



Evaluation Office

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE: EVALUATION OF THE UNFPA RESPONSE TO THE SYRIA CRISIS**

**27 JULY 2017**

### **A. Introduction**

1. Evaluation at the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) serves three main purposes: (a) demonstrate accountability to stakeholders on performance in achieving development results and on invested results; (b) support evidence-based decision making; (c) contribute key lessons learned to the existing knowledge base on how to accelerate implementation of the Programme of Action of the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD).<sup>1</sup>
2. Although it was not initially included in its quadrennial budgeted evaluation plan for 2016-2019, the Evaluation Office (EO) decided to launch an evaluation of the UNFPA response to the Syrian crisis in view of the increased focus and funding for sexual and reproductive health and gender-based violence interventions in Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey. The decision to launch an evaluation of the UNFPA response to the Syria crisis was announced in the Evaluation Office report on evaluation for 2016<sup>2</sup>, which was formally presented to the UNFPA Executive Board at the annual session 2017<sup>3</sup>.
3. The primary intended users of the evaluation are: (i) the UNFPA country offices in Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey; (ii) the UNFPA Syria Regional Response Hub; (iii) the UNFPA Arab States Regional Office (ASRO) and the UNFPA Eastern and Central Asia Regional Office (EECARO); (iv) the UNFPA Humanitarian and Fragile Contexts Branch (HFCB); (v) UNFPA Senior Management.
4. The results of the evaluation should also be of interest to a wider group of stakeholders, such as: (i) beneficiaries of UNFPA interventions and affected populations; (ii) national governments of Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey; (iii) humanitarian actors involved in the regional response to the Syrian

<sup>1</sup> Cf. UNFPA Evaluation Policy – DP/FPA/2013/5

<sup>2</sup> UNFPA Evaluation Office Annual report on evaluation for 2016 - DP/FPA/2017/5

<sup>3</sup> On 31<sup>st</sup> May, 2017

crisis; (iv) Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Principals and Directors; UNFPA Executive Board members.

**B. Background and context**

5. Already in its seventh year, the Syria crisis is still characterized by extreme levels of suffering, destruction and disregard for human lives. According to the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), as of July 2017, approximately 13.5 million people were in need of humanitarian assistance, including 6.3 million internally displaced persons and 4.9 million people in hard-to-reach and besieged areas. The number of Syrian who have fled their country and were registered as refugees by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) has reached 5.1 million in July 2017. In Syria and neighbouring countries, there are 5.3 million women of reproductive age, 440,000 of whom are pregnant.
6. UNFPA works closely with its partners to address the needs of affected populations within Syria, but also in neighbouring countries which host most of Syrian refugees (Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey). Since 2014, pursuant to United Nations Security Council resolutions n°2139, 2165 and 2191, UNFPA has become increasingly involved in the delivery of cross-border assistance from Jordan and Turkey through the Whole of Syria (WoS) approach.
7. In response to the need to scale up the UNFPA Syrian humanitarian crisis response, UNFPA established a regional response hub in 2013. The hub was meant to allow a more effective UNFPA representation at the different humanitarian coordination forums, increase the effectiveness and visibility of humanitarian response activities and enhance resource mobilization efforts. As from 2014, within the framework of the WoS approach, the hub was assigned the overall coordination role of cross-border assistance.
8. As part of its response to the Syria crisis, UNFPA activities include:
  - Support to life saving reproductive health, including maternal health and family planning, services including provision of necessary RH commodities (RH kits, medical equipment, contraceptives, RH drugs, etc);
  - Engagement in programs that seek to mitigate and prevent the occurrence of gender-based violence - particularly child marriage - and support survivors of this violence, including through clinical management of rape services and psychosocial support for women and girls at risk of or survivors of violence;
  - Distribution of specialized, customized and culturally sensitive hygiene or dignity kits (containing various sanitary items) targeting primarily women and girls;
  - Deployment of medical and specialized personnel to assist affected communities;
  - Deployment of trained personnel to support and encourage the participation of affected youth in society through the facilitation of recreational and educational programs, rehabilitation and psychosocial interventions, and life skills education.

**C. Purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation**

9. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the contribution of UNFPA to the Syria humanitarian crisis response. This exercise will generate findings and lessons that will be of use for UNFPA (at global, regional and country level) but also for humanitarian actors, partner countries affected by the Syria crisis, donors, and the civil society.
10. The specific objectives of the evaluation are:
  - To provide an independent comprehensive assessment of the UNFPA overall response to the Syria crisis including its contribution to the Whole of Syria approach for interventions inside Syria and provision of services for Syrian refugees in neighbouring countries;
  - To look at the organizational structure set up by UNFPA to coordinate its Syria crisis interventions, in particular the operations of the Syria Response Hub and its impact on improving overall response;
  - To draw lessons from UNFPA past and current Syrian humanitarian crisis response and propose recommendations for future humanitarian responses both in the sub-region and elsewhere.
11. The scope of the evaluation covers all UNFPA humanitarian interventions targeting populations affected by the conflict in Syria, as well as in neighbouring countries (Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey), including cross-border operations.
12. The evaluation aims to assess the UNFPA humanitarian response to the Syria crisis across the sub-region (i.e., Syria and neighbouring countries). It is not intended to evaluate separately each country programme response.
13. The period covered by the evaluation is 2011-2017.

**D. Evaluation criteria and indicative areas for investigation**

14. The evaluation will use internationally agreed evaluation criteria, drawn from UNEG norms and standards, OECD/DAC and the ALNAP criteria for the evaluation of humanitarian action.<sup>4</sup>
15. Attention will be given to gender, protection and accountability to affected populations.

16. The below list of indicative areas for investigation, structured around the above-mentioned evaluation criteria, will form the basis for the formulation of evaluation questions by the evaluation team at inception stage<sup>5</sup>. The final list of evaluation questions will be limited to a maximum of ten. Based on the agreed list of evaluation questions, the evaluation team will prepare an evaluation matrix<sup>6</sup>, linking questions with associated assumptions to be assessed, indicators, data sources and data collection tools.

### 1) **Relevance/Appropriateness**

- To what extent were the objectives of the UNFPA humanitarian response to the Syria crisis adapted to identified humanitarian needs inside Syria and amongst Syrian refugees in neighbouring countries?
- To what extent was UNFPA able to adapt its strategies and programmes over time to respond to changes in the context?

#### • **Coverage**

- To what extent did UNFPA interventions reach the population groups with greatest need for reproductive health and gender-based violence services, in particular, the most vulnerable?

### 2) **Effectiveness**

- To what extent did the UNFPA response to the Syria crisis contribute to an increased access to and utilization of quality reproductive health, including family planning and maternal health services, for: (i) the affected population in Syria; (ii) Syrian refugees in neighbouring countries?
- To what extent did the UNFPA response to the Syria crisis contribute to the prevention of and response to gender based violence (particularly child marriage) for the affected population, both within Syria and among Syrian refugees, in neighbouring countries?
- To what extent did the implementation of the UNFPA response to the Syria crisis take into account gender equality and human rights principles?

4 <sup>5</sup> Criteria should only be used if they directly relate to questions to be answered. What matters are the questions, not the criteria. The latter are tools to think with and help devise additional relevant questions where necessary.

<sup>6</sup> See **Annex 2**, Outline of the evaluation matrix

### 3) Efficiency

- To what extent did UNFPA make good use of its human, financial and technical resources, as well as of different partnerships, including multiyear humanitarian commitments, in pursuing the achievement of the results expected from its humanitarian response to the Syria crisis?
- To what extent did the establishment of the UNFPA Syria Regional Response Hub contribute to enhanced coordination, organizational flexibility, and the achievement of the intended results of the UNFPA humanitarian response?

### 4) Coherence

- To what extent was the UNFPA response to the Syria crisis aligned with: (i) the priorities of the wider humanitarian system (as set out in the successive Syria Humanitarian Response Plans and the Regional Refugee Response Plan); (ii) strategic interventions of other UN agencies; iii) and the UNFPA mandate and policies?

- **Connectedness**

- To what extent did UNFPA humanitarian activities support, and plan for, longer-term (i.e., developmental and/or resilience-related) goals of the affected countries?

### E. Methodology and approach

17. The evaluation team will design the evaluation methodology (including data collection methods and tools), which will be presented in the inception report.
18. The evaluation will use secondary qualitative and quantitative data, complemented with primary data collection as necessary and feasible.
19. At a minimum, the approach will comprise:
  - A reconstruction of the **theory of change** underlying the UNFPA response to the Syria crisis;
  - A **document review** as well as an **analysis of the available administrative and financial data** pertaining to the portfolio of activities conducted by UNFPA within the framework of its response to the Syria crisis;
  - A thorough gender responsive **stakeholder analysis**, including a beneficiary typology;
  - The conduct of **key informant interviews** and **focus group discussions**;
  - Direct observation through **field visits** (covering Syria, Jordan, Turkey, Lebanon and Iraq), including a **pilot mission** (in Jordan) at inception stage;

- Two **case studies**, respectively focused on the UNFPA Syria Regional Response Hub and the engagement of UNFPA in cross-border interventions.

20. Particular attention will be paid to triangulation of information, both in terms of data sources and methods and tools for data collection.

F. Evaluation process, timeline and deliverables

21. The evaluation will unfold in five phases and lead to the production of associated deliverables as follows:

**1) Preparatory phase**

This phase, which is led by the EO evaluation manager, includes: the initial documentation review; the drafting of terms of reference for the evaluation; supplier selection under the guidance of the Procurement Services Branch of UNFPA; the constitution of an evaluation reference group.

**2) Inception phase**

The evaluation team will conduct the inception phase, in consultation with the evaluation manager and the evaluation reference group. This phase includes:

- a **document review** of all relevant documents available at UNFPA headquarters, regional office and country office levels;
- a **stakeholder mapping** to be developed by the evaluation team, and displaying the relationships between different sets of stakeholders;
- a **reconstruction of the intervention logic** of the UNFPA response to the Syria crisis, i.e. the theory of change meant to lead from planned activities to the intended results of UNFPA interventions;
- the development of the **list of evaluation questions**, the identification of the assumptions to be assessed and the respective indicators, sources of information and methods and tools for the data collection (cf. Annex 2, Outline of the evaluation matrix);
- the development of a **data collection and analysis strategy** as well as a concrete **workplan** for the field and reporting phases.
- the **pilot mission** (max 15 working days) to test and validate core features such as the evaluation matrix (in particular the evaluation questions, assumptions and indicators) and data collection tools, in addition to collecting and analysing the data required in order to answer the evaluation questions. The pilot mission will take place in **Jordan**, allowing also for the conduct of the **case study** on the UNFPA Syria regional response hub.

The outputs of this phase are:

- the **inception report**, which will display the results of the above-listed steps and tasks, along the structure set out in **Annex 3**;
- a **country note**, synthesizing lessons learned from the country visit in Jordan;
- the **case study report** of the UNFPA Syria regional response hub.

The structure of the country notes and case study reports will be determined during the inception phase.

The evaluation team will present a draft version of the inception report, the Jordan country note and the case study report on the hub to the evaluation reference group (this will entail a travel mission of the whole evaluation team to New York, for **3 working days**).

The inception report, the Jordan country note and the case study report on the Syria regional response hub will be considered final upon approval by the evaluation manager.

### 3) **Data collection phase**

During this phase, the evaluation team will conduct:

- an in-depth document review,
- interviews at UNFPA HQ (taking advantage of the presence of the team in New York at the end of the inception phase), in the UNFPA regional office for the Arab States (through a mission to Cairo – **2 working days** for the whole evaluation team) and the regional office for Eastern Europe and Central Asia (combined with the country visit in Turkey);
- field work in Syria, Turkey, Lebanon and Iraq, including the conduct of the case study on cross-border operations.

Each in-country mission will last a minimum of **10 working days**. At the end of each mission, the evaluation team will provide the country office with a debriefing presentation on the preliminary results of the mission, with a view to validating preliminary findings.

The evaluation team will present the results of the data collection, including preliminary findings and lessons learned from the two case studies, to the evaluation reference group (this will require a mission travel to New York for **2 working days** for the evaluation team leader).

For each country visit, the evaluation team will proceed to prepare a **country note** (five in total, includ). The two case studies will lead to the production of corresponding **case study reports** (two in total). Country notes and case study reports will be annexed to the final report.

#### 4) Reporting phase

The reporting phase will open with a **2-day analysis workshop** bringing together the evaluation team and the evaluation manager to discuss the results of the data collection (in New York, or another location proposed by the bidder). The objective is to help the evaluation team to deepen their analysis with a view to identifying the evaluation's findings, main conclusions and related recommendations. The evaluation team then proceeds with the drafting of the **first draft final report**.

This first draft final report will be submitted to the evaluation manager for comments. The evaluation manager will control the quality of the submitted draft report. If the quality of the draft report is satisfactory (form and substance), the manager will circulate it to the reference group members. In the event that the quality is unsatisfactory, the evaluators will be required to produce a new version of the draft report.

The report, and in particular the tentative conclusions and recommendations, will be presented by the evaluation team during a stakeholder workshop (attended by the ERG as well as other relevant stakeholders), in New York (entailing a mission travel to New York for the whole evaluation team for **2 working days**).

On the basis of comments expressed, the evaluation team will make appropriate amendments to the report, finalize the recommendations and submit the **final report**. For all comments, the evaluation team will indicate how they have responded in writing ("trail of comments").

The report is considered final once it is formally approved by the evaluation manager in consultation with the reference group.

The final report will follow the structure set out in Annex 4.

#### 5) Dissemination phase

The evaluation team will assist the evaluation manager in dissemination activities. In particular, they will prepare an **evaluation brief**.

The evaluation report, along with the management response (by UNFPA management), will be published on the UNFPA evaluation webpage.

A presentation of the evaluation results to the UNFPA Executive Board (requiring the presence of the team leader in New York for **1 working day**) may take place at the annual session of the Executive Board, in January 2019.<sup>7</sup>

22. All deliverables will be in English, except for the evaluation brief, which the firm/company will also need to provide in French and Spanish versions.

8 <sup>7</sup> The exact date of the presentation, in case it is confirmed, will be communicated to the evaluation team in due course.

23. The final report and the evaluation brief should both be professionally copy edited; the layout should be professionally designed (using Adobe InDesign software) for printing. Covers for the inception and final report should follow the indications provided in **Annex 8**.
24. The table below recapitulates the phases, deliverables and timeline of the evaluation.

Terms of reference – Evaluation of the UNFPA response to the Syria crisis

Phase/milestone	Deliverables	Location	Timing
<p><b>Preparatory phase</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Drafting of ToR</i></li> <li>• <i>Establishment of the evaluation reference group (ERG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Procurement</i></li> <li>• <i>Contract signature</i></li> </ul>			<p><i>July-October 2017</i></p>
<p><b>Inception phase</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial document review</li> <li>• Stakeholder analysis</li> <li>• Initial key informant interviews (KIIs)</li> <li>• Submission of 1<sup>st</sup> draft inception report</li> <li>• Pilot mission (Jordan)</li> <li>• Debriefing meeting at the end of the inception mission</li> <li>• Submission of draft Jordan country note</li> <li>• Submission of draft case study report on the Syria response hub</li> <li>• <b>1<sup>st</sup> ERG meeting, followed by interviews at HQ</b></li> <li>• <b>Submission of final inception report, final Jordan country note and final case study report on the hub.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First draft inception report</li> <li>• Powerpoint presentation for the debriefing of the pilot mission</li> <li>• Draft Jordan country note</li> <li>• Draft case study report on the Syria response hub</li> <li>• Powerpoint presentation for the 1<sup>st</sup> ERG meeting</li> <li>• <b>Final inception report</b></li> <li>• <b>Final Jordan country note</b></li> <li>• <b>Final case study report on the response hub</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pilot mission: 15 working days in <b>Jordan</b> (evaluation team)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> ERG meeting and interviews at HQ: 3 working days in <b>New York</b> (evaluation team)</li> </ul>	<p>October-December 2017</p>

Terms of reference – Evaluation of the UNFPA response to the Syria crisis

<p><b>Data collection phase</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extended desk review</li> <li>• KIIs at UNFPA HQs (see above, end of the inception phase)</li> <li>• KIIs at ASRO and EECARO</li> <li>• 4 country visits</li> <li>• Debriefing meetings at the end of each field visit</li> <li>• Submission of draft country notes (Syria, Lebanon, Turkey, Iraq)</li> <li>• Submission of draft case study report on cross border operations</li> <li>• <b>2<sup>nd</sup> ERG meeting</b></li> <li>• <b>Submission of final country notes and final case study report on cross-border operations</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 draft country notes (Syria, Lebanon, Turkey, Iraq)</li> <li>• Draft case study report on cross-border operations</li> <li>• Powerpoint presentation of preliminary results of the data collection, including preliminary findings and lessons learned from the case studies</li> <li>• <b>4 final country notes</b></li> <li>• <b>Final case study report on cross-border operations</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cairo:</b> 2 working days (evaluation team)</li> <li>• <b>Syria:</b> 10 working days (evaluation team)</li> <li>• <b>Lebanon:</b> 10 working days (evaluation team)</li> <li>• <b>Turkey:</b> 10 working days (evaluation team)</li> <li>• <b>Iraq:</b> 10 working days (evaluation team)</li> <li>• <b>New York:</b> 2 working days (team leader)</li> </ul>	<p>January-June 2018</p>
<p><b>Reporting phase</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis workshop</li> <li>• Submission of draft final report</li> <li>• Stakeholder workshop (focusing on recommendations)</li> <li>• <b>Submission of final evaluation report</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> draft final report (with tentative conclusions and recommendations)</li> <li>• Powerpoint presentation for the stakeholder workshop</li> <li>• <b>Final evaluation report</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis workshop: 2 working days <b>in New York<sup>8</sup> or other location</b> proposed by the bidder</li> <li>• Stakeholder workshop in <b>New York:</b> 2 working days (evaluation team)</li> </ul>	<p>July-September 2018</p>

<sup>8</sup> The analysis could take place in New York, just after the 2<sup>nd</sup> ERG meeting.

<p><b>Dissemination and follow up phase</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparation of evaluation briefs in EN, FR and SP</li> <li>• Professional copy editing and design of the final report and the evaluation briefs</li> <li>• Presentation to the UNFPA Executive Board (TBC)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation briefs in EN, FR and SP</li> <li>• <b>Professional copy edited and designed evaluation report</b> (by November 2018)</li> <li>• <b>Professional copy edited and designed evaluation briefs in EN, FR and SP</b> (by November 2018)</li> <li>• Powerpoint presentation for the Executive Board (TBC)</li> </ul>	<p><b>New York:</b> 1 working day (team leader)</p>	<p>September 2018 - January 2019</p>
--	--	---	--------------------------------------

**G. Management and governance**

25. 25. The responsibility for the management and supervision of the evaluation will rest with the EO evaluation manager. The EO evaluation manager (who will also act as a team member) will have overall responsibility for the management of the evaluation process. The evaluation manager is responsible for ensuring the quality and independence of the evaluation (in line with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines – see **Annex 5**). The main responsibilities of the evaluation manager are:

- prepare the terms of reference
- participate in the procurement process conducted by the Procurement Services Branch of UNFPA as part of the technical evaluation committee
- chair the reference group and convene review meetings with the evaluation team
- supervise and guide the evaluation team all through the evaluation process
- participate in the data collection process (conduct interviews, facilitate group discussions and focus groups) both at inception and data collection phases including in field missions
- review, provide substantive comments and approve the inception report
- review and provide substantive feedback on the country notes and case study reports, as well as draft and final evaluation reports, for quality assurance purposes
- approve the final evaluation report
- disseminate the evaluation results and contribute to learning and knowledge sharing at UNFPA.

26. The progress of the evaluation will be followed closely by the evaluation reference group consisting of members of UNFPA services who are directly interested in the results of this evaluation. The main responsibilities of the reference group are to:

- provide feedback and comments on the terms of reference of the evaluation;
- provide feedback and comments on the inception report
- provide comments and substantive feedback from a technical expert perspective on the draft and final evaluation reports;
- act as the interface between the evaluators and key stakeholders of the evaluation, notably to facilitate access to informants and documentation;
- participate in review meetings with the evaluation team as required;
- play a key role in learning and knowledge sharing from the evaluation results, contributing to disseminating the results of the evaluation as well as to the completion and follow-up of the management response.

#### H. Composition of the team

27. The evaluation team is expected to be composed of 4-5 people, as follows:

- 1 experienced **team leader**, with at least 15 years of experience working in the humanitarian sector, including previous experience leading major evaluations of humanitarian assistance
- 2-3 **evaluators**, with at least 10 years of experience working in the humanitarian sector, as well as significant evaluation experience
- 1 **research assistant**, capable of organizing and analyzing large sets of data in support of the rest of the evaluation team.

28. The evaluation team will collectively bring the below expertise and experience:

- Extensive evaluation experience of humanitarian policies, strategies and programmes and of complex conflict situations, internal displacement, refugee programmes and transition settings;
- Experience with and institutional knowledge of humanitarian UN and NGO actors, the inter-agency mechanisms, such as OCHA and CERF funding, and the IASC;
- Familiarity with the Transformative Agenda (Leadership, Coordination, Accountability to Affected Populations);

- Extensive knowledge of humanitarian law and principles, and experience with using human rights and gender analysis in evaluations;
- Good understanding of UNFPA mandate and processes;
- Technical expertise in (i) sexual and reproductive health; (ii) gender equality; (iii) emergency preparedness and response;
- Extensive regional expertise, and solid knowledge of the regional issues;
- Excellent analytical skills;
- Excellent communication skills (written, spoken) in English;
- Good communication skills (written, spoken) in Arabic and/or languages spoken in the region and countries covered is desirable.

**I. Quality assurance**

29. The evaluation team will conduct the first level of quality assurance for all evaluation products prior to the submission to the UNFPA Evaluation Office.
30. The firm/company is expected to dedicate specific resources to quality assurance efforts that are independent from the evaluation team, and must consider all time, resources, and costs related to this in their technical and financial bid. The bidder must present the quality assurance mechanisms which will be applied throughout the evaluation process as part of the technical offer.
31. The Evaluation Office recommends that the evaluation quality assessment checklist (**Annex 6**) is used as an element of the proposed quality assurance system for the draft and final versions of the evaluation report. The main purpose of this checklist is to ensure that the evaluation report complies with evaluation professional standards.
32. The evaluation manager, with the support of the reference group, will provide a second level of quality assurance.
33. The draft final report will be subject to a third level of quality assurance, through a review by the EO external quality assurance panel.
34. The Director of the Evaluation Office maintains an oversight of the final evaluation reports.
35. Finally, the thematic evaluation report will be subject to assessment by an independent evaluation quality assessment provider using an evaluation quality assessment grid (see **Annex 7**). The evaluation quality assessment grid will be published along with the evaluation report on the Evaluation Office website.

**J. Budget and payment modalities**

36. The budget range for the overall cost of the evaluation is USD 400,000 - USD 450,000. The costs of the evaluation include:
- The evaluation as defined in the Terms of Reference (including other expenses as defined in the Terms of Reference associated with the editing, design (final evaluation report and evaluation briefs) and translation (evaluation brief);
  - The travel related costs for the participation in the reference group meetings, the stakeholder workshop and the presentation to the executive board as well as all field missions.
37. The bidder shall not bear all costs (including any related travel) associated with the preparation and submission of the bid. These cannot be included as a direct cost of the assignment. UNFPA shall in no case be responsible or liable for those costs, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the solicitation process.
38. The vendor will be responsible for the full cost of all travel, including in-country travel for case study country missions (site visits will be determined during the inception phase), accommodation to/from during the full mission period (s) of the consultants, including for national consultants, and security related costs.
39. All travel should be costed for economy class based on the most economical and direct route. Standard daily subsistence allowances should not exceed the UN DSA rates/diem. National consultant residing in the destination city will not be entitled to the payment of travel costs and daily subsistence allowance fees.
40. The maximum cost for travel will be used in the financial evaluation and will be included in the contract. UNFPA reserves the right to request less than the maximum number of visits and/or visits shorter than the indicated number of days, should the project needs change as work progresses. Should this occur, UNFPA will pay only for the actual number of visits and actual duration of visits requested.
41. The payment modalities will be as follows:
- 30% upon acceptance of the draft inception report;
  - 10% upon acceptance of the final inception report;
  - 5% upon acceptance of the final Jordan country note;
  - 5% upon acceptance of the final case study report on the Syria regional response hub;
  - 30% upon acceptance of the draft final evaluation report;

Terms of reference – Evaluation of the UNFPA response to the Syria crisis

- 10% upon acceptance of 4 final country notes (Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, Turkey) and 1 final case study report (on cross-border operations);
- 10% upon acceptance of the final evaluation report (designed and formatted, in English) and evaluation briefs (designed and formatted, in English, French, and Spanish).

Note that no payment will be processed until the corresponding deliverables are formally approved by the evaluation manager.

**Annex 1: Humanitarian Action Evaluation Criteria**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Definition of criterion</b>
Appropriateness	The extent to which humanitarian activities are tailored to local needs, increasing ownership, accountability and cost-effectiveness accordingly. (Replaces the relevance criterion used in development evaluations.)
Effectiveness	The extent to which an activity achieves its purpose, or whether this can be expected to happen on the basis of the outputs.
Efficiency	The outputs – qualitative and quantitative – achieved as a result of inputs.
Impact	The wider effects of the project – social, economic, technical, and environmental – on individuals, gender- and age-groups, communities and institutions. Impacts can be intended and unintended, positive and negative, macro (sector) and micro (household). (This is not exactly the same thing as ‘Impact’ in the results chain.)
Connectedness	The extent to which activities of a short-term emergency nature are carried out in a context that takes longer-term and interconnected problems into account. Replaces the sustainability criterion used in development evaluations.
Coverage	The extent to which major population groups facing life-threatening suffering were reached by humanitarian action.
Coherence	The extent to which security, developmental, trade, and military policies as well as humanitarian policies, are consistent and take into account humanitarian and human rights considerations. (More focused on donor policy, but can also be applied to individual agencies on their own policy coherence.)
Coordination	The extent to which the interventions of different actors are harmonised with each other, promote synergy, avoid gaps, duplication, and resource conflicts. (Often folded into effectiveness.)

Source: Adapted from Buchanan-Smith, M., Cosgrave, J. and Warner, A. (2016) Evaluation of Humanitarian Action Guide. ALNAP. Pp.113-114.

**Annex 2: Outline of the evaluation matrix**

EQ1 : To what extent ...			
Assumptions to be assessed	Indicators	Sources of information	Methods and tools for the data collection
Assumption 1 ...			
Assumption 2			

### **Annex 3: Outline of the inception report**

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms

List of Tables (\*)

List of Figures

#### **1 Introduction**

*Should include: objectives of the evaluation; scope of the evaluation; overview of the evaluation process; purpose of the inception report*

#### **2 Background and context**

*Should include: a description of the context (e.g. key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors) as well as the main programmes and interventions constituting the UNFPA response. Information on any relevant reviews, assessments, audits and/or evaluations previously conducted should be mentioned.*

*This section should detail strategies or approaches to programming as well as discuss cross-cutting issues, including particularly issues relating to human rights and gender equality.*

#### **3 Intervention logic**

*Should include: an in-depth analysis of the intervention logic, i.e., assumptions, causality links and risks underlying UNFPA interventions.*

#### **4 Methodology**

*Should include: rationale for methodological choices description of the methods and tools for data collection, analysis, as well as validation techniques. Detailed information on the instruments for data collection and analysis such as: interview protocols per type of informant; protocol for focus groups; structure and lines of enquiries for the case studies; etc. Description of how the data should be cross-checked and limitations of the exercise and strategies to mitigate them.*

#### **5 Proposed Evaluation Questions**

*Should include: a set of evaluation questions with explanatory comments (rationale; coverage of the issues raised in the ToR); detailed approach to answering the evaluation questions (including assumptions to be assessed, indicators, sources of information and associated data collection methods and tools) in the form of an evaluation matrix (cf. annex 2)*

#### **6 Next Steps**

*Should include: a detailed work plan for the next phases/stages of the evaluation, including detailed plans for the field visits, including the list of interventions for in-depth analysis in the field (explanation of the value added for the visits); team composition for the cases studies including distribution of tasks; logistics for the field phase; the contractor's approach to ensure quality assurance of all evaluation deliverables.*

#### **8 Annexes**

*Should include: portfolio of relevant interventions; evaluation matrix; stakeholder map; interview and focus group protocols; detailed structure of the case studies; bibliography; list of persons met; terms of reference*

*(\*) Tables, graphs and diagrams should be numbered and have a title.*

**Annex 4: Outline of the final report**

Number of pages: 50-70 pages without the annexes

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms

List of Tables (\*)

List of Figures

**Executive Summary:** 3-5 pages: objectives, short summary of the methodology and key conclusions and recommendations

**1 Introduction**

*Should include:* purpose of the evaluation; mandate and strategy of UNFPA in the response to the Syria crisis

**2 Methodology**

*Should include:* overview of the evaluation process; methods and tools used for data collection and analysis; evaluation questions and assumptions to be assessed; limitations to data collection; approach to triangulation and validation

**3 Findings**

*Should include for each response to evaluation question:* evaluation criteria covered; summary of the response; detailed response

**4 Conclusions**

*Should include for each conclusion:* summary; origin (which evaluation question(s) the conclusion is based on); detailed conclusion

**5 Recommendations**

*Should include for each recommendation:* summary; priority level (very high/high/medium); target (business unit(s) to which the recommendation is addressed); origin (which conclusion(s) the recommendation is based on); operational implications. Recommendations must be: linked to the conclusions; clustered, prioritized; accompanied by timing for implementation; useful and operational

**Annexes** shall be confined to a separate volume

*Should include:* country notes; case study reports; evaluation matrix; portfolio of interventions; methodological instruments used (survey, focus groups, interviews etc.); bibliography; list of people interviewed; terms of reference.

*(\*) Tables, Graphs, diagrams, maps etc. presented in the final evaluation report must also be provided to the Evaluation Office in their original version (in Excel, PowerPoint or word files, etc.).*

The final version of the evaluation report shall be presented in a way that enables publication (professionally designed and copy edited) without need for any further editing (see section below). Please note that, for the final report, the company should share the files in Adobe Indesign CC software, with text presented in two columns with no hyphenation. Further details on design will be provided by UNFPA Evaluation Office in due course.

### **Annex 5: Code of conduct and norms for evaluation in the UN system**

Evaluations of UNFPA-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous and evaluators must demonstrate personal and professional integrity. In particular:

1. To avoid **conflict of interest** and undue pressure, evaluators need to be **independent**. The members of the evaluation team must not have been directly responsible for the policy/programming-setting, design, or overall management of the subject under evaluation, nor should they expect to be in the near future. Evaluators must have no vested interest and should have the full freedom to conduct impartially their evaluative work, without potential negative effects on their career development. They must be able to express their opinion in a free manner.
2. The evaluators should protect the anonymity and **confidentiality of individual informants**. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are **not expected to evaluate individuals**, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
3. At times, evaluations uncover **evidence of wrongdoing**. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body.
4. Evaluators should be **sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs** and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to, and **address issues of discrimination and gender equality**. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the dignity and self-worth of all stakeholders.
5. Evaluators are responsible for the **clear, accurate and fair** written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, evidence based findings, conclusions and recommendations.

**A declaration of absence of conflict of interest must be signed by each member of the team and shall be annexed to the offer.** No team member should have participated in the preparation, programming or implementation of UNFPA interventions on GBV during the period under evaluation.

---

[ Please date, sign and write "Read and approved" ]

See Code of conduct for evaluation in the United Nations System at:

<http://www.unevaluation.org/search/index.jsp?q=UNEG+Ethical+Guidelines>

See Norms for evaluation in the United Nations System at:

[http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc\\_id=21](http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=21)

**Annex 6: Evaluation quality assessment check-list**

<b>1. Structure and Clarity of the Report</b> To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.
<b>2. Executive Summary</b> To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section including key elements of the evaluation, such as objectives, methodology and conclusions and recommendations.
<b>3. Design and Methodology</b> To provide a clear explanation of the methods and tools used including the rationale for the methodological choice justified. To ensure constraints and limitations are made explicit (including limitations applying to interpretations and extrapolations; robustness of data sources, etc.)
<b>4. Reliability of Data</b> To ensure sources of data are clearly stated for both primary and secondary data. To provide explanation on the credibility of primary (e.g. interviews and focus groups) and secondary (e.g. reports) data established and limitations made explicit.
<b>5. Findings and Analysis</b> To ensure sound analysis and credible evidence-based findings. To ensure interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions; contextual factors are identified; cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained.
<b>6. Validity of conclusions</b> To ensure conclusions are based on credible findings and convey evaluators' unbiased judgment of the intervention. Ensure conclusions are prioritised and clustered and include: summary; origin (which evaluation question(s) the conclusion is based on); detailed conclusion.
<b>7. Usefulness and clarity of recommendations</b> To ensure recommendations flow logically from conclusions; are targeted, realistic and operationally-feasible; and are presented in priority order. Recommendations include: Summary; Priority level (very high/high/medium); Target (administrative unit(s) to which the recommendation is addressed); Origin (which conclusion(s) the recommendation is based on); Operational implications.
<b>8. SWAP - Gender</b> To ensure the evaluation approach is aligned with the SWAP.

**Annex 7: Evaluation quality assessment grid**



**Organizational unit:**

**Year of report:**

**Title of evaluation report:**

**Overall quality of report:**

**Good**

**Date of assessment:**

**Overall comments:**

[insert text]

**Assessment Levels**



**Very good:**

strong, above average, best practice



**Good:**

satisfactory, respectable



**Fair:**

with some weaknesses, still acceptable



**Unsatisfactory:**

weak, does not meet minimal quality standards

<b>Quality Assessment Criteria</b>	<i>Insert <u>assessment level</u> followed by main <u>comments</u>. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)</i>		
<b>I. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Undefined</b>
<i>To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly</i>		Comment:	
<b>1. Is the report easy to read and understand (i.e. written in an accessible language appropriate for the intended audience) with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors?</b>	<Select one>		
2. Is the report of a reasonable length? (maximum pages for the main report, excluding annexes: 60 for institutional evaluations; 70 for CPEs; 80 for thematic evaluations)	<Select one>		
<b>3. Is the report structured in a logical way? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?</b>	<Select one>		
4. Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography; a list of interviewees; the evaluation matrix; methodological tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys) as well as information on the stakeholder consultation process?	<Select one>		
<i>Executive summary</i>			
<b>5. Is an executive summary included in the report, written as a stand-alone section and presenting the main results of the evaluation?</b>	<Select one>		
6. Is there a clear structure of the executive summary, (i.e. i) Purpose, including intended audience(s); ii) Objectives and brief description of intervention; iii) Methodology; iv) Main conclusions; v) Recommendations)?	<Select one>		
7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	<Select one>		

<b>2. Design and Methodology</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Undefined</b>
<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>		Comment:	
1. Does the evaluation describe the target audience for the evaluation?	<Select one>		
<b>2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?</b>	<Select one>		
<b>3. Does the evaluation report describe the reconstruction of the intervention logic and/or theory of change, and assess the adequacy of these?</b>	<Select one>		
<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>			
<b>4. Is the evaluation framework clearly described in the text and in the evaluation matrix? Does the evaluation matrix establish the evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data sources and methods for data collection?</b>	<Select one>		
5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	<Select one>		
6. Is there a comprehensive stakeholder map? Is the stakeholder consultation process clearly described (in particular, does it include the consultation of key stakeholders on draft recommendations)?	<Select one>		
7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	<Select one>		
8. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? (Does the report discuss how any bias has been overcome?)	<Select one>		
9. Is the sampling strategy described?	<Select one>		
10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	<Select one>		
	Yes		

11. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights)?		
--	--	--

<b>3. Reliability of Data</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Undefined</b>
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>		Comment:	
<b>1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?</b>	<Select one>		
<b>2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?</b>	<Select one>		
3. Did the evaluation make explicit any possible limitations (bias, data gaps etc.) in primary and secondary data sources and if relevant, explained what was done to minimize such issues?	<Select one>		
4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	<Select one>		

<b>4. Analysis and Findings</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Undefined</b>
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>		Comment:	
<b>1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?</b>	<Select one>		
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	<Select one>		
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	<Select one>		
4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?	<Select one>		

<b>5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?</b>	<Select one>	
6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	<Select one>	
<b>7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?</b>	<Select one>	
8. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?	<Select one>	

<b>5. Conclusions</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Undefined</b>
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>		Comment:	
<b>1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?</b>	<Select one>		
2. Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the programme/initiative/system being evaluated?	<Select one>		
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	<Select one>		

<b>6. Recommendations</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Undefined</b>
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>		Comment:	
<b>1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?</b>	<Select one>		
<b>2. Are the recommendations clearly written, targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?</b>	<Select one>		

3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial?	<Select one>	
4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed?	<Select one>	
5. Are the recommendations prioritised and clearly presented to facilitate appropriate management response and follow up on each specific recommendation?	<Select one>	

<b>7. Gender</b>	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level:	<b>Undefined</b>
<i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)</i>		Comment:	
1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?	<Select one>		
2. Do evaluation criteria and evaluation questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved?	<Select one>		
3. Have gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques been selected?	<Select one>		
4. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	<Select one>		

(\*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted (in correlation with the calculation in the tool and totalling the scores 11-12 = very good, 8-10 = good, 4-7 = Fair, 0-3=unsatisfactory).

(\*\*) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).

0 = Not at all integrated. Applies when none of the elements under a criterion are met.

1 = Partially integrated. Applies when some minimal elements are met but further progress is needed and remedial action to meet the standard is required.

2 = Satisfactorily integrated. Applies when a satisfactory level has been reached and many of the elements are met but still improvement could be done.

3 = Fully integrated. Applies when all of the elements under a criterion are met, used and fully integrated in the evaluation and no remedial action is required.

**Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment**

	<b>Assessment Levels (*)</b>			
<b>Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*)</b>	<b>Very good</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
1. Structure and clarity of reporting, including executive summary (7)				
2. Design and methodology (13)				
3. Reliability of data (11)				
4. Analysis and findings (40)				
5. Conclusions (11)				
6. Recommendations (11)				
7. Integration of gender (7)				
<b>Total scoring points</b>				
<b>Overall assessment level of evaluation report</b>				
	<b>Very good</b> very confident to use	<b>Good</b> confident to use	<b>Fair</b> use with caution	<b>Unsatisfactory</b> not confident to use

(\*) (a) Insert scoring points associated with criteria in corresponding column (e.g. - if 'Analysis and findings' has been assessed as 'Good', enter 40 into 'Good' column.

(b) Assessment level with highest 'total scoring points' determines 'Overall assessment level of evaluation report'. Write corresponding assessment level in cell (e.g. 'Fair').

(c) Use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour.

If the overall assessment is 'Fair', please explain

- How it can be used?

- What aspects to be cautious about?

**Where relevant, please explain the overall assessment Very good, Good or Unsatisfactory**

**Consideration of significant constraints**

The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances:

Yes

No

If yes, please explain:

**Annex 8: Cover for the inception report and for the final report**

UNFPA logo (there should be no other logo/ name of company)

Title of the evaluation:

Title of the report (example: Inception Report)

Evaluation Office

Date

The following information should appear on page 2:

- Name of the evaluation manager
- Names of the evaluation team

Copyright © UNFPA 2018, all rights reserved.

The analysis and recommendations of this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations Population Fund. This is an independent publication by the Evaluation Office of UNFPA.

Any enquiries about this report should be addressed to:

Evaluation Office, United Nations Population Fund, e-mail: [evb@unfpa.org](mailto:evb@unfpa.org)

For further information on the evaluation please consult the Evaluation Office webpage:

<http://www.unfpa.org/evaluation>

Editing: xxx

Design: XXX

Cover photos provided by: XXXX

See examples of evaluation reports at: <http://unfpa.org/public/home/about/Evaluation>