

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR INSTITUTIONAL CONTRACTORS

Summary	
Type of contract:	Institutional Contract
Title of assignment:	Summative Evaluation of the EU Global Promotion of Best Practices for Children in Migration (2020 - 2023) project
Purpose:	<p>The evaluation will provide an improved understanding of what works for strengthening child protection systems to protect children on the move. Particularly, how the intervention has strengthened the capacity of child protection systems through the provision of quality integrated services, mental health, psychosocial support as well as the promotion of alternative transitory care options and non-custodial measures to replace immigration detention.</p> <p>The evaluation will contribute to accountability of UNHCR and UNICEF for their current performance and results, as well as inform the design of future initiatives in the realm of protecting children on the move from violence, exploitation, abuse, and child detention.</p>
Objectives:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Examine the relevance of the program and appropriateness of country-specific interventions, as well as the gender-responsiveness of its approach. 2. Assess the coherence and sustainability of UNICEF-UNHCR' work and its synergies with the work of local, regional and international actors working toward protecting rights of children on the move. 3. Assess the effectiveness of UNICEF and UNHCR joint program in El Salvador, Mexico, South Africa, and Zambia in strengthening national capacity and mechanisms to protect children on the move, contributing to end their detention. 4. Assess the extent to which the program applied a cost-effective approach to building the capacity of child protection systems to provide integrated services, addressing the needs of children on the move. 5. Generate actionable recommendations to enable Country Offices (COs) and Regional Offices (ROs) to support scale-up of the intervention and inform future programming.
Location assignment:	Remote, with national consultants based in the countries of implementation: El Salvador, Mexico, South Africa, and Zambia.
Duration of contract:	12 months
Start date:	From: January 2023 To: December 2023
Reporting to:	UNICEF ESARO Evaluation Section
Estimated budget:	169,591.62 USD
Grant reference:	SC200755
Activity and WBS details:	WBS 240R/A0/11/801/007/016
Is consultancy assignment in the approved AWP:	Yes
If, yes, attach copy of the approved page.	To be attached

1. BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

The European Union (EU), in partnership with the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR), launched the EU Global Promotion of Best Practices for Children in Migration project to strengthen child protection systems and provide alternatives to immigration detention. This multi-country project has a total budget of USD 8.9 million, over a duration of 30 months (October 2020 – April 2023)¹. The program is implemented across four countries in two regions: El Salvador and Mexico in Latin America and the Caribbean Region (LACR); and South Africa and Zambia in Eastern and Southern Africa Region (ESAR). The program final beneficiaries are children on the move, including migrant, internally displaced, returnee, asylum seeking and refugee children; as well as children who move voluntarily or involuntarily, within or between countries, with or without their parents or other primary caregivers.

The umbrella term 'Children on the move' (CotM) refers to girls and boys moving for a variety of reasons, voluntarily or involuntarily, in a documented or undocumented manner, within or between countries, with or without their parents or other primary caregivers, and whose movement, while it may open up opportunities, might also place them at risk (or at an increased risk) of economic or sexual exploitation, abuse, neglect or violence².

The overall objective of the program is to contribute to the effective protection of children on the move and the realization of their rights through child protection systems that provide quality integrated services, alternative care, mental health, and psychosocial support.

The assumptions underlying the logic of intervention are that 1) a child on the move who benefits from appropriate services has less risk of ending up in detention and that 2) a system with alternative care measures for vulnerable children on the move helps to reduce the risk of detention.

The program's specific objectives were set as follows:

- Firstly, the program will ensure that the capacity of child protection systems to include gender responsive services and alternative care options to immigration detention is enhanced.
- Secondly, that the capacity of frontline actors to detect children on the move suffering from, or at risk of trauma and gender-based violence, and to refer them to appropriate alternative family and community-based care, mental health and psychosocial support is strengthened.
- And, thirdly, that lessons learned and best practices on programming with and for children on the move are documented and shared to contribute to strengthened south-south and global cooperation.

The program's logic of intervention fits within the broader UNICEF and UNHCR strategic directions for engagement and prioritisation of CotM. The project outcomes are:

- Sustained gender sensitive protection and alternative care to immigration detention for CotM will result from improved integrated systems, facilitation of the Best Interests Assessment (BIA) and Best Interests Determination (BID); and the inclusion of CotM in registration and case management systems, leading to increased access to basic services (Outcome 1).
- Building upon existing practices, the program will ensure that systems enable access to mental health and psychosocial support, and resilience building (Outcome 2), especially identifying and referring CotM who have suffered from or are at risk of gender-based violence and other trauma.
- The program will increase frontline officials and service providers capacities on case management, MHPSS, GBV, collection of data, etc; as well as access to appropriate family and community alternative care for CotM, adapted to the context and the individual needs of each unaccompanied child through referral pathways with the aim of eliminating the detention of children (Outcome 3).
- Piloting changes, and testing models (registry, case management, alternative care options, etc.) will help overcome existing resistance and provide the evidence required for potential scale-up at the national level. The Government initiatives/systems and pilots will be analysed, and best practices shared, contributing to the development of useful models, feeding into South-South and Triangular cooperation exchanges, the involvement of global partners working on and with CotM and links to regional and global knowledge development (Outcome 4).

This evaluation aims to both learn from the implementation of the project's targeted commitments towards children on the move and generate evidence by identifying key lessons and the impactful approaches, taking into account the specificities of national and regional contexts. The evaluation is expected to begin in January 2023 and take place over the course of the following eight months.

¹ No-cost extension of the project until July 2023 is underway.

² Definitions used are those agreed upon by the inter-agency Global Migration Group as stated in the 'Principles and Guidelines, supported by practical guidance, on the human rights protection of migrants in vulnerable situations within large and/or mixed movements'. [IAG CoM Background paper for CoM Side Event Meeting, Geneva copy.pdf \(savethechildren.net\)](https://www.savethechildren.net/publications/2020/06/16/ia-g-co-m-background-paper-for-co-m-side-event-meeting-geneva-copy.pdf)

² <https://www.unhcr.org/figures-at-a-glance.html> updated as of July 2020



These terms of reference present a brief description of the program context; an overview of trends and developments of the situation of children on the move in the participating countries and regions; the objectives, scope, and key questions for the evaluation; approach and methodology; plans for stakeholder involvement; roles and responsibilities; evaluation process including timeline and deliverables; and the desired qualifications of the evaluators.

UNICEF/UNHCR program activities

In El Salvador, UNICEF and UNHCR have supported the government in designing a strategic plan for the protection of displaced children led by the Presidential Office, and with the participation of government institutions, IOM, and CSOs. UNICEF established partnerships with five non-government organizations (NGOs) that will contribute to achieving the expected results. In June 2020, the Child Protection Area of Responsibility led by UNICEF was activated, to support the care and protection of displaced and returned migrants.

In Mexico, UNICEF and UNHCR teams focused on strengthening capacities of child protection, migration and asylum authorities and enhancing partnerships with CSOs to implement the new legal and policy frameworks related to migration and asylum. An important amendment to the Migration and the Refugee, Complementary Protection and Political Asylum Laws was published by the Mexican Government in November 2020 and came into force in January 2021. UNICEF and UNHCR, as well as other United Nations agencies, have been working on a joint plan to complement the government's efforts by improving shelter services and capacities of child protection authorities (CPAs). The provision of mental health and psychosocial support for children and families and quality alternative care services for unaccompanied children was also a major priority. To strengthen capacities at border areas and at federal level, UNICEF deployed, trained, and seconded multidisciplinary teams within the federal, state, and local child protection units to manage child protection cases. UNHCR also conducted training sessions for other government institutions and CSOs working with children on the move.

In South Africa, UNICEF entered into partnerships with six implementing partners, namely Action for Conflict Transformation (ACT), Future Families (FF), Childline South Africa, Refugee Social (RSS) Services, Scalabrini Center of Cape Town (SCCT) and the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC), as the independent National Human Rights Institution. In addition, a gender-sensitive Inter-Departmental Protocol on Multi-Disciplinary Management of Unaccompanied and Separated Migrant Children has been developed. Additional support was also provided by UNICEF to DSD to finalise the National Guidelines on Unaccompanied and Separated Migrant Children in South Africa and Unaccompanied South African Children in Distress in Other Countries. UNHCR and UNICEF partnered with the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC) to address barriers to lack of identity documents and ending detention including the monitoring of detention facilities to improve the care and protection of children and to bring coherence between laws and policies administered by different government departments. UNHCR remains engaged at high levels with the Department of Home Affairs (DHA) on the amendments in the Refugee Act, which could also put additional restrictions to the access asylum space in South Africa, directly impacting children on the move and their families.

In Zambia, UNICEF and UNHCR provided support to the Ministry of Community Development and Social Services (MCDSS) and the Ministry of Home Affairs and Internal Security (MoHAIS) to protect and safeguard the rights of children on the move. At the strategic level, the enactment of the Children's Code Act was supported so that migrant children are explicitly recognised as "children in need of care and protection" rather than children in conflict with the law. In addition, support was provided to support implementation of case management national referral mechanisms at the district level, the development of the Migration Policy and the National Refugee Policy. The Anti Human Trafficking and Smuggling Policy and the National Action Plan (NAP) on Human Trafficking 2022-2024 were reviewed and updated. South Africa and Zambia regularly convene virtual meetings to share country experiences and lessons learned (south-south learning).

2. CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF THE SITUATION OF CHILDREN ON THE MOVE

Children on the move face increased risks in the countries of origin, transit and destination. They are exposed to multiple vulnerabilities including immigration detention, kidnapping, separation from parents and care givers, violence, exploitation, and abuse. Many of these risks vary by age and gender, with boys and girls facing different levels and types of risks in terms of violence, trafficking, child labour and child marriage (United Nations, 2019). Moreover, children and adolescents with disabilities, adolescents and LGBTQI+ youth face discrimination that overlays and intersects with these risks. Children who move on their own often lack safe and regular options to reunite with family members. All these factors are deeply inter-related with emerging issues: COVID-19, climate change, and gender, which have played a critical role in influencing migratory movements in recent years.

The COVID-19 pandemic presented two inherent challenges: the public health emergency, and the socio-economic crisis caused by strict containment measures. In March 2020, Latin American and Caribbean countries adopted measures to curb the COVID-19 pandemic, such as the closure of borders and the restriction of movement within countries. However, this did not stop child migration and children crossed through the 'troches'. Similarly, in the early days of COVID-19, several countries in the Eastern and Southern Africa region completely closed their borders and

restricted movement, resulting in a significant decline in migration. However, this has changed throughout 2021-2022 as migration flows peaked again.

COVID-19 socio-economic impact also influenced the structural drivers of migration. Migrants and displaced people living in overcrowded and remote areas face several challenges, including limited or no access to health care services and difficulty adhering to prevention measures. In some countries, the pandemic exacerbated xenophobia and discrimination against migrants and displaced people³. Lockdown measures have disproportionately impacted undocumented migrants and asylum seekers, exacerbating their already precarious socio-economic situation by limiting access to essential services⁴. While some countries include migrants and displaced people in COVID-19-related health measures such as vaccinations, others did not, leaving them further behind. Even though the health risks of the pandemic on children have been relatively low, children, particularly those who are displaced, or migrating are at heightened risks due to the socio-economic impacts of containment measures.

Climate change and environmental hazards have also impacted population movements both at national and international level. The November 2020 hurricanes Eta and Iota affected 4.6 million people, 1.8 million of them being children, primarily from El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua, but also from Belize and Costa Rica. The volcanic eruption in April 2021 in St Vicente and the Grenadines led to the displacement of 20,000 people. Latin America is the second most disaster-prone region in the world⁵. The impact of climate change in Eastern and Southern Africa region also remains significant. An example is Mozambique where Cyclone Eloise made landfall in January 2021, leaving hundreds of thousands of people in need of humanitarian assistance. These climate effects have an impact on already existing migration drivers, including those related to economic factors, with communities that rely on rain-fed agriculture being the most affected. However, the relationship between climate change and migration is not linear. Recent evidence shows that slow-onset climatic changes, particularly extremely high temperatures and drying conditions are more likely to increase migration than sudden-onset events. Slow-onset climate impacts may allow more time to mobilize resources needed to migrate, whereas sudden-onset events limit movements by rapidly depleting resources⁶.

Gender also plays a critical role in decisions related to migration. Long lasting gender inequalities as well as gender and social discriminatory norms and individual beliefs have made adolescent girls particularly vulnerable to harmful practices, violence and socio-economic disparities. A recent UNICEF report (2021) states that “gender plays a pivotal role from the time the decision to leave home is made and continues to shape experiences and vulnerabilities throughout the child’s journey and integration process at the destination”⁷. In their countries of origin, girls may face more disadvantages than boys, such as a lack of access to quality education, the risk of child marriage, and gender-based violence. These risks are greatly exacerbated when girls are on the move. Who are more likely to be deported, exploited (including forced labour, sexual exploitation, and domestic abuse), detained for longer periods of time, and have started their journey alone⁸. The UN Reform, the UN System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (SWAP)⁹, as well as specific UN Agencies Policies¹⁰ offer a framework for gender protection, that complements the effort of CoTM policies.

Country contexts

El Salvador has a long migratory tradition that dates to the 20th century, historically characterized by being multifaceted and multicausal, although economic reasons such as inequality and little access to employment opportunities stand out as the main push factors. The country has a long migratory tradition, whose main destinations are the United States of America, Canada, neighboring countries of Central America, and Italy, among others. The civil war of the 1980s had an approximate number of 75,000 victims and caused an exodus of families who were forced to migrate. In recent years, displacements have increased due to the generalized violence, under which the decision to migrate offers an option for survival to the post-armed conflict. This reality, in addition to recent impacts of climate change, has shifted the dynamics of human mobility with an increase proportion of migrant children, among forced displaced people.

Mexico is a country of origin, transit, destination and return for migrants. Foreign and Mexican children and adolescents, unaccompanied or separated, represent a very important percentage of migratory flows (30%), constitute the most

³ [World Report 2021: South Africa | Human Rights Watch \(hrw.org\)](https://www.hrw.org/report/2021/03/02/world-report-2021-south-africa)

⁴ <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/download/76793>

⁵ IOCHA. (2000) Natural Disasters in Latin America and the Caribbean 2000-2019. OCHA ROLAC, Panama.

https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/20191203-ocha-desastres_naturales.pdf

⁶ World Migration Report 2022 (<https://publications.iom.int/books/world-migration-report-2022>).

⁷ Uncertain Pathways: How gender shapes the experiences of children on the move (<https://data.unicef.org/resources/uncertain-pathways-how-gender-shapes-the-experiences-of-children-on-the-move/>)

⁸ <https://www.unicef.org/esa/reports/unsettled-past-uncertain-future>

⁹ UN-SWAP :

<https://www.unwomen.org/sites/default/files/Headquarters/Attachments/Sections/How%20We%20Work/UNSystemCoordination/UN-SWAP/UN-SWAP-2-TN-en.pdf>

¹⁰ UNICEF Gender Policy 2021-2030; UNHCR Age, Gender and Diversity Policy.

vulnerable segment of the migrant population, and require extensive protection and attention from the Governments. In Mexico and Central America, three main factors are identified as causes: the generalized violence suffered by people in their communities; the socioeconomic impact generated by the pandemic and the disasters caused by natural phenomena; and the need for family reunification. The tightening of both the national and US immigration policies, the closure of the borders and the deployment of armed forces at the different border crossing points, has triggered a considerable increase in affected children in Mexican territory. Along with the lack of adequate public policies, and the scarcity of economic resources, the lack of access to basic health services and formal and informal education has been accentuated, which generates multiple violations of rights, psychosocial effects and lack of stimulation in childhood development.

South Africa is a popular destination country for migrants and forced displaced persons, and therefore likely to receive populations migrating because of chronic poverty. These factors are often exacerbated by droughts and political instability. In terms of the push factors, children repeatedly named poverty, hunger, lack of education and the death of a parent or caregiver as the reasons for their decision to migrate. The pull factors included stronger currencies, work opportunities, the possibility of an education, and extended family and other networks.

Migration has long been a feature of the social and economic fabric of **Zambia**, it been a country of origin, transit and destination of population movements. The country is affected by transnational migration flows, for various categories of migrant children. In recent years, the political instability of countries in the region, such as Burundi, Somalia, and the Democratic Republic of Congo have increased the number of forced migrants seeking for political asylum. Migrants and migration-affected populations in Zambia are affected by the high levels of communicable diseases, particularly HIV and tuberculosis. Moreover, Zambia is prone to environment and climate related emergencies, including flooding and drought, and the resultant insecurities, which has led to further population displacement. Lengthy and porous borders, the continued increase in mixed migration flows, human trafficking and migrant smuggling, presents increased challenges for the protection of children on the move.

Policy Framework

Overall, the protection risks facing children on the move are increasingly recognized, and policies and legal frameworks to better prevent and respond to these risks are evolving. At the same time, evidence on what works and what does not work in protecting children on the move has not been synthesized across a range of groups (refugees, internally displaced children, migrant children, returnees, children moving with and without families, and in different settings).

The **Convention on the Rights of the Child, the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants, and the Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees** contain several provisions and legally binding obligations on children's rights in the context of international migration in the countries of origin, transit, destination and return. The **Global Compact on Refugees** – signed by United Nations Member States in 2018 – has specific provisions relating to the identification and referral of children (including unaccompanied and separated children), best interest assessment and/or determination, and appropriate care arrangements and other services. Similarly, the **Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration** – also signed by Member States in 2018 – promotes the principle of the best interests of the child at all times as a primary consideration in all situations concerning children in the context of international migration, including unaccompanied and separated children. It also calls for governments to use immigration detention only as a measure of last resort and to end the practice of child detention in the context of international migration.

The **European Consensus on Development 'Our World, Our Dignity, Our Future'**, reaffirms the commitments to “work with partner countries to improve the protection of children and their participation in decisions that concern them”, to address the aspects of migration and forced displacement in a comprehensive manner, and to support to the implementation of migration policies fully in line with Human Rights and international conventions.

Specific United Nations agencies – the **International Labour Organization (ILO), International Organization for Migration (IOM), the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)**, have projects that benefit directly CotM through initiatives: promoting safe migration; economic-strengthening families, children and young people; reducing violence; strengthening the care of children on the move; and supporting its psychosocial well-being.

3. PURPOSE & OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

Purpose

The evaluation purpose is to provide the EU, UNHCR, UNICEF, donors, government counterparts and implementing partners with a stronger understanding of how the program has contributed to respond to the needs of children on the move in the participating countries. The evaluation will look into how a child protection system's approach helps

preventing and contributing to end child detention, building on empirical evidence and data through the provision of quality integrated services, mental health, psychosocial support and gender responsive interventions, as well as the promotion of alternative transitory care options and non-custodial measures to replace immigration detention. The evaluation will also contribute to UNICEF-UNHCR's accountability for their performance and results, contextualizing why countries and regions have taken different approaches to work towards expected results. The evaluation will offer credible evidence to inform design of future initiatives in the realm of protecting children on the move; by providing forward looking lessons regarding leadership, advocacy, strategies and methodologies, and partnerships for strengthening child protection systems and promoting alternatives to detention.

A detailed use and influence plan for this evaluation will be drawn up early in the inception phase, in collaboration with the Evaluation Reference Group (see section 5, below).

Objectives

1. Examine the relevance of the program and appropriateness of country-specific interventions, as well as the gender-responsiveness of its approach.
2. Assess the coherence and sustainability of UNICEF-UNHCR' work and its synergies with the work of local, regional and international actors working toward protecting rights of children on the move.
3. Assess the effectiveness of UNICEF and UNHCR joint program in El Salvador, Mexico, South Africa, and Zambia in strengthening national capacity and mechanisms to protect children on the move, contributing to end their detention.
4. Assess the extent to which the program applied a cost-effective approach to building the capacity of child protection systems to provide integrated services, addressing the needs of children on the move.
5. Generate actionable recommendations to enable Country Offices (COs) and Regional Offices (ROs) to support scale-up of the intervention and inform future programming.

The evaluation will provide structure for reflection and learning and be imbued with principles of participation and utilization. The principles of equity, human rights, gender equality and ethics are essential to both UNICEF's and UNHCR's goals. As such, these principles will be integrated in the evaluation design, scope, approach, methods and analysis. The evaluation itself will be transformative by:

- **Being participatory and inclusive** – promoting male and female adolescents, and boy's and girl's empowerment by incorporating their experiences and insights of diverse children in all stages of the evaluation process from planning and design to sharing lessons learned
- **Being innovative** – supporting innovative approaches to advancing child protection system strengthening for children on the move and ending immigration detention.
- **Being intentional** – fully considering how, by whom, when and where the evaluation could limit the participation of male and female adolescents, and boys and girls on the move.

The primary audiences for the evaluation are the EU, UNHCR and UNICEF offices responsible for design, implementation, coordination, and monitoring-evaluation-learning aspects of the Children on the Move program in El Salvador, Mexico, South Africa and Zambia and respective regional offices. The secondary audience for the evaluation is the following:

- The governments of El Salvador, Mexico, South Africa and Zambia
- Partners involved in child protection/migration (e.g., the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the International Detention Coalition (IDC) and Save the Children);
- Donor Agencies;
- Rights holders, primarily in communities and institutions where UNICEF and UNHCR have intervened and might intervene in the future.

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSIGNMENT

Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will examine **the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability** of the EU Global promotion of best practices for children in migration project (2020 – 2023). The evaluation will assess UNICEF's and UNHCR's efforts to effectively protect children on the move in the four participating countries through strengthening child protection systems and ending immigration detention. The timeframe under consideration will cover the program from initiation to completion (October 2020 – August 2023), with the evaluation running concurrent to the project's final eight months.

Geographic:

- Regional Offices: ESARO and LACRO

- Country Offices: El Salvador, Mexico, South Africa and Zambia.
 - El Salvador: 3 municipalities (San Salvador, San Miguel and Usulután).
 - Mexico: 4 States (Baja California, Chiapas, Chihuahua, and Veracruz), with focus on 5 cities (Tapachula, Juárez, Tijuana, Mexicali, and Mexico City).
 - South Africa: 3 cities (Cape Town, Johannesburg and Durban).
 - Zambia: 10 Districts (Nchelenge, Kalumbila, Kaoma, Ndola, Chililabombwe, Katete, Chipata, Nyimba, Lusaka and Sesheke), which includes the three refugee settlement districts.

Timeframe: January 2023 – January 2024 (the evaluation will start in parallel to the final months of the project)

Evaluation questions

The proposed main areas of inquiry for the evaluation are organized around five of the Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) criteria, namely **relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability**. It is expected that the evaluation team will fine-tune and prioritize the evaluation questions, during the inception phase, to ensure relevance and utilization of the exercise once the evaluation team is onboard and the Evaluation Reference Group is established.

Relevance: The extent to which the program and its components are aligned with the needs and priorities of right holders (children on the move, families, and host communities) and duty-bearers (national governments, donors and other key-stakeholders) and able to adapt as needed.

1. To what extent was a rationale for the program design provided and valid (i.e., aligned with country priorities, key partners' priorities, donor policies, UNICEF's and UNHCR's programmatic niche and positioning in the humanitarian-development-peace nexus)? To what extent was adaptability to context, risk and changing circumstances built into the design?
2. How did program design expand on existing projects and partnerships? To what extent were the interventions designed for child protection systems strengthening and ending detention (e.g., included hand over and transition plans)?
3. During implementation, to what extent and how has the program ensured that it remained relevant to the needs of rights-holders and to systems-strengthening objectives in the four countries and/or adapted as needed to contextual changes (including, but not limited to, COVID 19 pandemic and changes in migratory fluxes and trends)? How has the program ensured accountability to children on the move and other affected populations? To what extent the program response was tailored to the needs and vulnerabilities of women and girls?

Efficiency: Two sets of efficiency-related issues will be examined. One relates to resource allocation in terms of budget, staffing, time, level of effort, partnerships, etc. Another pertains to the establishment of monitoring, reporting and evaluation systems that cover the joint intervention in four countries.

1. To what extent has the program applied a cost-effective approach to building the capacity of the child protection systems to protect children on the move? How effectively have resources been used to complement existing capacities and achieve results in the four country-specific interventions within the two regions? To what extent has the availability of resources enabled interventions implemented by different country offices and regional offices?
2. Have the intervention processes, including program monitoring, evaluation and learning been inclusive and participatory? Is the monitoring system built/ inter-operable with government systems or is it standalone?

Effectiveness: The extent to which the program achieved its intended outcomes and contributed to impacts in four countries.

1. How and to what extent have the program activities resulted in children accessing quality integrated services, alternative care, mental health and psychosocial support? To what extent, how and why did the program components achieve expected progress, within the expected timeframe? What does this tell us about what works, how and why for children on the move with different characteristics and in different settings?
2. To what degree has the program contributed to prevent and end immigration detention? To what extent has the program strengthened the capacity of child protection systems to protect children on the move?
3. How did the monitoring system within countries and across regions contribute to program effectiveness? How does it demonstrate results for the most vulnerable children (e.g., girls and children with disabilities) and on human rights, gender, and equity dimensions more generally?

Sustainability: The extent to which the benefit of the program goes beyond the intervention period, and whether the benefits of that intervention are likely to continue once program resources and UNICEF/UNHCR support are withdrawn.

1. To what extent has the program succeeded in placing children on the move on the agenda of national governments and regional governance bodies, in particular the needs of most vulnerable children (e.g., girls, LGBTQI+, and children with disabilities)?
2. To what extent are results of the child protection systems-strengthening working (e.g., improving case management systems, strengthening data, promoting care and alternatives to detention; access to MHPSS and GBV services) and sustainable and resilient to risk once UNICEF/UNHCR support ends? How likely are those results to continue once the program resources cease?
3. What systems and partnerships have been put in place to build stakeholder ownership, capacity and resources and ensure that child protection systems-strengthening work is inclusive of children on the move and can be scaled up by governments and complemented by civil society and other UNICEF/UNHCR partners?

Coherence: The extent to which the program approach and specific country design, implementation and monitoring systems are in coherence with other interventions in the local, regional and global contexts addressing the same affected groups

1. To what extent is the program in synchrony with relevant local coordination systems in each setting (e.g., sector working groups, UN Network on Migration, regional fora, Opportunities and Issue Based Coalitions on Human Mobility, the Regional Conference on Migration, The Risk Emergency Disaster Working Group for Latin America and the Caribbean (REDLAC)) and with the efforts of other key actors at national and regional level?
2. What were any barriers to and opportunities for synergies for partnerships, and how were these managed by the different country teams?
3. To what extent has the program facilitated cross-regional, as well as inter-regional, learning and exchanges of good practices and inter-government peer learning initiatives?

The evaluation team will also identify lessons learned and good practices, which UNICEF, UNHCR and partners - as key players on Child Protection for CotM - can disseminate. These may include tools, approaches, training materials, management practices. The evaluation should explain why this is considered a good practice and make suggestions on their wider applicability.

Evaluability

Given the nature of this evaluation, a multi-country and multi-region programme, it is recommended that the evaluation team formulate a theory of change (TOC) and make it useful to the evaluation, proposing an appropriate evaluation design and prioritizing evaluation questions. The team should develop, a conceptual framework to guide the evaluation methodology, explain results and contextualize the recommendations based on ToC analysis.

It is acknowledged that, even when Information Management Systems are available at national level and efforts are in place to strengthen the quality of the data they produce, gaps are recorded in the availability, accessibility, and usage of data. These troubling gaps largely hamper the visibility of children on the move and the capacity to put in place policies and programs that meet their needs. Therefore, the consulting team is required to analyze the presence or absence of convergent monitoring systems, gaps and available datasets, and complementarity of national administrative data, leading to recommendations about possible methods to foster integrated monitoring systems and improve quality, accessibility and usage of project data.

The evaluation team should also make use of related evaluations/studies conducted by UNHCR and/or UNICEF in the targeted countries, as well as reports on Children on the Move program. It is important that previous findings, recommendations, and conclusions can inform the current evaluation exercise, allowing it to build from previous knowledge. Some referential evaluations:

- Evaluación de las intervenciones en materia de migración en México, Guatemala, Honduras y El Salvador, período entre 2017-2020 (UNICEF).
 - [El Salvador](#)
 - [México](#)
- [Report of Rapid Evidence Assessment: What works to protect children on the move 2020](#) (UNHCR, UNICEF, ILO, IOM).
- [Programme Evaluation: Protecting Children on The Move in the Horn of Africa 2021](#) (UNICEF).

The evaluation team is expected to engage with all the relevant stakeholders at the different stages of the evaluation. During the inception phase, a comprehensive stakeholder analysis will be conducted to identify all relevant UNICEF and UNHCR partners, including those that may have not worked with UNICEF and UNHCR directly but play a key role in the outcomes to which UNICEF and UNHCR contribute 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 evaluation, 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 and UNHCR's contribution.

The stakeholders may include, but are not limited to, UNICEF staff, UNHCR staff, relevant government partners, IOM staff, NGO partners implementing projects with UNICEF and UNHCR through cooperation agreements, and rights holders who are targeted by the program, including children and adolescents (both girls and boys) on the move.

4. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Approach

The evaluation approach will be **participatory and inclusive**. It will seek to obtain data from a range of sources (including through desk reviews and document analyses, surveys and questionnaires, as well as stakeholder consultations, interviews, focus group discussions, observation and in-depth case studies) and when possible, attempt to capture children's own voices, using appropriate consultative evaluation approaches. As far as this is possible, outcomes in relation to lives of children will be explored (from the perspective of children on the move themselves) and the lived experience of children documented. Care will be taken to do so through a **culturally sensitive, gender- and human rights-responsive, ethical and empowering** approach.

The evaluation approach will take a forward-looking lens and focus on performance and learning. The evaluation team is expected to develop theories of action for the four participating countries and map out how these relate to the overarching logical framework (see annex). Where possible and appropriate, the evaluation should seek to obtain evidence as to what may/may not have occurred in the absence of UNICEF and UNHCR engagement.

Data collection methods

The evaluation will use a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods to answer the proposed evaluation questions. Quantitative data will help to unpack and assess joint UNICEF-UNHCR's operations and associated trends in outputs and likely outcomes, especially at regional and national levels. These include surveys and secondary data analysis. The consulting team is invited to make use of new and innovative tools to gather quantitative data in more rapid and efficient ways (e.g., mobile phones, georeferenced survey, big data, administrative data, satellite imagery, etc.). Qualitative data will provide the evaluation with insight into direct and indirect roles that UNICEF and UNHCR play in targeted countries in supporting children on the move and key influencing factors in varied contexts and from differing angles. An evaluation matrix will map each method to the relevant evaluation question.

Prior to implementation of qualitative and quantitative data collection tools, a pilot test of all instruments should be conducted. This is of particular importance for surveys. The objective is to train enumerators, check appropriateness of questions and delivery mechanisms. The run test should be made on similar conditions and targeting the same groups. The security situation in each location should be assessed to ensure that methods chosen are not creating additional risks.

The following methods are suggested:

- **Desk review:** a comprehensive review of supply data, human resources data, financial data, performance monitoring data, progress reports, and strategic documents. The review should also include data from other relevant evaluations and studies recently conducted covering children on the move within any of the targeted countries. As well as make use of administrative data available on each country.
- **Key informant interviews:** semi-structured interviews (purposive sampling) conducted remotely or in-person with internal and external stakeholders at the global, regional and country level, including UNICEF, UNHCR staff, the EU, national government and CSO partners.
- **Focus Group Discussions:** The evaluation team will seek to gather the perspectives of rights holders, as well as including children and youth, through age-tailored participatory approaches during FGD and KII.
- **Online/mobile based surveys** of UNICEF and UNHCR staff and key external stakeholders including partner agencies, governments, and civil society. Other forms of remote data collection (administrative, big data, satellite) should be employed as appropriate.

The methods are expected to be tailored to the specific country (language, political context, etc.) and program needs. All information should be disaggregated, wherever possible; and identify the impact of program on marginalized groups.

It should include child rights based and gender sensitive, and for evaluation data to be disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, age, and disability.

Data analysis

Data analysis will proceed with consolidation of information drawn from each method through use of an evidence matrix. Triangulation both across and within categories of data sources will be a key analytical technique for this evaluation – for example, the results of the online surveys will be compared with the opinions and experiences relayed by key informants in the field case studies. The evaluation team is invited to suggest diverse and innovative evaluation methods, which will be considered in the selection of evaluation proposals (e.g. Qualitative Comparative Analysis, contribution analysis, realist evaluation, process tracing, etc.).

The following methods of data analysis and synthesis are suggested:

- Descriptive analysis – to identify and understand the contexts and characteristics of the different country-specific interventions.
- Content analysis – to analyse documents, interviews, group discussions and focus groups notes and qualitative data from the survey to identify emerging common trends, themes and patterns for each key evaluation question, at all levels of analyses. Content analysis can be used to highlight diverging views and opposing trends. The emerging issues and trends provide the basis for preliminary observations and evaluation findings.
- Comparative analysis – to examine findings on specific themes or issues across countries. It can be used to identify good practices, innovative approaches and lessons learned. This type of analysis allows for comparing findings emerging from the field visits and data collected through the survey.
- Quantitative analysis – to interpret quantitative data, in particular data emerging from the survey, as well as from the annual reports, country-level studies and reports, and financial data. Detailed analysis of performance monitoring and administrative data.
- Contribution analysis – to assess the extent to which the program has contributed to expected results. Test assumptions, examine influencing factors, and identify alternative assumptions for each pathway of change are suggested.

The evaluation matrix will be included in the detailed evaluation design developed by the evaluation team, to be contracted to conduct the evaluation, during the inception phase, in close consultation with UNICEF ESARO Evaluation Section managing the evaluation, as well as UNHCR and UNICEF Regional and country teams involved on the program, and key evaluation stakeholders.

The design should specify how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations throughout the evaluation process, including the inclusion of adolescent girls and boys, as well as a range of male and female stakeholders. Each component analyzed will be synthesized to form the evaluation findings and conclusions. The inception report will detail the analysis plan for each method as well as the overall approach to the triangulation and synthesis. The evaluation team will ensure that they obtain ethical clearance in all the program participating countries through their means.

The evaluation team is expected to triangulate information collected from different sources and/or by different methods to ensure that the data is valid, and findings are evidence based. Three types of triangulation methods are envisaged: 1) cross reference of different data sources (survey, interview, documentation); 2) investigator triangulation through the deployment of evaluators (observation and field work); 3) review by validation meeting and consultation with UNHCR-UNICEF and other key stakeholders during drafting process.

Methodological limitations

The geographical scope of the evaluation, extended to two distant regions and focused on four countries, two of which are predominantly Spanish speakers, adds complexity to the exercise. These and other limitations, and its mitigation strategies are to be discussed and detailed in the evaluation inception report.

The distances between different countries and large amount of primary and secondary data, may orient the team to rely heavier on local consultants to lead in person data collection. However, the context of CotM may affect the ability to obtain community-level perspectives, and limit evaluation teams from conducting direct observation at the national level. Therefore, the use of strong locally based consultants, that understand the cultural context, are fluent in the language and do not require to travel internationally, is strongly encouraged as a mitigation strategy. Use of innovative and rapid methods to organize remote data collection that can complement program quantitative information will also be expected.

5. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS AND QUALITY ASSURANCE

The evaluators will be recruited and report to the ESARO Evaluation Section under the overall oversight of ESARO's Regional Director. For the day-to-day management of the evaluation, the Evaluation Section will appoint an Evaluation Manager who will be accountable to the Regional Evaluation Adviser.

The Evaluation Manager will be the primary interface between the EU, UNICEF and UNHCR with the evaluation team lead. The manager role involves day-to-day support to all aspects of the evaluation process, including facilitating access to data, providing input to key methodological and strategic choices, and managing the evaluation budget. The evaluation manager may participate in key informant interviews and other activities during implementation.

An Evaluation Steering Committee (ESC), composed of Evaluation Staff from the EU, UNHCR and UNICEF, will be created to support the evaluation management. The ESC will assist in prioritizing and determining the strategic focus of the evaluation, ensuring a methodologically robust and credible evaluation process, and assisting in the identification of strategic themes arising from the initial evaluation findings.

An Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) comprised of UNHCR and UNICEF evaluation staff from both ESAR and LAC regions, and child protection specialist from the 4 implementing countries, the ERG will also include at least one EU official as well as other relevant stakeholders. The ERG will be established to ensure ownership of the evaluation process, provide expert advice, quality assure all evaluation products, and offer inputs and support throughout the evaluation.

The ERG will have the following responsibilities:

- Provide inputs in the inception phase to influence the approach of the evaluation, and, where necessary, provide information and institutional knowledge as key informants;
- Support the work of the evaluation team by facilitating connections with key informants and ensuring the team has relevant reference documents;
- Review selected evaluation products (implementation plan, inception report and final report) and provide written comments to the evaluation team through the Evaluation Manager;
- Where feasible, ERG members will also contribute to the post-evaluation management response, action plan and dissemination strategy.

UNICEF ESARO, through the Evaluation Manager, 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. The evaluation manager will provide a first quality review (i.e. zero draft) of all evaluation tools and products presented by the evaluation team before any deliverables are shared with the Steering Committee and the Evaluation Reference Group.

The evaluation team lead will be the direct responsible for communicating with UNICEF Evaluation Manager, coordinating international and local consultants, organizing data collection missions and instruments, and ensuring that recommendations for quality improvement of the evaluation instruments and deliverables are timely and fully addressed. In addition to his/her participation on virtual ERG meetings, the team lead should provide monthly written updates on the progress of the evaluation to the Evaluation Manager.

The firm needs to comply with quality assurance guidelines from UNICEF and UNHCR. All data collection tools need to be reviewed by the ERG and approved by the Evaluation Manager before implementation. Moreover, inception report and draft final report will be subject to ERG as well as to an external quality assessment. The Final Evaluation report will also be submitted to the Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System (GEROS) for final quality assessment (See annex). All products need to achieve a satisfactory rating, based on checklists provided in annexes, before any payment for the deliverables can be made.

Ethical considerations

The evaluators shall adhere to the following UN, UNHCR and UNICEF norms and standards and are expected to clearly identify any potential ethical issues and approaches in their proposal. Guidance documents mentioned below are those that the evaluators are expected to comply with:

- ALNAP guidance for evaluation of humanitarian action;¹¹
- Ethical Guidelines for UN Evaluations;¹²
- EU Ethics and data protection guidelines¹³;

¹² UNEG Ethical Guidelines, 2020. Available at: <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/2866>

¹³ https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/guidance/ethics-and-data-protection_he_en.pdf

¹³ <https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/alnap-evaluation-humanitarian-action-2016.pdf>

- UNEG guidance on integrating human rights and gender equality and UN System-Wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) on gender equality;¹⁴
- UNICEF adapted evaluation report standards and Geros¹⁵;
- UNICEF Ethical Guidelines and standards for research and evaluation¹⁶ and Ethical Research Involving Children¹⁷;
- UNICEF Guidance Note on Adolescent participation in UNICEF monitoring and evaluation¹⁸;
- UNICEF Guidance on Gender Integration in Evaluation¹⁹;
- United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System 2016²⁰ (including impartiality, independence, quality, transparency, consultative process);
- UN Disability Inclusion Strategy (2020)²¹
- UNSDG Human Rights-Based Approach

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, particularly with children and adolescents on the move, the evaluation team should look into the requirements for ethical review board approval either from recognized Institutional Review Boards in the four countries and/or via UNICEF’s LTA for ethical approval. Any ethical issues that arise during the evaluation need to be documented including how the evaluators will respond or address each.

6. DELIVERABLES, TIMELINES, AND PAYMENT SCHEDULE

Deliverables and timeline

Total estimated of working weeks for consulting team is 16, from which at least 4 need to be done on the field. The assignment is envisaged to take place between January 2023 and January 2024.

I – Preparatory Phase – 4 working weeks for UNICEF/UNHCR	
October 2022	Development of ToR for the evaluation
November 2022	Setting up governance structure for the evaluation Constitution of Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)
December 2022	Recruitment of evaluation contractor/s 1 st ERG meeting, introduction of the Evaluation Team and overview of evaluation design.
II – Inception Phase -4 working weeks for consulting team	
January – February 2023	Scoping for the evaluation - document review, evaluation framework and matrix, work planning, use and influence plan, tool development, and piloting data collection tools. Ethical review and ethical clearance
March 2023	Draft inception report due to the Evaluation Manager and ERG
Mid-March	2 nd ERG meeting (discussion of inception report) and feedback to the evaluation team lead
End-March 2023	Further refinements based on feedback Final inception report due to Evaluation Manager and ERG
III – Data Collection and Analysis Phase - 4 working weeks for consulting team	
April 2023	Document review (continued); creation of four pre-mission matrices and draft theories of action reflecting the literature/desk-based analysis for each country
April 2023	Data collection (remote or on the field) through KII, online/mobile surveys, participatory methods, etc.
May 2023	Data analysis and triangulation (using the triangulation matrix)

¹⁴ <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1616>

¹⁵ <https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/global-evaluation-reports-oversight-system-geros>

¹⁶ UNICEF Procedure on Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis, 2021

¹⁷ <https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/eric-compendium-approved-digital-web.pdf>

¹⁸ [Guidance Note: Adolescent participation in UNICEF monitoring and evaluation](#)

¹⁹ [UNICEF Guidance on Gender Integration in Evaluation](#)

²⁰ UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation, 2016. Available at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

²¹ <https://www.un.org/en/content/disabilitystrategy/>

Mid - June 2023	Zero draft report showing emerging findings and thematic analyses per country, due to the Evaluation Manager and ERG
IV – Reporting Phase – 4 working weeks for consulting team)	
End-June 2023	Report drafting, with information for each country, based on feedback from the Evaluation Manager
Early July 2023	3 rd ERG meeting (discussion of draft report and co-creation of recommendations) Feedback to the evaluation team
Mid August 2023	Draft evaluation report in English due to the Evaluation manager and ERG
End-August 2023	Further analysis and drafting based on feedback received Penultimate draft due to the Evaluation Manager and ERG
Early-October 2023	Further analysis and drafting based on feedback; final revisions, copy-editing, annexes, etc.
Mid- October 2023	Final draft evaluation report to the ERG, including its child-friendly version. Four learning briefs based on the final report, one per country. An audio-visual product specially targeted to communicate findings to children and adolescents All products (evaluation report, four learning briefs and the audio-visual product) need to be available in English and Spanish.
V – Dissemination, follow-up and management response phase -3 working weeks for consulting team	
Mid-November 2023	Finalization of Evaluation report and Evaluation brief Finalization of 4 country reports Final corrections from the ERG and Evaluation manager (factual errors/omissions) and review of translations. Release of evaluation report for Management Response
Mid-December 2023	-Dissemination of Evaluation Findings -Presentation to stakeholders of hard copies of Evaluation products -Participatory EMR construction

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.
- The structure of the evaluation report should include an executive summary and follow the UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports²², respecting both UNICEF Adapted Reporting Standards (2017)²³, as well as UNHCR Checklist for Evaluation Reports²⁴. A reference of 40-60 pages is indicated.
- The structure of the inception report should follow the UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Terms of Reference and Inception Reports²⁵; respecting both UNICEF Adapted TOR and IR Standards (2017)²⁶, as well as UNHCR Checklist for Inception Reports²⁷. A reference of 20-40 pages is indicated.
- All products should be available in English and Spanish, formatted on a print layout, and in respect of UNICEF and UNHCR style and branding guidelines.

Payment schedule and deliverables

All payments will be issued after the products have been reviewed and changes approved by UNICEF and UNHCR, for quality assurance. Payment to the evaluation team will be deliverable based, following completion of the following milestones:

²² <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/853>

²³ https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/UNICEF_adapted_reporting_standards_updated_June_2017.pdf

²⁴ <https://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendocAttachment.zip?COMID=61262a234>

²⁵ <http://www.uneval.org/document/download/852>

²⁶ <https://www.unicef.org/media/54786/file>

²⁷ <https://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendocAttachment.zip?COMID=61262a234>

Deliverables	Old derivable price (USD)	Timeline
Data collection tools and Inception Report	\$ 50,897.91	Completed
Zero Draft report	\$ 42,414.93	15/10/2023
Final Evaluation report	\$ 50,897.91	15/11/2023
Evaluation Brief and 4 Country reports	\$ 25,380.87	30/11/2023
Total	\$ \$169,591.62	

Location and Duration

Location: the four countries of program implementation (i.e., El Salvador, Mexico, South Africa, and Zambia) and the two regions (ESAR and LACR). Final workshop will take place in Brussels

Duration: January 2022 to December 2023 (12 months), with an estimated effort of 20 weeks.

7. QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Team composition and responsibilities

Institutions with strong background in child protection and evaluation of system-strengthening and children on the move programs are encouraged to submit a proposal. The evaluation team should be gender balanced, culturally diverse and composed of an evaluation team leader and at least 4 national team members (with expertise on child protection in the targeted countries).

The team leader should have extensive experience in leading and conducting complex global evaluations, excellent project management skills, and demonstrated experience in implementing and/or evaluating protection or migration programs. The team leader is expected to be fully engaged and available throughout the evaluation process. The team should include at least one expert on migration and one on child protection, although it is also possible to have expertise in both under the same person; the team should bring solid monitoring & evaluation competencies in the targeted countries.

The ideal members of the evaluation team need to demonstrate complementary expertise in the areas under scrutiny, including evaluation, child protection systems strengthening, migration, ethics, and related fields. The team needs to show a strong track record and commitment to delivering contextually relevant and nuanced evidence in support of the wider child rights agenda, and to using participatory approaches. The team is expected to be balanced in terms of gender and geographic origin (global North/South).

In view of the focus on identifying best practices, structure and resources necessary for scale-up, evaluation team members should also have expertise in analysing budgets and costing interventions for scale, as well as conducting child- and adolescent-centred evaluations using inclusive methods and child-friendly reporting techniques.

Required Qualifications

Specific requirements include:

1. Expertise in conducting similar or related comprehensive multi-country and multi-regional evaluations and/or applied research work to assess children on the move programs and/or national systems-strengthening works supported by UN or UNICEF/UNHCR specifically.
2. Demonstrated experience of programming in child protection, gender-sensitive programs, human rights including sound knowledge of children on the move policies and processes, interventions on MHPSS, GBV, case management, detention and non-custodial measures, alternative and transitory cares, as well as familiarity with other sectors, such as education and social protection.
3. Extensive evaluation expertise of comprehensive scope with strong mixed-methods evaluation skills and proficiency in using participatory, child- and adolescent-centred innovative evaluation methods including gender-sensitive methods.
4. Knowledge of the UN's human rights, gender equality and equity agendas and experience in applying these to evaluation.
5. A work record in Eastern and Southern Africa as well as in Latin America and Caribbean regions and with experience in El Salvador, Mexico, South Africa and Zambia.

6. Excellent command of English and Spanish, with a proven ability to prepare high-quality reports and employ child/adolescent-friendly participation and reporting techniques.
7. Strong quantitative and qualitative analytical skills, and expertise in analysing budgets and costing interventions for scale.
8. A team lead who has held a lead role in evaluations of similar scope/complexity, and at least four national child protection evaluation experts in the team from each implementation country.
9. The team must consist of senior-level experts specializing in national systems-strengthening, gender equality, migration, child rights and participation, and equity.
10. Demonstration of capacity to carry out the evaluation and complete deliverables under possible travel restrictions and social distancing measures.

Significant advantages

- Nomination of a team leader from the 'global South'.
- Team member(s) who have fluency of Spanish and English.
- Proven ability to develop attractive evidence products that present complex information via infographics and other communication means.
- Knowledge of the diverse social, economic, and political context of the two targeted regions.
- Record of top ranked (exceptional or highly satisfactory) evaluation reports by GEROS.

8. REQUIREMENTS FOR TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL PROPOSALS

This evaluation can be awarded to a firm or institution working under the coordination of a team leader. Proposals will be evaluated based on a combination of technical and financial considerations including the need to meet the mandatory criteria. The technical quality of the proposals will account for 70 per cent of the final score; financial proposals will account for 30 per cent.

A panel of UNICEF and UNHCR specialists will review the technical proposals first; only proposals that meet the mandatory criteria and receive a minimum of 50 points during the technical evaluation will be considered further. Proposals that pass the technical stage will then receive a financial score and the two scores will be added together.

Content of the technical proposal

You may build on the proposal submitted to express interest in this evaluation. The technical proposal will be in PDF format and must include at a minimum the following elements:

A. Table of contents

B. Presentation of the bidding institution or institutions if a consortium, including:

- Name of the institution
- Date and country of registration/incorporation, and location of offices or agents
- Summary of corporate structure (detailed organogram), business areas, corporate directions, experience and values
- Past two years' annual turnover (in US dollars)
- Past two years' audited financial report (income statement and balance sheet)
- Number of full-time employees and type (technical experts, administrative and logistics support staff, financial staff, etc.)

C. Short narrative description of the bidding institution's experience and capacity in the following areas:

- Project evaluations
- Multi-country evaluations or studies/research conducted in ESAR/LACR
- Migration/child protection-related assignments
- Capacities, including the ability (if a part of the proposed methodology) to locate and manage local partners in the four program countries.

D. List of similar/relevant past and on-going assignments carried out by the proposer in the past 7 years. UNICEF-UNHCR may contact reference persons for feedback on services provided by the proposers.

E. List of full reports (preferably with links to full reports) as examples of relevant past and on-going assignments of the proposer (at least 3), on which the proposed key personnel directly and actively contributed or authored.

F. Proposed methodology.

It should minimize repeating what is stated in the ToR. There is no minimum or maximum length. If in doubt, ensure sufficient detail is provided for the panel to be able to judge the technical expertise.

Required content is as follows:

- Understanding of and comments on the context and rationale for the evaluation, and on UNICEF-UNHCR's action in the area of migration/child protection, notably based on proposers' knowledge, experience and familiarity with the available literature
- Understanding of and comments on the evaluation scope
- Comments on the evaluation criteria, key evaluation questions, and areas of particular interest
- Understanding of, comments on, and in-depth analysis of the aspects of complexity, potential challenges, risks and ethical issues related to this evaluation exercise. This must include a description of the bidding institution's ethics protocols including data privacy protocols.
- Proposed evaluation design and methodology, with a sufficient level of detail on each phase and activity of the evaluation process, including on data to be collected to answer the evaluation questions, envisaged data collection and analysis methods, the sampling methodology and criteria, as well as the duration of the country visits and the number and profile of evaluation team members participating AND/OR methods to conduct remote data collection in the selected countries. Particular attention should be paid to the issues of management of local partners/consultants; stakeholder availability and participation (including proposed methods for the engagement of children and adolescents on the move); access and security constraints; mix of quantitative and qualitative data and methods; data disaggregation, accuracy and triangulation; approaches to data treatment and analysis; and quality assurance.
- Comments and additional details/suggestions on the deliverables proposed in the ToR, if any
- Comments and suggestions on the management arrangements described in the ToR, if any, and proposed internal management and quality assurance arrangements
- The presence of any local consultants/researchers or others not normally full-time members of the bidding institution should be indicated, with a description of how they will be engaged, trained, supported and supervised.

G. Work plan, which will include as a minimum requirement the following:

- General work plan based on the one proposed in the ToR, with comments and proposed adjustments, if any
- Detailed timetable by activity. It must be consistent with the general work plan and the financial proposal. It must factor in sufficient time for the drafting of deliverables report, their quality assurance by the evaluation team, UNICEF-UNHCR and the Evaluation Reference Group, and their finalization.

H. Evaluation team:

- Summary presentation of proposed experts
- Description of support staff if any
- Level of effort of proposed experts by activity. It must be consistent with the financial proposal.
- CVs of each proposed expert. For information, senior and intermediate level experts will be asked to sign a statement of exclusivity and availability prior to contract signature; however, at the stage of the proposal submission, the proposed team is expected to be available for the full duration of this assignment.

Content of the financial proposal

The financial proposal must be fully separated from the technical proposal. The financial proposal will be submitted in both PDF and Microsoft Excel format. Costs will be formulated in US dollars and free of all taxes. It will include the following elements as a minimum requirement:

A. Overall price proposal

B. Budget by phase, by activity, and by cost category as per UNICEF procurement procedures, the budget for this evaluation assignment is not disclosed. During any travels that may be undertaken for the evaluation if COVID-19 restrictions are no longer in place, costs for accommodation, meals and incidentals shall not exceed applicable daily subsistence allowance (DSA) rates, as promulgated by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC):1.

9. ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSALS PROCESS AND METHODS

Interested and qualified evaluation firms are requested to submit one technical proposal and one financial proposal within the indicated deadline. After the opening, each proposal will be assessed first on its technical merits and subsequently on its price.

All bidders' proposals will be reviewed by the evaluation panel. The proposal with the best overall value, composed of technical merit and price, will be recommended for approval. The overall weighting between technical and financial evaluation will be as follows: The technical component will account for 70 per cent of the total points allocated and the financial component will account for 30 per 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.

The financial proposal should include all eligible costs (fees, international and field travel expenses, etc.) of the evaluation team. The evaluation partner is also expected to work independently and regular overhead costs relating to office space and equipment should be included in the financial proposal. The arrangement of necessary human resources including research assistants, enumerators and data entry personnel must be well defined and costed in the proposal.

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 evaluation 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> - Team leader experience and qualifications (8 points/20) - Gender and geographical balance (4 points/20) - Other team members experience and qualification (8 points/20)	20
TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE		70
TOTAL FINANCIAL SCORE		30
SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL & FINANCIAL SCORE		100

