

Terms of Reference

Institutional Contract for Mid-Term Evaluation of the UNICEF supported “Accelerating Sanitation and Water for All” (ASWA) Programme in the Iringa, Mbeya, Njombe and Songwe Regions of Tanzania – (2019 to 2022)

Project Title	Institutional Contract for Mid-Term Evaluation of the UNICEF supported “Accelerating Sanitation and Water for All” (ASWA) Programme in the Iringa, Mbeya, Njombe and Songwe regions of Tanzania during 2019 to 2022
Purpose	The mid-term evaluation of the UNICEF supported ASWA programme has a learning purpose. The evaluation will provide a feedback loop into the first years of the programme and inform strategic directions during the remaining years of the programme, including scale-up plans. The secondary purpose of this evaluation is to strengthen UNICEF’s accountability to targeted populations, partners, and donors supporting the programme. Output - Final report of Mid-Term Evaluation of the UNICEF supported ASWA programme
Deliverables	See section 7.0 below. Inception phase (I) - Inception Report and Summary, Data Collection phase (II) - preliminary findings and preliminary briefing report, Draft Report phase (III) - Comprehensive Draft Report, Final Report Phase (IV)- Final Report, Policy Brief, Final Report Presentations
Expected fee	US\$ 80,000 (to be determined through competitive bidding)
Location	Evaluation will cover the regions of Iringa, Mbeya, Njombe and Songwe on Tanzania Mainland.
Duration	60 working days over a period of 3 months from 17 Oct 2022 – 11 Jan 2023
Start Date	17 October 2022
Reporting to	Research and Evaluation Manager (Social Policy), in close consultation with the Chief of WASH, UNICEF Tanzania
Budget Code/PBA No	SC190010 – 4550/A0/06/004/002/007
Project and activity code	WASH AWP 2022

Background and Rationale:

1.1. Project/Programme Background

In the United Republic of Tanzania, 6 in 10 households have access to an improved source of drinking water, while the remaining 40 per cent of Tanzanians still rely on unimproved water sources (MoHCDGEC et al., 2017) such as ponds, shallow wells and rivers. In Tanzania Mainland, only 50% of rural households have access to an improved source of water.

Only 29% of households in URT use improved sanitation, while more than 80 per cent of rural Tanzanians and 64.5 per cent of urban residents use rudimentary and unimproved sanitation facilities (ibid.). One in 10 households nationally has no toilet at all (MoHCDGEC et al., 2016). In Tanzania Mainland, 35% of urban households and 15% of rural households have access to improved sanitation.

According to the Tanzania National Nutrition Survey 2018, the percentage of households who reported having used soap for handwashing at least at two critical times, including after defecating, had declined significantly from 11.7 per cent in 2014 to 2.7 per cent in 2018 at national level and stood at 2.8 per cent in Mainland Tanzania. Notwithstanding the fact that 69.4 per cent of households nationally said that they had soap, handwashing practices were still very weak (MoHCDGEC et al., 2018).

UNICEF Tanzania is supporting the government of the United Republic of Tanzania in Mbeya, Iringa, Njombe, and Songwe (MINS) to implement the National Sanitation Campaign that aims to increase access to improved sanitation and hygiene and reach an Open Defecation Free (ODF) Tanzania that will guarantee access to “at least basic” sanitation and universal hygiene by year 2025. UNICEF Tanzania is contributing to the campaign by implementing the programme “Accelerating Sanitation and Water for all” (ASWA) covering the MINS regions of mainland Tanzania since 2019. The program is designed to contribute to child survival and development through improved access to basic water, sanitation and hygiene services, and is funded, in part, by the Dutch Directorate General for International Development (DGIS), and in part through UNICEF direct support. So far, access to improved sanitation facilities and hand washing facilities respectively in the target regions stand at – Iringa (89/76), Mbeya (71/32), Njombe (84/83) and Songwe (79,34). The project is implemented in Iringa DC, Kilolo DC, Mufindi DC, Mafinga TC and Iringa MC in Iringa region; Mbeya DC, Chunya DC and Mbarali DC in Mbeya Region; Njombe DC, and Makete DC in Njombe Region and in Mbozi DC, Ileje DC, Momba DC, Tunduma TC and Songwe DC in Songwe.

The programme goal emphasizes sustainability and linkages with child survival and development works in institutions (schools and healthcare facilities) and in communities. It also states the specific contributions this programme will make to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) targets 6.1 for achieving universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all by 2030, and SDG 6.2 for achieving access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all, and end open defecation paying special attention to the needs of women and girls and those in vulnerable situations by 2030. This will be achieved through community engagement, switching ownership to government, ensuring sustainability employing innovative, gender inclusive and equity focused approaches.

The aim and scope of programme, therefore, is to increase access to improved water, sanitation and hygiene services; end open defecation; reduce childhood and maternal disease and mortality and contribute to the reduction of stunting in the MINS regions of Tanzania. The programme is anchored upon and leverages the National Sanitation Campaign of the United Republic of Tanzania and provides actionable options to family aspirations to acquire an improved toilet, triggered through the sanitation campaign.

So far, the project has *inter alia*, contributed to the development of the national strategy for accelerating sanitation and hygiene for all 2020 – 2025, development of regional/district sustainability compacts, and review of policies to increase access to basic water supply, sanitation and hygiene nationally. In addition, it promotes access in target communities, schools, healthcare facilities. The programme monitoring system is results-based, assessing progress against set indicators, and processes using data generated from partner reports, the national sanitation management information system, (NSMIS), the annual review of UNICEF supported WASH programmes, and data from the Demographic and Health Survey, and the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP). Result indicators are identified for each result in the log frame to provide a framework for monitoring. The programme logframe for the US\$8.8 million programme funded by DGIS is attached in annex below. A theory of change for this programme shall be reconstructed by the Evaluation team once they are on board.

2. Purpose of the mid-term evaluation

The selected institution (also referred to as Evaluation team throughout the document) will conduct a mid-term evaluation of the ASWA programme in four regions of Tanzania mainland. The mid-term evaluation was initially planned to be conducted in the last quarter of year 2021 but it was delayed due to Covid-19-related challenges.

The results of the mid-term evaluation will serve various audiences. The primary audience and users of the evaluation are, first and foremost, the project proponents which include DGIS, UNICEF, and the GoT and implementing partners. The evaluation will be used to promote accountability within respective institutions, further increase learning and education in WASH programmes, and to advocate for the scaling of WASH programs with concerned government ministries and agencies. Findings, lessons learnt, and recommendations from the evaluation are intended to guide and inform all stakeholders on what has worked well, highlight shortcomings, and what can be done to improve the design and implementation of the remaining part of the ASWA programme and other future WASH programmes.

Various branches of the government at national and sub-national will be among the primary users of the mid-term evaluation results mostly to utilise the information to make better, more-informed decisions around their own planning, policies and guidelines, implementation and service delivery, and advocacy for WASH-related issues. The report of the mid-term evaluation will also be relevant to development partners, WASH donors, and WASH stakeholders not directly involved or concerned with the ASWA programme.

2.1 Objectives of the mid-term evaluation

This is a formative mid-term evaluation that will assess the ASWA programme including the DGIS funded WASH component in MINS regions of Tanzania mainland. It will be based on the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development-Development Assistance Committee (**OECD-DAC**) criteria - relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, coherence and impact. The assessment will closely look at the extent to which the WASH program outputs have so far been achieved and will examine its delivery to strengthen or improve the overall UNICEF WASH programme in Tanzania. The evaluation findings will help inform and improve outstanding components of the programme and other future WASH projects.

The evaluation will, therefore, provide an opportunity to identify the key milestones necessary for replication and replicability based on the associated lessons learned for each milestone. It will seek to explore good practices that may be used to improve programme approaches and outstanding programme interventions going forward. Special consideration will be made to include equity-focused questions and to involve representatives of the most marginalized groups in the target regions in course of data collection processes.

More specifically, the objectives of the evaluation are as follows:

1. Analyse the extent to which the programme has so far achieved its planned results as identified in the proposal, programme strategy note, log frame or budget; effectiveness of the mechanisms put in place to ensure community involvement (including women) including differential results across groups.
2. Assess the relevance of programme interventions to the government's National Sanitation Campaign and actual needs of the target population and the extent to which the programme is relevant or aligned with government policy, technical standards, and guidelines and how they have, so far, contributed to nutrition outcomes (stunting or malnutrition).
3. Assess the extent to which the programme is sustainable, and equity focused; has targeted the poor, marginalised population including the last mile, gender, and child sensitivity, hard to reach communities, and is climate resilient. This could also include considerations of children with disabilities and accessible WASH.

4. Assess the extent to which the programme results are impacting the most marginalised communities, and whether the current strategies are appropriate for addressing key issues affecting these communities, and to what extent it has met programme objectives and achieved value for money.
5. Identify best practices and key lessons learned from the programme and assess the extent to which the programme has contributed to broader development results at sub-national level, and whether lessons so far learnt can allow the replication and/or scaling up of WASH interventions in target regions.
6. Provide recommendations for improving program implementation approaches and what is required for replication and/or scaling up of WASH interventions.
7. Draw operational recommendations for further improvement and enhancement of relevant WASH sector policies, plans, strategies through analyses of the factors are contributing to the success or failure of the programme.
8. Assess the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on the WASH programme implementation and timeliness and effectiveness of the WASH Infection Prevention and Control (IPC) component of the COVID-19 response.

The evaluation team will assess relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, equity, timeliness, coherence, and adequacy of the WASH programme. The report of the evaluation will provide recommendations that will guide UNICEF, the government, implementing partners and beneficiary communities to improve future WASH programme designs and implementation strategies. Recommendations generated from the evaluation will be reviewed and discussed by UNICEF Tanzania mid-term evaluation group. At the end of the evaluation exercise, a management response plan will be developed to respond to the recommendations, and at the same time, be used for monitoring of what needs to be done for uncompleted programme activities and any remedial follow-up actions.

3. Scope of the mid-term Evaluation

The mid-term evaluation will cover community WASH interventions including the DGIS supported ASWA II programme in rural districts in Iringa, as well as to UNICEF supported programme as part of the national sanitation campaign in Mbeya, Njombe and Songwe regions for the period January 01, 2019 to July 31, 2022. This will also include municipal locations in those target regions. The evaluation will cover target villages/communities in target districts, schools, health care facilities, and UNICEF contribution to WASH IPC intervention in the MINS region with consideration to climate resilience, adaptation, and environmental safeguards. A statistically significant sample size will be selected within a reasonable confidence limit. The Evaluation team is expected to propose a sampling approach for the quantitative as well as qualitative aspects of the mid-term evaluation that will be agreed with UNICEF.

Geographically the evaluation will cover villages, schools and healthcare facilities in selected districts across all four targeted regions using methodologies agreed with UNICEF. The evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner, involving key stakeholders (e.g., government ministries, civil society organizations, private sector and direct and indirect project beneficiary groups) in the design and implementation of the evaluation, and more broadly in all phases of the process. The evaluation may, depending on desired methodology and its feasibility, also consider targeted intervention sites versus villages not yet covered under the ASWA programme for comparative purposes

In all stages of the evaluation process, the universally recognised values and principles of human rights, gender equality and equity will be integrated ensuring that these lenses are applied across the analyses even in areas where programme design may not have specifically aimed at greater gender equality, human rights, or equity in all its areas of intervention.

4.1 Evaluation criteria and questions:

The mid-term evaluation will follow the five evaluation areas recommended by the OECD-DAC above. It is recommended that the Evaluation team elaborates a draft evaluation tools during the submission of their proposals, which will be used for the selection process by UNICEF. The list of evaluation questions will be discussed and finalised with UNICEF Tanzania during the inception phase. The final list of questions must be realistic given the budget and timeframe proposed for the evaluation process. The results or impact so far achieved will be assessed mainly by using both qualitative and quantitative methodologies by considering progress through reports, observations and the perception of beneficiaries and stakeholders in communities and institutions (schools and health care facilities). Some indicative evaluation questions are attached in Annex 1.

4.0 Methodology:

The Evaluation team will suggest the best evaluation methodology that will deliver a credible evaluation result. However, a mixed-method approach is suggested and may involve the systematic use of qualitative (e.g structured interviews and focus groups), and quantitative (e.g., recent survey results including household surveys previously done that may serve as baseline, existing routine data) methods. The overall methodology will be determined by the Evaluation team but must be participatory in nature and scope. This also includes engaging with and involving all sections of the communities including vulnerable and last mile groups, women, children, and the private sector including micro finance institutions where required. The evaluation will also include review of other related programmes implemented by other WASH sector partners and draw out lessons for strengthening sanitation programmes.

A general proposition for developing the technical proposal for the applicant is provided below. Three phases are suggested for this evaluation exercise as outlined below.

i) Phase 1: Desk review and refinement of methodology

This phase will include conducting a desk review and to develop the inception report to further refine and unfold key elements of the TOR such as: objectives, expected results, timeframe and related field work, evaluation questions and methodology, and work plan for the assignment.

The list of references and documentations will be shared with the selected Evaluation team. These include:

- a) The DGIS ASWA II proposal and budget
- b) WASH mid-term review briefing paper.
- c) DGIS Tanzania country annual reports.
- d) Project cooperation agreements (PCAs) with all implementing partners
- e) Programme document reports by WASH implementing partners.
- f) Other relevant documents that **may** be available upon request.

In relation to this programme, the baseline results of any Knowledge, Attitude and Practice (KAP) studies or baseline studies may be considered. These data need to be reviewed and utilized for the mid-term evaluation together with other existing sources (Demographic and Health Survey, Joint Monitoring Reports, Programme progress reports, etc.) as appropriate by considering the disparities based on geography, gender, disability and other key variables based on the availability of disaggregated data. To ensure a participatory approach and to refine the methodology based on the Tanzania context, the

Evaluation team will have the opportunity to finalise the methodology during the in-country visit and meeting with key stakeholders. (See part 6 below). More background information may be accessed from the National Bureau of Statistics or the environmental Health Unit of the Ministry of Health.

ii) Phase 2: Data collection, field work (site visit/interviews)

This phase will cover data collection, field visits, interviews, and meetings. The Evaluation team may need to hire data collection assistants (where required, translators) to complete this task and must include associated costs in the proposal and budget for this assignment.

The systematic use of qualitative (e.g., Key informant interviews, structured interviews and focus groups) and quantitative (e.g., recent survey results, existing routine data) methods are required to collect the additional evidence. The Evaluation team will determine, prior to data collection, the sampling frame from communities and institutions as may be agreed between the evaluation team and UNICEF, including the area and the population that will be represented, rationale for their selection along with the limitations of the sampling. UNICEF will facilitate and, where required, accompany or designate a government personnel to accompany the Evaluation team to meetings with key stakeholders. This may also be the case for field visits in the targeted districts/regions, as may be requested by the Evaluation team to facilitate communication in local language during data collection and focus group discussions. The respondents and tools need to be strategically selected based on the evaluation questions.

iii) Phase 3: Data Analysis and Reporting

This phase will cover data analysis and draft report preparation in line with DGIS Report Standards. It will also involve delivering a half-day validation workshop on draft findings conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned, and finalisation of the mid-term evaluation report.

The final stage of analysis and reporting may be conducted remotely. The results of the analysis need to systematically respond to the mid-term evaluation questions under each evaluation criteria. Critical considerations should be made to application of gender, human rights, and equity lenses in implementation. Consequently, this should help in achieving the purpose of the mid-term evaluation. The report is to be written in a reader-friendly manner. Before finalising, UNICEF will organise a one-day workshop that will bring together project team, stakeholders, beneficiaries and the evaluation team, to discuss recommendations and action plan drawn from the evaluation. This one-day workshop would help ensure recommendations are appropriate and owned by the project team and stakeholders. It is mandatory that the Evaluation team participates in the meeting which could be done preferably, physically.

The Evaluation team is required to adhere to the UN Norms and Standards for Evaluation, as well as to the UNICEF's revised Evaluation Policy, UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation and Data Collection and Analysis and UNICEF's Evaluation Reporting Standards. The team is also expected to identify all relevant ethical issues from the proposed methodology and seek an ethical clearance as per UNICEF PROCEDURE ON ETHICAL STANDARDS IN RESEARCH, EVALUATION, DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS (2021). The UNICEF social policy and programme monitoring and field coordinating sections will provide support with acquiring the relevant ethical clearances. Please see link to the UNICEF Evaluation Resource Centre. <https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/resources>.

The ethics section of the proposal, inception report and final report should address:

1. consideration of potential harms and if the benefits outweigh the risks

2. measures taken to ensure 'do no harm'
3. methodology to minimize stress for participants
4. how informed consent will be/have been acquired
5. any compensation paid for participation
6. measures to ensure privacy and confidentiality.

5. Limitation of the mid-term Evaluation:

Gender and Human Rights aspects of the programme need to be considered during the mid-term evaluation to draw relevant recommendations. While the programme relatively addresses practical aspects of gender issues by improving access to water, sanitation and hygiene which to a large extent engage women in planning and implementation, it may not be necessarily sufficient to be considered as having a gender sensitive approach.

Problems with access to valid and reliable WASH data in Tanzania is already well documented. This includes quantitative and qualitative data around the WASH sector as a whole. Although the information to be gathered in this mid-term evaluation would be specific to the UNICEF supported programme in the MINS region, it cannot be guaranteed that all information required in the analysis and to answer the evaluation questions will be readily available. The government is preparing to carry out a Tanzania Demographic and Health Survey (TDHS) and to be followed by a National Population and Housing Census separately in last half of the year 2022. Reports of the TDHS and census once completed, can also contribute to WASH information to inform planning and implementation.

Logistical issues that may arise later such as poor access to sites due to bad roads and unavailability of critical stakeholders and informants for interviews, may have consequences on the consultation thus affecting the strength of the evaluation findings. UNICEF Tanzania WASH section will facilitate the arrangement of meetings and workshops with partners as required and will provide logistics and technical support as necessary. UNICEF may support the Evaluation team with transportation to assist with accessibility to sites. It is however recommended that this aspect is included in bidding documents. The Evaluation team is also expected to recruit local staff to support community engagements and interviews. UNICEF will provide support with initial engagement of community groups and other stakeholders for the evaluation process including data collection.

6. Work Schedule

The assignment will run 60 working days over a period of 3 months, from 17 Oct 2022 – 11 Jan 2023. The Evaluation team will provide a detailed timetable in its technical proposal, specifying the distribution of tasks and duration to complete each task. The proposed sequencing in the table below is an indicative proposal which could be improved in the technical offer. The column on the right indicates suggested duration for each activity.

Activity	Duration and location
Phase 1: Literature Review & Preparation (Total number of days: 14)	
1. Literature review and consultations	8 days offsite and
2. Draft Inception report with proposed revised version of TOR, and revised evaluation questions, mid-term evaluation methodology, information/data collection method for each midterm evaluation	6 days in Tanzania

question, sampling for interviews and field visits, and development of data collection, and data analysis plan.	
3. Review and feedback on inception report and mid-term evaluation questions by UNICEF Tanzania mid-term evaluation reference group.	
4. Finalization of inception report and mid-term evaluation questions N.B. Any ethical clearance needed should be carried out before data collection starts.	
Phase 2: Consultations, Data collection, Analysis and Reporting (Total number of days: 46)	
5. Data collection and field work in select villages from all four programme implementing regions; Submission of field reports.	28 days in Tanzania (in six targeted districts/regions) and
6. Processing, cleaning, validation, triangulation and analysis of the collected data	18 days offsite
7. Preparation, presentation and review of interim report for UNICEF Tanzania mid-term evaluation reference group (WASH, PMFC, Social policy Units) feedback	
8. Incorporate feedback and conduct validation exercise with key stakeholders	
9. Presentation of draft final midterm evaluation findings and recommendations to key stakeholders	
10. Finalization and submission of midterm evaluation report with a short summary for publication in a newsletter or website.	
Total duration = 60 days	

7.0 Deliverables/End Products with Payment Schedule:

The following are the Evaluation team's deliverables with timelines and payment terms

Deliverable	Due date	Payment
Inception report with final mid-term evaluation questions and final version after comments from UNICEF mid-term evaluation group.	3 weeks from contract commencement date.	20% upon receipt and acknowledgement by UNICEF Tanzania that the deliverable meets required standards and is of high quality.
Field reports	Within 2 days from completion of field data collection.	30% upon receipt and acknowledgement by UNICEF Tanzania that the deliverable meets required standards and meets required quality
Interim/draft report submission for UNICEF Tanzania midterm evaluation group feedback	Within 1 week from UNICEF approval of field report.	
Final midterm evaluation report and PowerPoint presentation with data base of collected data.	4 weeks from submission of interim/draft report to UNICEF Tanzania mid-term evaluation group.	50% upon receipt and acknowledgement by UNICEF Tanzania that the deliverable meets required standards and is of high quality

The mid-term evaluation report should not exceed more than 60 pages (without annexes) and will include (not limited to) the following:

- Executive Summary
- Brief description of the program, its context, financial arrangements, areas of intervention, timing, implementation modalities and actors

- Objectives, methodology, timing of mid-term evaluation, challenges and/or limitations of the analysis
- Results in terms of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability
- Analysis, including reflection on gender, human rights and BabyWASH
- Lessons learned, challenges, conclusions, recommendations, action plan and way forward for the remaining programme interventions.

Note: The page limit does not include annexes including that may also include list of the data with maximum disaggregation

Once completed, UNICEF will organise for dissemination of the final midterm evaluation report to all stakeholders. This will follow presentation of the final results by the evaluation team to selected group of stakeholders.

Note: The final report needs to meet UNICEF standards on the quality of evaluation as described in the [UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation](#). More information on the quality criteria (utility, feasibility, accuracy and appropriateness) and good examples of WASH evaluation reports from other countries could be availed from UNICEF. The report and all collected and produced data by the evaluation team remain the exclusive property of UNICEF.

The evaluation is required to adhere to the UN norms for evaluation as well as to the UNICEF revised evaluation policy, UNICEF procedures for ethical standards in research, evaluation and data collection and analysis, and UNICEF evaluation reporting standards. The report structure, format and quality should adhere to the UNICEF evaluation report standards and the Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System (GEROS) evaluation quality assessment system.

8.0 Management and quality assurance of the evaluation

The evaluation will be managed by the Research and Evaluation Manager at UNICEF Tanzania, Social Policy, Research and Evaluation Section, in close collaboration with the Chief of WASH. The Research and Evaluation Manager will also chair the Evaluation Reference Group that will guide the evaluation process and ensure adequate participation of key stakeholders, including WASH colleagues at UNICEF Tanzania, Government and other key partners. This evaluation reference group will be formed for this particular evaluation, and should at least include the Research and Evaluation Manager, the Chief of WASH, as well as a representative of PMFC and Social Policy. For quality assurance of this evaluation, the draft inception and final mid-term evaluation reports will be shared with ESARO Evaluation and WASH Sections, to obtain their technical input and clearance before finalisation of the TORs, inception and draft final midterm evaluation report for quality assurance. All evaluative products need to be Quality Assured by ESARO Evaluation Section, as per QA Regional Guidelines. Receiving at least a satisfactory review from ESARO Evaluation Section is a precondition for moving from one evaluation phase to the other.

The main roles of the UNICEF Tanzania mid-term evaluation reference group are:

- To contribute to the design and execution of the mid-term evaluation
- To share available information
- To clear the ToR and validate the mid-term evaluation questions
- To monitor and facilitate implementation of the mid-term evaluation
- To provide comments on draft reports
- To assist with feedback on findings and making recommendations
- To disseminate the results of the mid-term evaluation to all stakeholders in WASH and possibly to certain beneficiaries or their representatives.

- To develop the management response plan and regularly monitor follow-up actions

The Evaluation team will be responsible for refining the mid-term evaluation questions, in consultation with the Evaluation Reference Group. The methodology, data collection and analysis as well as the formulation of findings and conclusions containing judgments in response to the mid-term evaluation questions. The evaluation should also include key lessons and proffer realistically doable recommendations for a potential action.

The Evaluation team should adhere to [Revised Evaluation Policy of UNICEF](#); [UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](#) ; to [UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation](#) and to [UNICEF Reporting Standards](#).

9.0 Work plan for Evaluation team and official travel involved (if international)

The Institution / Evaluation team is required to make own return travel arrangements from place of recruitment to Duty Station (if Evaluation team is international) - **on the most direct route on economy class**. Travel costs that will be agreed with unicef before hand and will be reimbursed to the Evaluation team upon submission of invoice and travel documents. All related (internal/external) official travel related to this consultancy will be organized by the Evaluation team and costs reimbursed accordingly or included in bidding document.

Prospective bidders are required to prepare and submit a detailed methodology at the time of submission of the technical proposal which will be used as a basis for proposal assessment by UNICEF. Afterwards, the contracted Evaluation team will be requested to develop a more holistic evaluation plan which must contain a work plan.

10.0 Workplace of Evaluation team and Work Arrangements

- 60 working days (60 person-days) over the period of 17 Oct 2022 – 11 Jan 2023.
- Given COVID-19 restrictions, the Evaluation team may employ to work from virtual offices. The Evaluation team will use his/her own laptop for the assignment.
- UNICEF Tanzania WASH section will facilitate the arrangement of meetings and workshops with partners as required and will provide logistics and technical support as necessary.
- The Evaluation team is expected to undertake field trips to target programme locations in the target districts/regions.

The Evaluation team will also cover the following to facilitate field visits:

- Secure transportation for field mobilization and consultations.
- Provide standard living allowance (to be included in consultancy bidding documents)

A national UNICEF WASH staff **may** travel with the Evaluation team during field visits to provide translation services if required.

Technical Criteria	Technical Sub-criteria	Maximum Points
Overall Response	Completeness of response	5
	Overall concord between RFP requirements and proposal	5
Maximum Points for overall response		10
	Reputation of the Institution and personnel (Competence / Reliability)	5

Technical Criteria	Technical Sub-criteria	Maximum Points
Institution and Key Personnel	General organizational capability which is likely to affect implementation	5
	Range and depth of experience with similar projects:	5
	Key personnel: - Proposed team structure Relevant experience and qualifications of team-leader/team-member(s)	5
Maximum Points for Institution and Key Personnel		20
Proposed Methodology and Approach	Monitoring and quality assurance process	10
	Innovation approach	10
Maximum Points for Proposed Methodology and Approach		20
Proposed Technical Presentation	Relevance and rigor of the technical approach/ methodology, including consideration of the context	20
Maximum Points for Proposed Methodology and Approach		20
Overall marks for proposal		70
Financial proposal		30
Total		100

11.0 Qualifications or specialized knowledge/experience required

Institutions with strong background in evaluation of development programs and WASH interventions more specifically 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.

Minimum Qualifications

Experience

The team lead should

- have at least 10 years of training and experience in the field related to water, sanitation and hygiene with academic qualifications (at least a master's degree) in Public Health, civil engineering, mechanical engineering, sanitary engineering, social sciences or combination of qualifications.
- Should have skills in anthropology, statistics, conducting external evaluation using mixed methods evaluation skills, with experience in planning, implementation, management or monitoring and evaluation of integrated water, sanitation and hygiene programmes in developing countries.
- Excellent evaluation and report writing skills
- Specifically have experience executing similar evaluation assignments with credible organisations.
- Extensive experience in programme evaluation and mastery of data collection techniques and methods, qualitative and quantitative analysis including proven track records of evaluation of UNICEF supported WASH programmes.
- Experience working in East Africa, preferably in Tanzania, will be an added advantage.
- Expertise in gender equality and human rights including child rights.

Team members of the evaluation team

- should be gender balanced, and where possible, with diverse group of persons.
- should be familiar with cross-cutting issues (e.g., gender equality, equity and human rights, including child rights) and how they relate to WASH results and equity agenda.
- Strong analytical skills including ability to conduct quantitative data analysis to demonstrate attribution/ impact/results (as applicable) and background on WASH sector information and data.
- Team members should have at least five years' experience and an advanced university degree in the Social sciences.
- The institution should have proven experience with similar programme evaluations in the WASH sector in developing countries, preferably for the fields of WASH in communities and schools, hygiene behavior changes approaches including CLTS (Community-Led Total Sanitation), and community interventions and should be able to share link to some recent evaluations/studies.
- Proven experience for DGIS funded project/programme evaluations is an asset.

Languages

- Excellent communication and report writing skills in English. Ability to communicate in Kiswahili will be an added advantage for the team leader and an essential requirement for field workers.

Competencies

- Ability to work independently.
- Commitments to deliver the final products in line with the set TOR within the agreed timeframe.

Prepared by:		08 September 2022
James Conrad Massaquoi, WASH Specialist	Signature:	Date:
Reviewed by:		08 September 2022
Luisa Natali, Research and Evaluation Manager	Signature:	Date:
Reviewed by:		08 September 2022
Francis Odhiambo, Chief of WASH	Signature:	Date:
Approved by:		08 Sept 2022
Ousmane Niang, Dep Representative	Signature:	Date:

Annex 1:

Child Safeguarding
Is this project/assignment considered as “[Elevated Risk Role](#)” from a child safeguarding perspective?

YES NO If YES, check all that apply:

Direct contact role YES NO
If yes, please indicate the number of hours/months of direct interpersonal contact with children, or work in their immediately physical proximity, with limited supervision by a more senior member of personnel:

Child data role YES NO
If yes, please indicate the number of hours/months of manipulating or transmitting personal-identifiable information of children (name, national ID, location data, photos):

More information is available in the [Child Safeguarding SharePoint](#) and [Child Safeguarding FAQs and Updates](#)

Annex 2:

Evaluation criteria for the ASWA programme 2022.

Evaluation Criteria	Example of questions
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the intervention responding to the needs of the various target groups, specifically children? How? - To what extent has this WASH programme’s outputs suited the priorities and policies of the national and subnational Government ministries? - Is the WASH programme supporting the vision of the government and is it in line with existing policy? - Is the programme contributing to national policy development and reviews? - To what extent has the programme outputs suited the needs of disadvantaged children, and particular geographical areas and/or conditions? - Is the logical framework coherent enough to achieve the results? Logframe and other relevant documents will be made available to selected evaluation team. - To what extent are the objectives of the WASH programme still valid? - Are the activities and outputs of the WASH programme in targeted districts/regions consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives? - Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects?
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are the resources being utilized and managed in an efficient manner? - Is the WASH programme efficient in terms of working with the government programmes and systems? - Are the programme objectives being achieved on time and within set timeframe? - If there have been any modifications to implementation plans, specify these and indicate if these modifications are efficient. - To what extent has the programme created financial and operational efficiencies, based on measurable outcomes? - Is it possible to achieve the same results at a lower cost? What measures have been taken to achieve results at reduced costs (cost-efficiency analysis)?
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is the level of quality and compliance of activities to the norms and standards previously established by the program, for the institutional strengthening, market-

	<p>based sanitation, innovation, private sector engagement, hardware and software components, social behavior change communication, etc?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To what extent are the objectives being achieved / are likely to be achieved? - What are the major factors influencing the achievement or nonachievement of the objectives?
Coherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How well does the intervention fit? - To what extent is this intervention coherent with other interventions in the study areas which have similar objectives? How well is the programme coordinating with other, similar interventions (if any) for synergy and to avoid overlaps? - To what extent is the intervention coherent internally? - To what extent is the intervention coherent with wider WASH policy? - Are the outputs being delivered as planned and in a coherent manner? - Is the programme meeting required objectives as per programme indicators
- Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is the likelihood that the operation and maintenance and repair of the installed facilities will continue to be financed at the local and sub-national level for sustainability of the services (access to clean water etc.) after the end of the project? - To what degree has the programme considered any existing structures or resources to enhance the sustainability after the end of the intervention? - What can the programme do differently to improve sustainability? - What is the likelihood that the benefits of the WASH programme (both service-related interventions as well as policy formulation support) will continue after funding ceases? - What are the major factors which influence the achievement or nonachievement of sustainability of the WASH programme? <p>The evaluation team will also consider impacts on climate and environmental sustainability.</p>
Impact/results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the main results/impacts so far (positive/negative, expected/unexpected) as perceived by the different actors and beneficiaries of the programme? - What has happened because of improving WASH in the targeted districts/regions? - What real difference is this intervention/programme making to the beneficiaries?
Other areas of project specific concern	
Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the programme aligned with UNICEF's equity agenda in addressing the needs of the target groups (i.e. to what extent is the programme reaching different groups including the most marginalized)? - Is the programme contributing to equitable participation and benefits to various groups (men, women, children and differently abled people)?
Risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How is risk mainstreamed in the design and delivery of the programme? - Is there an updated analysis of risks and a Risk Management Matrix prepared?
Scale-Up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does this WASH programme in Tanzania support the possibility of programme scale up? - What lessons can be learned for the scaling up of UNICEF supported interventions and for the sustainable development of WASH programmes in the country. - How can these lessons inform improvement in design, implementation and delivery of the outstanding programme activities and other UNICEF programmes in Tanzania?



DGIS

2018-2022_Logframe

DGIS Logframe (Note). This covered only DGIS funded programme component.