. The programme aligns with various frameworks and strategies, including the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF), the Revised National Development Strategy, and the UNICEF Strategic and Gender Action Plans.

To achieve the identified programme outcomes, the following strategies will be implemented:

- a) Use of integrated service delivery platforms to improve programme effectiveness
- b) Building the capacity and systems at the community level
- c) Supply chain optimization through common inter-agency mechanisms, including pre-positioning of humanitarian supplies
- d) Evidence-based, gender-responsive social and behavioural change and community engagement
- e) Innovative use of technology to improve social service delivery coverage and quality.

Health

UNICEF's health initiative aims to improve maternal, neonatal, child, and adolescent health access and quality, focusing on malaria prevention and treatment. Strategies include strengthening government health facility planning and management, community-based preventive and curative services, and adolescent-friendly sexual and reproductive health services. Emphasis is on tackling neonatal deaths, enhancing early infant care, HIV transmission prevention, and immunization coverage, including COVID-19 vaccination.

Nutrition

The nutrition program focuses on reducing malnutrition among children, adolescents, and pregnant women. It involves shifting towards government-managed nutrition services and a multi-sectoral approach, integrating food, health, social protection, WASH, and education sectors. Key areas include treating severe wasting, improving infant and young child feeding, adolescent and maternal nutrition, micronutrient supplementation, and promoting healthy dietary practices.

Climate-Resilient WASH

This component aims to deliver sustainable, climate-resilient water and sanitation services. In rural areas, it focuses on climate-resilient infrastructure, water management, and sustainable WASH services. In urban areas, it advocates for equitable access to water services and sanitation. The program includes

hygiene and sanitation promotion, school-based WASH initiatives, and public-private-community partnerships.

Education and Learning

UNICEF's education component seeks to increase school attendance, particularly for vulnerable groups like girls. It involves advocating for education budget efficiency, supporting formal and non-formal education, promoting safe school environments, teacher training, and curriculum development. The focus is also on early childhood education and reducing barriers to school enrollment.

Child Protection

This component aims to create a safer environment for children, focusing on preventing and addressing violence, GBV, child marriage, and supporting children in contact with the law or armed groups. Efforts include professionalizing the social service workforce, developing child protection policies, providing multi-sectoral GBV services, and integrating child protection services into health, nutrition, and education sectors.

Social Policy

Under this thematic area, UNICEF works on reducing child poverty and enhancing household resilience. This includes monitoring child poverty, developing child-focused policies and strategies, advocating for increased social sector spending, and promoting public financial management. The focus is also on designing social protection mechanisms linked to health, nutrition, and education.

Programme Effectiveness

This component supports effective program delivery across all areas, emphasizing cross-sectoral work, research, evaluations, and digital approaches for scalable results. It aims to integrate early childhood development, adolescent programming, and climate change resilience into all initiatives.

By 2025 UNICEF aims at achieving the following Outcomes for children and women in South Sudan:

- **Health:** More neonates, infants, children, adolescent girls and women survive and thrive, benefiting from improved access to and use of quality and equitable health services and practices, including in emergencies.
- **Nutrition:** More children, including adolescents, and women have improved nutrition, benefiting from increased access to and use of quality services and practices, including in emergencies.
- **Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH):** More children, women and their families, particularly the most vulnerable populations, have equitable and sustainable access to and use safe and climate-resilient water and sanitation services and practice safe hygiene behaviours, including in emergencies.
- **Education:** More children aged 3–18 years, particularly girls and the most vulnerable, access equitable, inclusive and quality education with improved learning outcomes, including in emergencies.

- Child protection: Children and women are safe and protected from violence, exploitation, abuse and harmful practices.
- Social policy: More children and families benefit from better government services that reduce monetary and multidimensional poverty and strengthen resilience.

4 Evaluation Objectives

The **overall objectives** of the CPE are:

- To assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, sustainability, connectedness, coverage, and orientation towards impact of the previous and current South Sudan Country Programmes (2019-2022 & 2023-2025 respectively), with particular focus on the programme and operational strategies and UNICEF's positioning within the development community; with national partners, and field presence to respond to South Sudan's development and humanitarian needs.
- To identify and document key lessons from the 2019-2022 and 2023-2025 Country Programmes to make the best use of UNICEF's change strategies, good practices, and innovations.
- To provide a set of forward-looking and actionable recommendations to contribute towards course correction of the current Country Programme, strengthen programmatic and operational strategies in the design of the next South Sudan Country Programme, taking into consideration national and regional development priorities and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in the country.

5 Scope of the Evaluation

The proposed CPE will cover the 2019-2022 and 2023-2025 South Sudan Country Programmes, capturing and demonstrating evaluative evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, sustainability, connectedness, coverage, and impact, in achieving development results, while responding to humanitarian needs for children at the country level and reinforcing national efforts. The evaluation is expected to begin in February 2024 and will take 20 weeks, spread over a period of 9 months to complete.

As a country-level evaluation of UNICEF, the CPE will focus on the Government of the Republic of South Sudan and UNICEF CPDs approved by the Executive Board but also consider any relevant changes/revisions introduced during the implementation. The scope of the CPE includes the entirety of UNICEF's engagement in the country, and therefore covers interventions funded by all sources, and includes any humanitarian or emergency response supported by UNICEF South Sudan during the period under evaluation. However, even though CPE is expected to cover the entirety of the South Sudan CP, it is not meant to be an assessment of the full results framework. Therefore, the emphasis will be on assessing outcome level results while assessing individual programmes and operations change strategy's contribution to those results. The CPE will also examine the contribution of the South Sudan

CP to advancing national development results (Revised National Development Strategy 2021–2024) and the SDGs through the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF), Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and International Normative Frameworks. In principle, the CPE will not seek to conduct a full evaluation of individual programmes, project, or activities, but rather synthesize and build on the evidence already collected from evaluations/studies/research. Any gaps in the existing evidence can be bridged by primary data collection using quantitative and/or qualitative methods.

The CPE will have a strong focus on gender, social and behaviour change, equity, and human (child) rights as cross-cutting theme across evaluation criteria and evaluation questions. In addition, the CPE will have a particular focus on UNICEF's positioning within the development community and national partners in relation to its child rights mandate. The CPE will also examine the following areas:

- Identify missing areas in the current Country Programme that should be considered for inclusion in the upcoming CPD (key gaps in response; key beneficiaries missing, Key strategies to be used /employed UNICEF processes not being fully followed to be more effective).
- The core programming strategies SSCO to provide specifics);
- New programming areas (innovation, disability, children on the move, humanitarian, development, peace linkages).
- Operational management structures (matrix management and sub-national presence through field offices).
- Partnership management (ranging from traditional to non-traditional partners such as the government agencies, international organizations, NGOs, CSOs, academic institutions, donors, media organizations and private sector).
- Assess the implementation of multi-sectoral approaches under the current CPD.
- Analyze the extent to which we can demonstrate impact for children and impact at scale.

An analysis regarding the extent to which crosscutting priorities such as ECD, HIV, climate-sensitive programming, Adolescents & Youth, Communication, gender, disability inclusion, equity and human rights have been integrated into programmes implementation so that new informed commitments towards strengthening gender-responsive and increased gender transformative programming as well as organizational practices towards gender equality can be adopted moving forward.

The geographic scope of the evaluation will be national, with a particular focus on locations identified as priority areas under the 2019-2022 and 2023-2025 CP's.

6 Evaluation Criteria and Preliminary Evaluation Questions

The CPE will be guided by the key evaluation criteria and associated questions listed below:

Relevance: The CPE will seek to assess the extent to which the objectives of the Country Programme and its design were and remain appropriate within the country context, as well as how suitable UNICEF's approach towards addressing them was considering its mandate, resource base, comparative

advantages, and operational structures. It will assess both whether UNICEF has identified the most relevant goals, objectives or strategies to solve the problems UNICEF intended to address and whether these are equity focused and gender responsive.

1. To what extent has the Country Programme remained relevant and aligned with national priorities, legislative frameworks, plans and strategies, UNICEF's Strategic Plan, and the UN joint programme in South Sudan? How responsive and adaptive has the Country Programme been to the changing context and emerging needs of children (including adolescents, young people, and the most marginalized, including persons with disabilities), particularly in view of the COVID-19 pandemic, the leaner funding landscape and shift from direct service delivery?

Effectiveness: The CPE will assess the extent to which the Country Programme results were achieved despite challenges caused by COVID-19, including gender equity results, and whether the adopted six key strategies by UNICEF demonstrated a reasonable contribution at the Outcome level, including any differential results across groups.

2. To what extent has the Country Programme achieved its intended results, or is likely to achieve them, including any differential results across gender, disability inclusion, social behaviour change, income, ethnicities, etc.? What are the major factors influencing the achievement (or not) of these outcomes, including equity, behavioural and gender-related results?

Efficiency: The CPE will measure how resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) were converted into and affected results. It will also measure the extent to which the programme and operational structures are appropriate to achieve the anticipated programme results. It is also understood as the way in which UNICEF manages its partnerships to operationalize its strategies, implement activities and deliver outputs.

3. To what extent have the programme and the office structures supported the cost-effective and timely delivery of the Country Programme? How have these structures facilitated or hindered resource mobilization and utilization of funds?

Impact: While it is anticipated that programmatic outcomes from the 2023-2025 South Sudan CP may not yet be sufficiently mature to enable a comprehensive assessment of its impact, the CPE should aim to assess both positive and negative outcomes—whether intended or unintended—that are probable consequences of the interventions undertaken by the South Sudan CP. This evaluation should focus on identifying potential long-term effects these interventions may have, and the extent to which the CP is poised to effectuate meaningful change. Concurrently, the CPE is expected to evaluate the impact of the 2019-2022 CP, examining a spectrum of outcomes including social, economic, and environmental impacts, with specific attention to critical areas such as gender equality or environmental sustainability.

4. What positive and negative (intended and unintended) long-term outcomes/impact are likely to be produced by the South Sudan CP interventions? To what extent can the South Sudan programme demonstrate impact for children and impact at scale?
5. To what extent did the preceding Country Programme (or Country Programmes) contribute to positive long-term change on children, particularly the most marginalized and vulnerable?

Coherence: The CPE will assess policy consistency with key UNICEF strategies and international commitments including gender equality and women’s empowerment, equity for children, and the human rights-based approach; and UNICEF’s coordination and convening role, within the UN, with government sectors and donors in South Sudan.

6. To what extent were meaningful partnerships or coordination mechanisms established with other key actors e.g. government at national and local levels, other UN agencies, civil society, NGOs, private sector, academia, etc. contributed towards addressing the predefined bottlenecks and contributing to the results at scale?
7. To what extent have key UNICEF strategies and international commitments been consistently integrated in all aspects of SSCO programming and implementation, including policy and advocacy, particularly vis-a-vis the Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action and UNICEF’s Gender Action Plans (2018–2021, 2022-2025)?

Sustainability: The CPE will assess the extent to which the continuation of benefits from Country Programme interventions was ensured, including the likelihood of and risks to continued long-term benefits, and its potential for scale-up and/or replication.

8. To what extent has the country programme contributed to improving government systems, service delivery mechanisms, and service integration in a manner that the benefits for children would extend after the termination of UNICEF programmes? (Providing clear evidence of where this has been the case what have been enabling factors, and where it has not been the case, the reasons why and key challenges)

Connectedness: assess whether activities of a short-term emergency nature were carried out in a context that takes longer term and interconnected problems into account

9. To what extent has the UNICEF response to humanitarian issues contributed to strengthening national preparedness and response efforts, including the humanitarian, development, and peace linkages?

Coverage: The CPE will assess the Country Programme reach to major population groups facing life-threatening risks in South Sudan, and the extent to which they were provided with assistance and protection proportionate to their need

10. How effectively has UNICEF managed to reach the most vulnerable populations, such as children, women, and those with disabilities?

To answer these overarching questions, the evaluation team will be expected to breakdown main questions into sub-questions as part of the evaluation matrix to further focus the evaluation. The evaluation matrix will be reviewed by all stakeholders during the inception period.

7 Evaluation Approach and Methods

7.1 Evaluation Approach

The evaluation methodology will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards. The detailed evaluation design will be developed by the evaluation consultancy firm to be contracted to conduct the evaluation during the inception phase, in close consultation with the ESARO Evaluation Section managing the evaluation and key evaluation stakeholders. The design should specify how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations while linking to the GAP indicators throughout the evaluation process, including to the extent possible, inclusion of girls and boys, women and men, as well as a range of Country Programme stakeholders.

The CPE will be conducted at the outcome level. A Theory of Change (ToC) approach (including reconstructing a theory of change for the entire Country Programme) will be used in consultation with stakeholders, as appropriate, to better understand how and under what conditions UNICEF's interventions may have led to improved wellbeing of children in South Sudan. Discussions of the ToC will focus on mapping the assumptions behind the programme's desired change(s) and the causal linkages between the intervention(s) and the intended Country Programme outcomes. As part of this analysis, the implementation of the Country Programme over the evaluation period will also be examined, covering UNICEF's capacity to adapt to the changing context in South Sudan and responsiveness to changing needs and priorities will also be looked at. Where possible and appropriate, the evaluation should seek to obtain evidence as to what may or may not have occurred in the absence of UNICEF's programme. The effectiveness of the selected outcomes of UNICEF's Country Programme will be analysed to understand the extent to which the Country Programme achieved (or is likely to achieve) its intended objectives. Including to what extent did the implementation of the country programme consider crosscutting issues. This will include an assessment of the achieved results and the extent to which these results have contributed to the intended CPD objectives.

To better understand UNICEF's performance, the specific factors that influenced performance - positively or negatively, and the sustainability of results in South Sudan will be examined. In addition to country-specific factors that may explain UNICEF's performance, the utilization of resources to deliver results (including managerial, programmatic, Operational practices), the extent to which the CO fostered partnerships and synergies with other actors, and the integration of gender equality, equity, disability inclusion and human rights in design and implementation of the CPD are some of the aspects that will be assessed.

It is expected that the CPE apply a strong gender-sensitive, disability inclusive, equity, and human rights-responsive focus by: i) including disability, equity, social and behaviour change and gender in evaluation criteria and evaluation questions; ii) making evaluation methodology and data collection and analysis methods equity, gender-responsive and disability-inclusive; and iii) reflecting disability, equity and gender analysis in evaluation findings, conclusions and concrete recommendations and action points that can be addressed in the design of the next CPD both for a better integration of social and behaviour change, disability, equity and gender in the office and programming efforts, and for strengthened results for children.

The CPE will rely on a mix of quantitative and qualitative information that will need to be triangulated. The design should specify how data collection and analysis methods will integrate disability, equity, and gender considerations throughout the evaluation process, including to the extent possible, inclusion of girls and boys, women, and men, including persons with disabilities, as well as a range of country programme stakeholders.

As part of the inception phase, the evaluation team will conduct an assessment to ascertain the available information, identify data constraints, and determine the data collection needs and methods. The methodology should be aware of and prepared to take advantage of the accumulated and in-process evidence generated through research, studies, surveys, and evaluations conducted within both UNICEF-South Sudan Country Programme and by other stakeholders.

With respect to indicators, the CPD results framework is updated annually during the annual reporting to show progress towards outputs. A Country Office Annual Report (COAR) is produced annually, covering all the programme components and implementation strategies and their status. In addition, other relevant programmatic surveys and studies will be availed to the evaluation team.

7.2 Data collection methods

The Evaluation Team should select the most appropriate combination of data collection methods to address each evaluation question. Suggested data collection methods include, but are not limited to, document review, synthesis of meta-analysis of previous evaluations and assessments, semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, field visits, stakeholder surveys, focus group discussions, and other methods such as case studies and direct observation. The evaluation is expected to use both primary and secondary data, participatory feedback and other consultative mechanisms. The CPE is expected to draw on an extensive review of secondary data and primary data collected through individual and group interviews with a wide range of key stakeholders. The document review will play an important role in answering questions related to results achieved by SSCO as well as the CP's contribution to national priorities.

The desk review may include, but not be limited to, review of key programme documents, previous assessments, and evaluations, behavioural research including Knowledge, Attitude and Practice (KAP) findings and key national surveys, documents produced by Government counterparts and NGO partners and relevant literature. More specifically, the following secondary resources will be reviewed, among others: background documents on the national context, documents prepared by international partners during the period under review and documents prepared by UN system agencies; programme strategy notes, plans and frameworks; progress reports; monitoring self-assessments such as the UNICEF Country Office Annual Reports; national surveys (e.g. DHS, EICV, etc.); national reports (e.g. SitAn); and evaluations conducted by the country office and partners. UNICEF can provide data from its administrative information systems (Evidence Information Systems Integration (EISI), Results Assessment Module (RAM), Country Office Annual Report (COAR), Inter-Agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation (IGME), Joint Monitoring Plan (JMP), Gender Programmatic Review, Disability, etc

that are used for planning, monitoring, reporting and performance management for use in this CPE. Government administrative information that will be used will include HMIS, EMIS, WMIS, Disability MIS, Social Protection MIS, etc. These will be used to further assess results in specified areas and can be used to map and analyse achievement. Sex-disaggregated data will be reviewed, where available, and assessed against programme results.

Interviews should cover a wide range of key stakeholders such as Government representatives at national and decentralized levels, field office staff, civil-society organizations, community representatives, private-sector representatives, UN agencies, multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, and rights holders including children and adolescents under the programme and UNICEF staff through a survey included as part of a perception study. Focus group discussions may be used to consult different groups of rights holders and duty bearers as appropriate. Participatory data collection methods, especially when collecting information from adolescents and children, should be considered. The evaluation team should put in place measures that support the involvement and engagement of children or adolescents with disability. Consideration of any potential ethical issues and approaches to involving adolescents and children in the evaluation should be outlined in the proposal. To answer evaluation questions in relation to relevance and strategic positioning, the evaluation may consider conducting a perception study of major stakeholders about the roles UNICEF is well or poorly positioned to play. The method to accomplish it should be described in the technical proposal.

Validation. The evaluation team is expected to triangulate information, using both "triangulation by method" and "triangulation by source."

Stakeholder Involvement. A participatory and transparent process will be followed to engage with multiple stakeholders at all stages of the evaluation process. During the inception phase a comprehensive stakeholder analysis will be conducted to identify all relevant UNICEF partners, including those that intervene in crosscutting areas such as Gender, disability as well as those who may have not worked with UNICEF directly but play a key role in the outcomes to which UNICEF contributes or have in-depth knowledge of the context or issues covered by the evaluation. This stakeholder analysis will play a key part in informing the design of the CPE, serve to identify key informants for interviews during the main data collection phase of the evaluation, and will examine any potential partnerships that could further improve UNICEF's contribution to the country. The stakeholders may include, but not limited to, relevant Government partners, NGO partners implementing programmes with UNICEF through cooperation agreements and rights holders who are targeted by UNICEF programmes, including young people (adolescents and youth, students from universities and schools) and persons with disabilities who are involved throughout the Country Programme to address issues and decisions that affect them.

8 Specific Tasks, Deliverables and Timeline

The CPE is anticipated to begin in February 2024 with the preparatory phase and take 20 weeks over a span of 9 months to complete.

Timeline	Activity	Deliverable	Other elements to be aware of or link to	Payment schedule
2 weeks	<u>Preparatory phase</u> - Secondary data collection and desk review - Preliminary stakeholder analysis - Preparation for the inception phase - Introductory meeting with ESARO, SSCO staff to review/discuss TOR and South Sudan's CPs	1. Plan for inception phase Recipients: ESARO, SSCO members of the evaluation reference group	Evaluation Reference Group is formed. UNICEF and other stakeholders are informed to secure cooperation for the effort. Documentation and data are assembled by UNICEF for use by the evaluation team.	
5 weeks	<u>Inception phase</u> - May include a 1-week inception mission including visiting one community outside of Juba - Initial desk review - Discussion of Theory of Change - Preparation of draft inception report (see Annex 5 for the indicative table of contents) and data collection tools - Engagement with stakeholders on inception report - Undertake ethical approval process - Finalization of inception report	2. Presentation of proposed CPE approach and evaluation plan during CPE Launch Meeting Recipients: ESARO and SSCO 3. Draft inception report and instruments Recipients: ESARO, SSCO, members of the evaluation reference group 4. Presentation of the draft inception report - in person or via video link – to the Evaluation Reference Group. 5. Submit ethical approval application(s) and respond to all comments 6. Final inception report (plus completed audit trail addressing all comments) Recipients: ESARO, SSCO, members of the evaluation reference group	The inception report structure, format and quality should adhere to the UNICEF Inception Report standards and the GEROS Quality Assessment System . The draft inception report will undergo two reviews, first by ESARO and SSCO, and then after revisions, by the ERG and EO. The inception report and instruments will need to undergo ethical review, depending on the national requirements, and the evaluation workplan will need to account for time needed to secure approvals.	30 per cent upon completion of deliverables 1 through 6
6 weeks	<u>Data collection phase</u> - Preparation for data collection, including piloting of instruments - Mission in South Sudan to collect data and meet with stakeholders – including an	7. Debrief with key SSCO staff at the end of the data collection phase (to present emerging findings for feedback and discuss initial recommendations)		

Timeline	Activity	Deliverable	Other elements to be aware of or link to	Payment schedule
	internal rapid survey with UNICEF South Sudan CO staff as main respondents • Conduct remote and in person interviews/FGDs and undertake additional desk review • Preparation of interview reports • Population of evaluation matrix • Preparation and delivery of Emerging Findings Debrief			
7 weeks	<u>Analysis, drafting, validation and completion phase</u> • Data analysis and drafting • Preparation of a PowerPoint presentation on preliminary findings, conclusions, and recommendations • Engagement with stakeholders on draft report • Finalization of report and summary PowerPoint presentation	8. A complete first draft evaluation report Recipients: ESARO, SSCO, EO, members of the evaluation reference group 9. Presentation of Draft Report (draft findings, conclusions, and recommendations) to the Evaluation Reference Group Recipients: members of the evaluation reference group 10. Presentation of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations at the SSCO Strategic Moment of Reflection 11. A final evaluation report (plus completed audit trail addressing all comments). The final report should be illustrated with data and infographics and formatted with UNICEF branding. Detailed recommendations on each theme should be presented in a separate concluding chapter. Equity and gender should also be included as cross-cutting themes throughout the findings. Recipients: ESARO, SSCO, members of the evaluation reference group	The draft report will undergo two reviews, first by ESARO Evaluation and SSCO, and then after revisions, by the ERG, EO, and ESARO programme sections. Presentations of key findings, conclusions and recommendations need to be ready for the UNICEF South Sudan Strategic Moment of Reflection (preparation of the next CP) and other identified CPD events in Q3 of 2024. Recommendations should be in line with the UNICEF Strategic Plan 2022-2025. The report structure, format and quality should adhere to the UNICEF Evaluation Report standards and the GEROS Quality Assessment System. Dissemination and use strategy commence as deliverables are received.	30 per cent upon completion of deliverables 7 through 8 40 per cent upon

Timeline	Activity	Deliverable	Other elements to be aware of or link to	Payment schedule
		12. Final PowerPoint presentation that summarizes the evaluation findings and formatted with UNICEF branding. 13. Other agreed dissemination products including: evaluation brief, two or three thematic evaluation briefs, evaluation poster etc. are completed. Exact products to be agreed during inception phase. Final products should be illustrated with data and infographics and graphically designed with UNICEF branding.		completion of deliverables 9 through 14
20 weeks	TOTAL			

Important notes:

- Data archive: Data gathered in the exercise is transferred in an organized archive that will permit follow-on users to replicate or extend the analysis. Suitable care to be taken in assuring the anonymity of respondents and documented in inception and final reports.
- Monitoring work progress on deliverables which are not listed in the TOR will be periodically required.
- The format of and page limits for the final deliverables will be decided in the inception period and in accordance with the CPE guidance issued by the Evaluation Office. A high value will be placed on products that are concise and communicate well with different audiences. Thus, the final products should be edited and produced to include infographics and print layout in an easy-to-read format and in accordance with UNICEF style and branding.

9 Management Arrangements and Quality Assurance

The evaluation consulting firm will be recruited by and report to the ESARO Evaluation Section under the overall oversight of the ESARO Regional Director. For the day-to-day management of the CPE, the Evaluation Section will appoint an Evaluation Manager who will be accountable to the Regional Evaluation Adviser. Quality assurance will be provided by UNICEF's Evaluation Office.

SSCO will appoint an Evaluation Focal Point who will act as the primary liaison with the Evaluation Manager and will facilitate the data collection and evaluation process at the country level.

The Evaluation Manager will work with SSCO to constitute an Evaluation Reference Group (ERG), comprising key stakeholders of the CPE, including Government counterparts; several senior SSCO staff

members; select development, civil society, and private sector partners; and, if possible, adolescents or young people. The ERG's responsibilities are described in the ERG terms of reference. The ERG has an advisory capacity whose primary role is to review evaluation milestones (terms of reference, inception report, draft evaluation report) and to provide comments. The ERG will be chaired by the ESARO Evaluation Specialist, the Evaluation Manager will support as the secretary, who will maintain a written record, as part of an audit trail, of all ERG comments, which the evaluation team is expected to respond to in writing (agree – actions taken; disagree – justification).

ESARO will assure the quality of the evaluation and guarantee its alignment with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines and provide quality assurance checking that the findings and conclusions are relevant and proposed adaptations and recommendations are actionable. All major deliverables will be reviewed first by ESARO and SSCO (zero draft) and then by the Evaluation Reference Group. The inception report and draft final report will be subject to a satisfactory rating by an external quality assurance facility, using quality assurance checklists provided in Annexes 7 and 8, before payment can be made. The evaluators will be responsible for ensuring that recommendations for quality improvement of the deliverables are fully addressed. The Final Evaluation report will also be submitted to the Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System (GEROS) for final quality assessment with feedback provided to ESARO on the quality of the evaluation.

10 Ethical Considerations

The evaluation consulting firm should adhere to the following UN and UNICEF norms and standards. Copies of all these documents will be provided upon request:

- United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Standards for Evaluation in the UN System
- United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms for Evaluation in the UN System, including impartiality, independence, quality, transparency, consultative process
- Ethical Guidelines for UN Evaluations and the UNICEF procedure for ethical standards in research, evaluation, data collection and analysis, as well as the Ethical Research Involving Children guidance, will guide the overall process
- UNICEF adapted evaluation report standards and GEROS
- The evaluation should incorporate a human rights-based, disability-inclusive and gender perspective and be based on results-based management principles and logical framework analysis.
- UNICEF Disability Inclusive Evaluations guidance

The evaluation team is required to clearly identify any potential ethical issues and approaches, as well as the processes for ethical review and oversight of the evaluation process, in their proposal. Owing to the envisaged participation of human subjects in the evaluation, the evaluation team should look into the requirements for ethical review board approval either from a recognized Institutional Review Board in South Sudan or via UNICEF's LTA for ethical approval. Any ethical issues that arise during the evaluation need to be documented including how the consultants will respond or address each.

11 Expected Background and Experience of the Evaluation Firm

Institutions with strong background in evaluation of development effectiveness are encouraged to submit a proposal. The evaluation team should be gender balanced, culturally diverse and composed of a team leader and additional team members, both national and international.

Specific requirements include:

1. Expertise in conducting similar or related strategic programme evaluations, including proven track record of evaluation of similar large multisectoral and multi-stakeholder country programmes supported by UN or UNICEF.
2. Demonstrated expertise in evaluating institutional support systems including operations and the human resource function.
3. Knowledge of programming theories and strategies employed in each of the programme pillars.
4. A work record in Eastern and Southern Africa and with experience in South Sudan.
5. Excellent command of English, with a proven ability to prepare high-quality reports.
6. Strong quantitative and qualitative analytical skills and participatory methods, and knowledge of latest methods and approaches in humanitarian evaluation.
7. A team lead who has held a lead role in evaluations of similar scope/complexity, and a national expert.
8. The team must consist of experts specializing in child rights and participation, disability inclusion, equity, gender equality, emergency response, health, nutrition, water, sanitation and hygiene, social policy, child protection, education, adolescent development and participation, early childhood development, C4D/SBCC/Community engagement, local government systems strengthening.
9. The evaluation team should collectively demonstrate knowledge and experience on disability inclusion, with an understanding of and familiarity with disability-inclusive approaches to programming and evaluative methodologies.
10. The firm must submit samples (at least three) of similar work they have conducted.

Significant advantages

- ❖ Proven ability to develop attractive evidence products that present complex information via Infographics, child-friendly and accessible formats and other communication means.
- ❖ Knowledge of the social, economic, and political context of South Sudan.
- ❖ Record of top ranked evaluation reports by GEROS.

Annexes

- Annex 1. Proposal assessment process and methods
- Annex 2. General conditions: Procedures and logistics
- Annex 3. Policy both parties should be aware of
- Annex 4. Intellectual property rights
- Annex 5. Inception report outline
- Annex 6. UNICEF quality review checklists for inception reports
- Annex 7. UNICEF quality review checklist for draft evaluation reports
- Annex 8. UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standard

TOR Clearance and Approval

Name	Bikul Tulachan	Hamida Ramadhani
Designation	OIC Regional Evaluation Adviser, UNICEF Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office	UNICEF Representative in South Sudan
Date	01-03-2024	09-02-2024
Signature		

Annex 1. Proposal assessment process and methods

Interested companies are requested to submit their technical and financial proposals by... *(this will be added by Supply Section when the Request for proposal is issued)*. After the opening, each proposal will be assessed first on its technical merits and subsequently on its price.

The proposal with the best overall value, composed of technical merit and price, will be recommended for approval. UNICEF will set up an evaluation panel composed of technical staff and their conclusions will be forwarded to the internal UNICEF Contracts Review Committee, or other relevant approving authority.

The evaluation panel will first evaluate each response for compliance with the requirements of the request for proposal (RFP) procedure of UNICEF. Responses deemed not to meet all the mandatory requirements will be considered non-compliant and rejected at this stage without further consideration. Failure to comply with any of the terms and conditions contained in this RFP, including provision of all required information, may result in a response or proposal being disqualified from further consideration.

All bidders' proposals will be reviewed by the evaluation panel. The overall weighting between technical and financial evaluation will be as follows: The technical component will account for 70per cent of the total points allocated and the financial component will account for 30per cent of the total points allocated. The assessed technical score must be equal to or exceed 50 of the total 70 points allocated to the technical evaluation in order to be considered technically compliant and for consideration in the financial evaluation.

Below is allocation of points to both the technical and financial evaluation.

ITEM	TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	MAX OBTAINABLE POINTS
1	Overall quality of the technical proposal <i>Demonstrated understanding of the assignment by the proposer and the responsiveness of the proposal submitted to the TOR.</i>	15
2	Company experience <i>Range and depth of organizational experience in the provision of the services mentioned in the TOR, samples, and references of previous work.</i>	10
3	Proposed Methodology and Approach <i>Quality and appropriateness of the overall approach and methodology proposed to design and undertake the CPE per the evaluation criteria and key evaluation questions, including detailed work plan in line with the TOR.</i>	25
4	Quality of the proposed team <i>Relevant experience and qualifications of the proposed team for the assignment as per the TOR.</i>	20
TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE		70
TOTAL FINANCIAL SCORE		30
SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL & FINANCIAL SCORE		100

Annex 2. General conditions: Procedures and logistics

1. No lodging or meals will be provided to the consulting firm.
2. The consulting firm will not work from UNICEF office. It must use its own office facilities.
3. DSA will not be paid to the consulting firm by UNICEF. All such costs should be included in the price quotations.
4. The consulting firm should use its own materials such as computers and printers, etc.
5. The consulting firm is not authorized to use UNICEF's vehicles. Local transport costs should therefore be part of the price quotation.
6. Payment will be made upon delivering of the deliverables listed above that meet UNICEF quality standards.
7. Flight costs will not be covered by UNICEF. Such costs must be included in price quotations for the bid.
8. Translations of evaluation deliverables and interpretation services are the responsibility of the consulting firm and should be included in the bid.

Annex 3. Policy both parties should be aware of

- Under the consultancy agreements, a month is defined as 21 working days, and fees are prorated accordingly. Consultants are not paid for weekends or public holidays.
- Consultants are not entitled to payment of overtime. All remuneration must be within the contract agreement.
- No contract may commence unless the contract is signed by both UNICEF and the consultant or Contractor.
- For international consultants outside the duty station, signed contracts must be sent by fax or email. Signed contract copy or written agreement must be received by the office **before Travel Authorization is issued.**
- No consultant may travel without a signed travel authorization prior to the commencement of the journey to the duty station.
- Unless authorized, UNICEF will buy the tickets of the consultant. In exceptional cases, the consultant may be authorized to buy their travel tickets and shall be reimbursed at the “most economical and direct route”, but this must be agreed to beforehand.
- Consultants will not have supervisory responsibilities or authority on UNICEF budget.
- Consultant will be required to sign the Health statement for consultants/Individual contractor prior to taking up the assignment, and to document that they have appropriate health insurance, including Medical Evacuation.
- The Form 'Designation, change or revocation of beneficiary' must be completed by the consultant upon arrival, at the HR Section.

Annex 4. Intellectual property rights

All intellectual property rights in the work to be performed under this agreement shall be vested in the Government of South Sudan and UNICEF, including without limitations, the right to use, publish, translate, sell, or distribute, privately or publicly, any item or part thereof. The Government of South Sudan and UNICEF hereby grants to the Recipient Organization a non-exclusive royalty-free license to use, publish, translate, and distribute, privately or publicly, any item or part of the work to be performed under this Agreement for non-commercial purposes. Neither the Recipient Organization nor its personnel shall communicate to any other person or entity any confidential information made known to it by the Government of South Sudan and UNICEF during the performance of its obligations under the terms of this Agreement nor shall it use this information to private or company advantage. This provision shall survive the expiration or termination of this Agreement.

Further analysis of data collected in the evaluation will appear as South Sudan-UNICEF Country Programme Evaluation. Once the official report is cleared consultants will be free to work further on those papers for publication in peer reviewed journals, acknowledging UNICEF¹⁷. Consultants will provide the ESARO Evaluation Section with raw data, corrected/verified data once cleaned and programming files that permit replication of results from core evaluation reports.

Data collected for the evaluation is the property of UNICEF ESARO. Master versions of the data, coding protocols and programming code permitting replication of results of core evaluation reports will be kept by ESARO. Copies of the data will be distributed to researchers with the permission of the ESARO Evaluation Section with a view to helping to disseminate learning derived from the data sets.

¹⁷ Please consult UNICEF's GUIDANCE ON EXTERNAL ACADEMIC PUBLISHING (2017) for further guidance: <https://www.unicef-irc.org/files/upload/documents/UNICEF-External-Publishing.pdf>

Annex 5. Inception report outline

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION*

- 1.1. Objective of the evaluation
- 1.2. Background and context
- 1.3. Scope of the evaluation

2. METHODOLOGY

- 2.1. Evaluation criteria and questions
- 2.2. Conceptual framework
- 2.3. Evaluability
- 2.4. Data collection methods
- 2.5. Analytical approaches
- 2.6. Risks and potential shortcomings

3. PROGRAMME OF WORK

- 3.1. Phases of work
- 3.2. Team composition and responsibilities
- 3.3. Management and logistic support
- 3.4. Calendar of work

ANNEXES

- I. Terms of reference of the evaluation
- II. Evaluation matrix
- III. Stakeholder map
- IV. Tentative outline of the main report
- V. Interview checklists/protocols
- VI. Theory of change / outcome model
- VII. Detailed responsibilities of evaluation team members
- VIII. Reference documents
- IX. Document map
- X. Project list
- XI. Project mapping
- XII. Detailed work plan

The structure of inception reports may be adjusted depending on the scope of the evaluation.

Annex 6. UNICEF quality review checklist for inception reports



UNICEF Evaluation Inception Report
 Quality Review Checklist
 Universal, June 2, 2023

NOTE: Reviewers complete the cells formatted in yellow

IDENTIFICATION OF DELIVERABLE				
Title of Report		Management of Evaluation (Management control and oversight of evaluation activities)		
Region		UPCA Correspondence (Alignment with UPCA focus areas/priorities)		
Year of Report Completion		Evaluation Object		
Office		Evaluation Type		
Country		Evaluation Strategy		
TOE present		Evaluation Design		
Date of Review		Evaluation Level		
Date of 2nd review		Geographic Scope		
1st Reviewer		Primary TOEs Covered (Number)		
1st Reviewer 2nd Reviewer		Every child survives and thrives		
		Every child learns		
		Every child is protected from violence and exploitation		
		Every child lives in a safe and clean environment		
		Every child has an equitable chance to thrive		
		Gender equality (non-rating)		
		Humanitarian action (non-rating)		

RATING SCALES											
Individual Rating Criteria Guide	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Rating</th> <th>Explanation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>Criterion is addressed.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Partially</td> <td>Criterion is only partially addressed, one or more important elements are missing or incorrect.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>Criterion is not addressed or is inadequately addressed, all important elements are missing or incorrect.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not rated</td> <td>Criterion could not be rated, reasons are provided.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Rating	Explanation	Yes	Criterion is addressed.	Partially	Criterion is only partially addressed, one or more important elements are missing or incorrect.	No	Criterion is not addressed or is inadequately addressed, all important elements are missing or incorrect.	Not rated	Criterion could not be rated, reasons are provided.
Rating	Explanation										
Yes	Criterion is addressed.										
Partially	Criterion is only partially addressed, one or more important elements are missing or incorrect.										
No	Criterion is not addressed or is inadequately addressed, all important elements are missing or incorrect.										
Not rated	Criterion could not be rated, reasons are provided.										

RATING SCALES											
Section Rating Criteria Guide	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Rating</th> <th>Explanation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Highly satisfactory (91.25% – 100%)</td> <td>Exceeds UNICEF/UNIS standards for evaluation inception reports.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfactory (82.5% – 91.25%)</td> <td>Meets UNICEF/UNIS standards for evaluation inception reports.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not (73.75% – 82.5%)</td> <td>Meets UNICEF/UNIS standards for evaluation inception reports in some regards, but not all.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsatisfactory (50% – 73.75%)</td> <td>Does not sufficiently meet UNICEF/UNIS standards for evaluation inception reports.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Rating	Explanation	Highly satisfactory (91.25% – 100%)	Exceeds UNICEF/UNIS standards for evaluation inception reports.	Satisfactory (82.5% – 91.25%)	Meets UNICEF/UNIS standards for evaluation inception reports.	Not (73.75% – 82.5%)	Meets UNICEF/UNIS standards for evaluation inception reports in some regards, but not all.	Unsatisfactory (50% – 73.75%)	Does not sufficiently meet UNICEF/UNIS standards for evaluation inception reports.
Rating	Explanation										
Highly satisfactory (91.25% – 100%)	Exceeds UNICEF/UNIS standards for evaluation inception reports.										
Satisfactory (82.5% – 91.25%)	Meets UNICEF/UNIS standards for evaluation inception reports.										
Not (73.75% – 82.5%)	Meets UNICEF/UNIS standards for evaluation inception reports in some regards, but not all.										
Unsatisfactory (50% – 73.75%)	Does not sufficiently meet UNICEF/UNIS standards for evaluation inception reports.										

INCEPTION REPORT REVIEW				
SECTION A: OPENING PAGES AND INTRODUCTION (weight 10%)	Rating	Constructive Critiques (3-4 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes", if not rated, provide reasons here.)	Second Reviewer Rating	Second Reviewer (3-4 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes", if not rated, provide reasons here.)
Question 1: Do the opening pages and introduction of the Inception Report contain all the relevant information?				
1.1 The introduction contains a short description of the purpose and content of the IR, the key activities undertaken for its preparation and its place in the evaluation process.				
1.2 The introduction highlights any emerging issues that have arisen during the inception phase (if applicable).				
1.3 Back elements in the opening pages are presented (evaluation title, country, years covered by the evaluation, name(s) and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), and commissioning organization on cover page, list of acronyms, table of contents, including list of tables and figures).				
Feedback on Section A: The reviewer will verify (3-4 sentences) score top five issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	Overall rating for Section	Score	Overall 2nd Reviewer Rating	2nd Reviewer Section Score
	MSU/IS	MSU/IS	MSU/IS	MSU/IS
	Weighting: 0.25		Weighting: 0.25	

SECTION B: CONTEXT AND DESCRIPTION OF THE OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION (weight 10%)	Rating	Constructive Critiques (3-4 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes", if not rated, provide reasons here.)	Second Reviewer Rating	Second Reviewer (3-4 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes", if not rated, provide reasons here.)
Question 2: Are the context and description of the object of the evaluation clearly presented?				
2.1 Clear and relevant description of the context of the object of the evaluation (i.e. relevant policy, environment, political, cultural, power (influence, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the object of the evaluation.				
2.2 Images are drawn to the TOEs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.				
2.3 The object of the evaluation is clearly and clearly explained (the objectives, stakeholders involved and their roles, contributions, and roles, right holding/beneficiaries and their status and needs, time period, budget, geographic scope, phase of implementation).				
2.4 The description of the object of the evaluation makes adequate references to human rights, gender, and equity/indicators.				
2.5 The high model or the theory of change (TOC) of the object being evaluated is described to some extent, with the assumption that it will be further refined or finalized in the Evaluation Report.				
Feedback on Section B: The reviewer will verify (3-4 sentences) score top five issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	Overall rating for Section	Score	Overall 2nd Reviewer Rating	2nd Reviewer Section Score
	MSU/IS	MSU/IS	MSU/IS	MSU/IS
	Weighting: 0.25		Weighting: 0.25	

SECTION C: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVE, AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION (weight 10%)	Rating	Constructive Critiques (3-4 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes", if not rated, provide reasons here.)	Second Reviewer Rating	Second Reviewer (3-4 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes", if not rated, provide reasons here.)

Question 3:	Are the purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation clearly presented?				
3.1	The evaluation purpose is clearly presented, including the rationale behind the evaluation, its intended use and what this use is expected to achieve, its primary intended users and how they stand to gain or lose from the results of the evaluation.				
3.2	The evaluation objectives are clearly presented with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the TOR.				
3.3	The scope of the evaluation is clearly defined (includes what will and will not be covered, the geographic location, period, thematic field(s) of intervention/interventions to be evaluated, levels (regional, country, municipal). Changes from TOR are clearly indicated and justified.				
Feedback on section C - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top five issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.		Overall rating for section:	Score	Overall 2nd Review Rating	2nd Review Section Score
		NRV/OI	NRV/OI	NRV/OI	NRV/OI
		Weighting		Weighting	
		0.3		0.3	

SECTION D: EVALUATION FRAMEWORK (weight 20%)	Rating	Constructive Comments (3-5 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.)	Second Review Rating	Second Review (3-5 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.)
Question 4: Are the evaluation criteria and questions clearly presented?				
4.1 All of the evaluation criteria and questions are listed as per TOR. If criteria/questions differ from TOR, the inception report justifies the changes, e.g., efforts to prioritize questions and reduce number of questions to address should be noted in the report.				
Question 5: Are evaluation findings derived from the conceptualization, explicit and implicit use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence.				
5.1 The inception report links the evaluation criteria and questions to the chosen methodology through an evaluation matrix that includes indicators, benchmarks, assumptions and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based and conclusions drawn, referring to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), Leave No one Behind (LNOB), and disability inclusion as appropriate.				
5.2 Indicators, data sources, and data collection methods are identified for each question.				
5.3 The indicators chosen are specific, easily measurable, and relevant to the corresponding evaluation questions and TOR.				
5.4 The evaluation questions and indicators include reference to human rights, gender, and equity dimensions.				
Feedback on Section D: The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top five issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	Overall rating for Section:	Score	Overall 2nd Review Rating	2nd Review Section Score
	NRV/OI	NRV/OI	NRV/OI	NRV/OI
	Weighting		Weighting	
	0.2		0.2	

SECTION E: METHODOLOGY (weight 30%)		Rating	Constructive Comments (3-5 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.)	Second Review Rating	Second Review (3-5 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.)
Question 6:	Is the methodology clearly presented, technically sound, logically feasible, and appropriate considering the evaluation framework?				
6.1	Clear and complete description of a relevant and robust methodological design and set of methods that are suitable for the evaluation's purpose, objectives, and scope. Any adaptations to the methods proposed in the TOR are explained and justified.				
6.2	If the evaluation uses attribution questions (outcome or impact level), an appropriate evaluation design (qualitative or quantitative) to reliably measure attribution is proposed.				
6.3	Key data sources are clearly presented and appropriate (includes list of documents for desk review, the group of stakeholders to be interviewed, available databases, data gaps), and appear comprehensive and reliable.				
6.4	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.				
6.5	The sampling methods described for qualitative data collection are appropriate and adequate (includes list of the following sample size, the geographic area(s), specific populations, sampled site/country visits, the rationale/criteria for selection, how participants/interviewees will be selected, and criteria for selection of countries to be visited/skipped (if applicable)).				
6.6	The sampling methods described for quantitative data collection are appropriate and adequate (includes list of the following sample size, the geographic area(s), specific populations, sampled site/country visits, the rationale/criteria for selection, how participants/interviewees will be selected, and criteria for selection of countries to be visited/skipped (if applicable)).				
6.7	The data collection tools are fitted to the specific evaluation questions (the way in which the tools are designed should facilitate capturing the information needed to answer the evaluation questions).				
6.8	Questions in interview protocols, discussion guides and questionnaires are robust, focused, linked to the evaluation needs and avoid leading questions.				
6.9	The inception report describes relevant methodological limitations to the evaluation.				
6.10	Clear and complete description of evaluation limitations, potential biases and constraints faced by the evaluation team, and mitigation strategies to be used.				
6.11	The inception report specifies that the evaluation will follow the UNHCR Norms and Standards as well as the UNHCR Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.				
6.12	Explicit and contextualized reference to the obligations of evaluations (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) in accordance with UNHCR ethical standards.				
6.13	Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues described (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups (i.e. adherence to ethical principles and procedures, disclosure, confidentiality and data collection), for those cases where the evaluation will involve interviewing children, explicit reference is made to the UNHCR procedures for ethical research involving children.				
Feedback on section E: The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top five issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.		Overall rating for section:	Score	Overall 2nd Review Rating	2nd Review Section Score
		NRV/OI	NRV/OI	NRV/OI	NRV/OI
		Weighting		Weighting	

SECTION F: EVALUATION WORKPLAN (weight 20%)		Rating	Constructive Comments (3-5 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.)	Second Review Rating	Second Review (3-5 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.)
Question 7:	Is the evaluation complete and containing relevant information?				
7.1	The evaluation phases are clearly described, including a timeline with associated activities, number of days for each team member, locations and deliverables.				
7.2	The roles and responsibilities of each member of the evaluation team are clearly described.				
7.3	If the evaluation requires official ethical approval, the process to be followed is clearly described.				
7.4	The inception report describes the evaluation quality assurance process.				
7.5	The logistics of carrying out the evaluation are discussed (e.g. assistance required from UNHCR for interview arrangements, field visits, etc.) and the expected roles and responsibilities from the coordinating organization(s) or steering committee are adequately explained.				
Feedback on section F - The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top five issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.		Overall rating for section:	Score	Overall 2nd Review Rating	2nd Review Section Score
		NRV/OI	NRV/OI	NRV/OI	NRV/OI
		Weighting		Weighting	

SECTION 4: DESCRIPTION REPORT STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 10%)		Rating	Comments/Feedback (2-3 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.)	Second Review Rating	Second Review (2-3 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.)
Question 4.1	Do the annexes contain all the relevant elements?				
4.1	The evaluation tool are included in the annexes.				
4.2	The following elements are annexed to the description report (high-level): Plan, evaluation matrix, bibliography, data collection tools (if not interview protocols, survey, case study format), budget of people to be interviewed, if applicable and available ethical review board approval form and/or informed consent form.				
Question 4.2	Is the description report coherent and logical?				
4.3	Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and subtitles, well formatted).				
4.4	Description report is easy to understand (written in an accessible way for intended audiences and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors), and conveys key information through the use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) which are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced to text.				
Feedback on Section 4: The rubric will likely (2-3 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.		Overall rating for Section	Score	Overall 2nd Review Rating	2nd Review Section Score
		NOV/21	NOV/21	NOV/21	NOV/21
		Weighting		Weighting	
		5		5	
Weighting checklist (should appear 1)			Weighting checklist (should appear 1)		

NOV/21	OVERALL SCORE	NOV/21
Overall suggestions for improvements, suggestions made throughout the review should be listed clearly and succinctly, referring both to pages as well as individual criteria. (2-3 sentences)		
NOV/21	OVERALL SECOND REVIEW SCORE	NOV/21
Overall suggestions for improvements, suggestions made throughout the review should be listed clearly and succinctly, referring both to pages as well as individual criteria. (2-3 sentences)		

6.2	Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation what will and will not be covered (geographically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as the reasons for this scope (e.g., specificities by the T&A and/or the report, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/baseline or particular elements of the intervention).				
Question 6:	Is the Theory of Change, results chain or logic model articulated?				
6.3	Clear and complete description of the intervention's intended results or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to, or are being tested by, the evaluation.				
6.4	Clear relationship between outputs and outcomes is presented in narrative and graphic form (e.g., results chain, logic model, theory of change, evaluation matrix).				
6.5	For theory-based evaluations, the Theory of Change or Results Framework is assessed, and if requested in the T&A, it is reformulated/improved by the evaluation.				
Feedback on Section 6: The score will clarify (3-5 sentences) scores for the issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.		Overall rating for Section	Score	Overall/2nd Review Rating	2nd Review Section Score
		40%/10	40%/10	40%/10	40%/10
		Threat (1/4)		Threat (1/4)	
		0.25		0.25	

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)		Rating	Constructive Criticism (3-5 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.	Second Review Rating	Second Review (3-5 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 7:	Does the evaluation use questions and the relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD DAC criteria that all OECD DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scope. Standard OECD DAC criteria include: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability, Impact. Evaluation should also consider equity, gender and human rights (these can be reinforced by other criteria). For qualitative evaluations, should consider Coverage, Generators, Credibility, Feasibility, Security.				
7.1	Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation and are aligned with the evaluation criteria.				
7.2	In addition to the questions and sub-questions, the evaluation matrix includes indicators, benchmarks, assumptions and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based and conclusions drawn.				
Question 8:	Does the report specify methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?				
8.1	Clear and complete description of a mixed and robust methodological design and set of data collection methods that are suitable for the evaluation's purpose, objectives, and scope.				
8.2	Data sources are appropriate, normally including qualitative and quantitative sources (notes information on that in the T&A and are all clearly described).				
8.3	Sampling strategy is provided, describing how diverse perspectives were captured (or if not, providing reasons for this).				
8.4	Clear and complete description of data analysis methods.				
8.5	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.				
8.6	Clear and complete description of evaluation limitations, biases and constraints faced by the evaluation team and mitigation strategies used.				
Question 9:	Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNICEF ethical standards for evaluation and to OECD UNICEF Procedures on Ethics in Conduct Research, Studies, Practices. In such, the evaluation report should include: 8.7 Explicit and contextualized reference to the obligations of evaluations (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) in accordance with UNICEF ethical standards. 8.8 Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues described (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups (e.g. adherence to ethical principles/procedures, do no harm, confidentiality and data collection). For those cases where the evaluation involved interviewing children, explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research involving Children. 8.9 If the Evaluation Report required an official ethical approval and informed consent, both forms are included as annexes in the draft final evaluation report.				
Feedback on Section C: The score will clarify (3-5 sentences) scores for the issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.		Overall rating for Section	Score	Overall/2nd Review Rating	2nd Review Section Score
		40%/10	40%/10	40%/10	40%/10
		Threat (1/4)		Threat (1/4)	
		0.2		0.2	

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)		Rating	Constructive Criticism (3-5 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.	Second Review Rating	Second Review (3-5 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes"). If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 10:	Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?				
10.1	Findings cover sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's criteria and questions. Steps to evidence that are generated and mitigation of bias are highlighted if relevant.				
10.2	If feasible and relevant to the purpose, each analysis is clearly presented (how data compare to similar interventions or standards, most efficient way to get expected result if not feasible, an explanation is provided).				
10.3	Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/T&C in the formulation of the findings.				
Question 11:	Are evaluation findings derived from the considerations, explicit and implicit use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence?				
11.1	Evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data, presenting both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident through the use of multiple data sources.				
11.2	Findings are clearly supported by, and respond to, the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison as relevant for each question.				
11.3	Unexpected effects (positive and negative) are identified and analyzed.				
11.4	The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings analyze the logical chain (progression from implementation to results).				
Question 12:	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?				
12.1	Clear and comprehensive assessment of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework, including output and outcome-level logic, indicator levels and their usage to support decision-making).				
Feedback on Section D: The score will clarify (3-5 sentences) scores for the issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.		Overall rating for Section	Score	Overall/2nd Review Rating	2nd Review Section Score
		40%/10	40%/10	40%/10	40%/10
		Threat (1/4)		Threat (1/4)	
		0.25		0.25	

SECTION 5: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight: 10%)	Rating	Constructive Criticism (0-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.)	Second Review Rating	Second Review (0-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.)
Question 15: Do the conclusions present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?				
15.1 Conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. They are sufficiently forward looking (if a formative evaluation) or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phases.				
15.2 Conclusions are derived appropriately from findings and present a picture of the strengths and limitations of the intervention that adds insight and extends beyond the findings.				
Question 16: Are logical and informative lessons learned identified? (N/A if lessons are not presented and not requested to fill.)				
16.1 Identified lessons stem logically from the findings, have wider applicability and relevance beyond the object of the evaluation.				
16.2 Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.				
Feedback on Section 5 - The rater will briefly (0-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	Overall rating for Section	Score	Overall 2nd Review Rating	2nd Review Section Score
	ND/N/NI	ND/N/NI	ND/N/NI	ND/N/NI
	Weighting		Weighting	
	0.1		0.1	

SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight: 10%)	Rating	Constructive Criticism (0-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.)	Second Review Rating	Second Review (0-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.)
Question 15: Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?				
15.1 Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.				
15.2 Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and users relevant to the intended audience. Guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.				
15.3 Process for developing the recommendations is described, and includes the involvement of duty bearers, as well as rights holders where feasible (for explanation given for why they were not involved).				
Question 16: Are recommendations clearly presented?				
16.1 Clear identification of groups or duty bearers responsible for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations). Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.				
Feedback on Section 6 - The rater will briefly (0-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	Overall rating for Section	Score	Overall 2nd Review Rating	2nd Review Section Score
	ND/N/NI	ND/N/NI	ND/N/NI	ND/N/NI
	Weighting		Weighting	
	0.15		0.15	

SECTION 6: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight: 10%)	Rating	Constructive Criticism (0-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.)	Second Review Rating	Second Review (0-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.)
Question 17: Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?				
17.1 Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the object evaluated, date of report, location of evaluated object, name(s) and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, title of number including, as relevant, letters, graphs, figures, annexes, list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers.				
17.2 Annexes include terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of interviews, results study/ToC/logical framework (unless included in report body), list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include additional details on methodology, information about the evaluator(s).				
Question 18: Is the report logically structured?				
18.1 Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles, well formatted).				
18.2 Structure follows UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports context, purpose, objectives and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.				
18.3 Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.				
18.4 Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced to text.				
18.5 Report is of reasonable length; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.				
Feedback on Section 6 - The rater will briefly (0-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	Overall rating for Section	Score	Overall 2nd Review Rating	2nd Review Section Score
	ND/N/NI	ND/N/NI	ND/N/NI	ND/N/NI
	Weighting		Weighting	
	0.25		0.25	

SECTION 6: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight: 10%)	Rating	Constructive Criticism (0-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.)	Second Review Rating	Second Review (0-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.)
Question 19: Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, for greater equality, and to equity?				
19.1 Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, and/or CCC, and/or CSW and/or other rights-related instruments in the design of the evaluation.				
19.2 Clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation, including to the development of recommendations, (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering).				
19.3 Explicit evidence of the inclusion of these considerations can include using human rights language, gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing, disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups, disaggregating data by socially excluded groups.				
Question 20: Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addressed equity?				
20.1 Evaluation assesses the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addresses child rights and leaves no one behind (gender and other excluded and marginalized groups). It is disability inclusive, i.e. it is aligned with the UN Disability Inclusion Strategy as appropriate.				
Question 21: Does the evaluation meet UN SDG evaluation performance indicators?				
Note: this question will be rated according to UN SDG standards.				
21.1 Gender is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures SDG-related data will be collected.				
21.2 A gender-responsive Evaluation Methodology, Methods and Tools, and Data Analysis Techniques are selected.				
21.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis.				
Feedback on Section 6 - The rater will briefly (0-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	Overall rating for Section	Score	Overall 2nd Review Rating	2nd Review Section Score

	MDPI/20	MDPI/20	MDPI/20	MDPI/20
	Weighting		Weighting	
	0.5		0.5	
SECTION 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (single 100)	Rating	Consideration 0-100 (0-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.	Second Review Rating	Second Review (0-2 sentences with page references to suggest improvements for every statement that is not rated "yes". If not rated, provide reasons here.
Question 22: Can the executive summary inform decision making?				
22.1 (An executive summary is included that is of relevant conciseness and depth for key users. (Maximum of 3 pages unless otherwise specified in ToR))				
22.2 (Includes all necessary elements (overview of the object of the evaluation, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key considerations on findings, issues identified if any, and key recommendations) as per ToR)				
22.3 (Includes all significant information to understand the object of the evaluation and the evaluation itself AND does not introduce new facts to the rest of the report)				
Feedback on Section 1: The rater will briefly (0-2 sentences) assess top line issues for this section and provide suggestions for improvements.	Overall rating for Section	Score	Overall 2nd Review Rating	2nd Review Section Score
	MDPI/20	MDPI/20	MDPI/20	MDPI/20
	Weighting		Weighting	
	0.25		0.25	
Weighting: 0.25 (should equal 1)	0		0	
MDPI/20	OVERALL SCORE	MDPI/20		
Overall suggestions for improvements, suggestions made throughout the review should be listed clearly and succinctly, referring back to pages as well as individual sections. (0-10 sentences)				
MDPI/20	OVERALL SECOND REVIEW SCORE	MDPI/20		
Second Review: Overall suggestions for improvements, suggestions made throughout the review should be listed clearly and succinctly, referring back to pages as well as individual sections. (0-10 sentences)				

Annex 8. UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standard

The title page and opening pages provide key basic information

1. Name of the evaluation object
2. Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report
3. Locations (country, region, etc.) of the evaluation object
4. Names and/or organizations of evaluators
5. Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
6. Table of contents which also lists Tables, Graphs, Figures and Annexes
7. List of acronyms

Executive Summary is a stand-alone section of 2-3 pages that includes:

1. Overview of the evaluation object
2. Evaluation objectives and intended audience
3. Evaluation methodology
4. Most important findings and conclusions
5. Main recommendations

Annexes increase the credibility of the evaluation report. They may include, inter alia:

1. ToRs
2. List of persons interviewed, and sites visited
3. List of documents consulted
4. More details on methodology, such as data collection instruments, including details of their reliability and validity
5. Evaluators biodata and/or justification of team composition
6. Evaluation matrix
7. Results framework

Object of Evaluation

The report presents a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation

1 The **logical model and/or the expected results chain** (inputs, outputs, and outcomes) of the object is clearly described

2 The **context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors** that have a direct bearing on the object is described. For example, the partner government's strategies and priorities, international, regional, or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency's corporate goals and priorities, as appropriate.

Scale and complexity of the object of the evaluation are clearly described, for example:

3 **The number of components**, if more than one, and the size of the population each component is intended to serve, either directly or indirectly

- **The geographic context and boundaries** (such as the region, country, and/or landscape and challenges where relevant).

- **The purpose and goal, and organization/management of the object**

- The **total resources** from all sources, including human resources and budget (s) (e.g., concerned agency, partner).

4 The **key stakeholders involved** in the object implementation, including the implementing agency (s) and partners, other key stakeholders, and their roles

5 The report identifies **the implementation status of the object**, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes (e.g., plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time and explains the implications of those changes for the evaluation

Evaluation Purpose, Objective(s), and Scope

The evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope are fully explained

1 The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used by different intended audiences.

2 The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover

3 The report describes and provides an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators

4 As appropriate, evaluation objectives and scope include questions that address issues of gender and human rights

Evaluation Methodology

The report presents transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve evaluation purposes.

1 The report describes the data collection methods and analysis, the rationale for selecting them, and their limitations. Reference indicators and benchmarks are included where relevant.

2 The report describes the data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations. The report includes discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure data accuracy, and overcome data limits.

3 The report describes the sampling frame – area and population to be represented, rationale for selection, mechanics of selection, numbers selected out of potential subjects, and limitations of the sample

4 The evaluation report gives a complete description of stakeholder's consultation process in the evaluation including the rationale for selecting the particular level and activities of consultation

5 The methods employed are appropriate for the evaluation and to answer its questions.

6 The methods employed are appropriate for analysing gender and human rights issues including child rights issues identified in the evaluation scope.

7 The report presents evidence that adequate measures were taken to ensure data quality, including evidence supporting the reliability and validity of data collection tools (e.g., interview protocols, observation tools etc.)

8 The evaluation design was ethical and included ethical safeguards where appropriate, including protection of confidentiality, dignity, rights, and welfare of human subjects particularly children, and respect of the values of the beneficiary community.

5. Findings

4.0 Findings respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report are based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report

- 1 Reported findings reflect systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data
- 2 Reported findings address the evaluation criteria (such as efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact, and relevance) and questions defined in the evaluation scope
- 3 Findings are objectively reported on the evidence
- 4 Gaps and limitations in the data and/or unanticipated findings are reported and discussed
- 5 Reasons for accomplishments and failures, especially continuing constraints, were identified as much as possible
- 6 Overall findings are presented with clarity, logic, and coherence

6. Conclusions and Lessons Learned

Conclusions present reasonable judgements based on findings and substantiated by evidence and provide insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation

- 1 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgements relating to key evaluation questions
- 2 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings
- 3 Stated conclusions provide insights into the identification and/or solutions of important problems issues pertinent to the prospective decisions and actions of evaluation users
- 4 Conclusions present strengths and weaknesses of the object (policy, programmes, projects, or other intervention) being evaluated, based on the evidence presented in taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders
- 5 Lessons learned, when presented, were generalized beyond the immediate intervention being evaluated to indicate what wider relevance there might be.

7. Recommendations

Recommendations are relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation, are supported by evidence and conclusions, and were developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders

- 1 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendation including consultation with stakeholders
- 2 Recommendations are firmly based on evidence and conclusions
- 3 Recommendations are relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation