Evaluation of UNICEF’s Response to the Rohingya Crisis in Bangladesh
Terms of Reference

Introduction

This terms of reference describes the Evaluation Office’s plan to conduct an independent rapid and timely humanitarian evaluation of UNICEF’s Response to the Rohingya Crisis in Bangladesh. This evaluation will have a limited scope: it will assess the first six months of the response to the Level 3 emergency with a focus on four programming sectors. This terms of reference outlines the purpose of the evaluation, its objectives, scope, and the questions it will seek to answer, the approach and methods to be used. This document also describes the composition of the evaluation team, the desired profile of team members, tasks, and the timeline for the evaluation.

Background

Since the late 1970s, nearly one million Rohingya people have fled Myanmar, due to persecution.¹ According to the International Organization for Migration, more than 87,000 Rohingya fled to Bangladesh between October 2016 when violence broke out, and July 2017.² The influx increased dramatically in August 2017. Since then, nearly 688,000 refugees have arrived in Bangladesh almost 400,000 of whom are children.³ With the new influx, 1.2 million, both refugees and Bangladeshi host communities, are in need of urgent humanitarian assistance including critical life-saving interventions. Background information on the situation as well as the wider response is available on Relief Web and Humanitarian Response.

UNICEF had begun providing humanitarian assistance since the influx in October 2016. On 20 September 2017, UNICEF formally activated the Level 3 emergency response. UNICEF issued a revised response plan that prioritized life-saving interventions to address immediate and urgent needs in affected Rohingya children, women and adolescents. Shortly thereafter, the Resident Coordinator issued the Joint Response Plan which describes how all humanitarian actors, including UNICEF will respond.⁴

The focus of this evaluation is UNICEF’s Response Plan. It outlines six programme areas:

i) WASH, which focuses on the immediate provision of safe water, basic sanitation and community engagement around hygiene practices

ii) Nutrition, which focuses on treating children with severe acute malnutrition through community-based management of acute malnutrition (CMAM) using ready-to-use therapeutic food (RUTF) and providing IYCF counselling to pregnant and lactating women;

² Ibid.
⁴ Humanitarian Response Plan. Available at: https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/2017_HRP_Bangladesh_041017_2.pdf
iii) Health, which focuses on acute watery diarrhea (AWD), support to a mass vaccination campaigns for cholera prevention, and immunization of children against measles and other vaccine preventable diseases; as well as preventative and curative health services and strengthening the health system;

iv) Child Protection, which focuses on delivering psychosocial support, identification and case management of unaccompanied and separated children, strengthening the existing child protection mechanisms, responding to gender-based violence, and service provision for adolescents.

v) Education, which focuses on providing early learning and non-formal basic education; and,

vi) C4D/Community Engagement and Accountability, a cross-cutting component which focuses on life-saving information on services and household level practices; community engagement for facilitating positive behaviour development and change; as well as increased accountability to the affected population.

UNICEF’s original appeal also proposed a component on Humanitarian Social Protection, which was later excluded from the 6-month Humanitarian Response Plan. During the emergency, there have been outbreaks of measles and diphtheria to which UNICEF has responded. Preventive measures for avoiding a cholera epidemic were also undertaken.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has been assigned to coordinate the Rohingya response with support from the Bangladesh Army and Border Guard Bangladesh (BGB). UNICEF is working closely with key humanitarian actors at the national and sub-national level, including with Government line ministries.

While the cluster system has not been officially activated, sectoral coordination is taking place. UNICEF leads the coordination of the nutrition sector and child protection sub-sector. It co-leads the education sector with Save the Children and co-leads the WASH sector with Action Contre la Faim.

**Purpose and Objectives**

This a ‘Rapid and Timely Humanitarian Evaluation’ meaning it will be completed in a short time frame with the primary purpose of **generating lessons to improve UNICEF’s response to the on-going emergency**. For this reason, the findings of the evaluation will be shared with management as they emerge. At the discretion of the team leader, the inception report will contain an annex of preliminary findings. Both missions to the country will conclude with a debriefing session with management. The evaluation team will provide a set of draft recommendations to strengthen UNICEF’s response to the current situation. The team will also lead recommendations workshop at which the recommendations will be discussed and refined with staff from BCO/ROSA/NYHQ. This evaluation is planned to inform the Mid-Year Review which will take place in June 2018. The secondary purposes of this evaluation are to help hold UNICEF accountable for its response, and to assist UNICEF, its Executive Board and the international humanitarian community better understand how to program in situations of rapid mass displacement and rural resettlement.
The objectives of the evaluation are as follows:

i) to assess the adequacy of the emergency response plan, how well it was designed according to needs of the population, and (with a focus on certain elements of the child protection, education, WASH, and nutrition sectors) how well its operations were scaled up.

ii) within the areas of child protection, education, WASH and nutrition evaluate, as deemed relevant, effectiveness, efficiency, timeliness, coverage and quality of UNICEF’s response.

iii) to determine how well UNICEF worked with others (including implementing partners, other agencies and government)

iv) to determine how well UNICEF initiated efforts towards the long term while addressing the current humanitarian challenge (bridging the humanitarian-development ‘divide’)

v) Based on the above, to identify areas of strengths and weakness and actions to improve the response.

Intended users and use

The primary users of the evaluation are UNICEF staff in the Bangladesh Country Office and staff supporting the response in the Regional Office in South Asia and UNICEF Head Quarters (HQ). Other users include government stakeholders, partners, and donors.

The evaluation will have a strong utilisation focus, and is expected to capture lessons and make conclusions that will be used to strengthen the on-going response. To this end, an in-country debriefing session will be held to keep stakeholders abreast of what the evaluation team has learned during the data collection mission. After the draft report has been prepared, there will be a recommendations workshop, involving UNICEF managers at HQ/RO/BCO to fine tune and adjust the draft recommendations to encourage uptake and use of the findings.

Scope

Programmatic focus: The evaluation will not look at the entire response. As mentioned above this is a ‘Rapid and Timely Humanitarian Evaluation’ (R&THE), meaning it needs to be undertaken within a short time frame with a primary purpose of generating lessons to improve UNICEF’s response to the on-going emergency. The evaluation will focus on four following sectors: child protection, education, WASH, and nutrition.

These sectors were selected for two reasons. First, there are the areas in which UNICEF leads or co-leads the coordination of the responses. As mentioned above, UNICEF leads the coordination of the nutrition sector and child protection sub-sector. It co-leads the education sector with Save the Children and co-leads the WASH sector with Action Contre la Faim.

Second, these are the areas in which UNICEF carries much of the responsibility for implementation. For example, within nutrition, UNICEF is responsible for more than
50% of the target to treat children under five for SAM and more than 50% of the target to reach pregnant and lactating women with counselling on infant and young child feeding practices. It responsible for 100% of the target for multi-micronutrient supplementation.\(^5\) UNICEF has the largest funding requirements within the nutrition sector.\(^6\) According to the Joint Response Plan, WASH is one of the largest areas of intervention (by funding amount) and among the partners contributing to work in the sector, UNICEF requires the most funding. It is responsible for more than 50% of two WASH targets. In education UNICEF requires more than 50% of the funding. It is responsible for more than 50% of two (out of three) targets. Finally, out of the four sectoral targets in UNICEF’s response plan for Child Protection, it is responsible for the majority of each.

Cross-cutting issues such as gender, adolescents, C4D and accountability to affected populations will be considered within these sectors, where appropriate.\(^7\)

**Important note: within each sector, the programmatic scope will be further limited during the inception phase. The evaluation team, after consulting with UNICEF staff and senior management, will identify the priority areas for focused attention.** For example, within nutrition the team may focus on SAM.

While the programmatic focus will be on the four sectors outlined above, the evaluation will consider UNICEF’s work within the broader context. However, issues related to repatriation will be excluded.

**Operational Focus:** The evaluation will look at how well supply, funding, HR, HPM, and knowledge management contributed to results within the programmatic areas above.

**Geographic and population focus:** The geographic focus of the evaluation will be Cox’s Bazar, particularly the makeshift camps and host communities located in Leda, Kutupalong, Shamlapur, Balukhali, Ukhiya and Teknaf. This will include Rohingya who have arrived since 2016, those who reside in camp settings, those integrated within Bangladeshi communities, and vulnerable host communities in identified locations.

We note that UNICEF’s response to the Rohingya crisis extends beyond the borders of Bangladesh to the Rakhine State in Myanmar. However, the focus of this evaluation


\(^6\) Humanitarian Response Plan

\(^7\) Additionally, it is important to note the Communication and Community Engagement Initiative, a partnership between UNICEF, OCHA, the IFRC, CDAC Network and several other partners, is planning a real-time evaluation of its work in Bangladesh. The evaluation will take stock of the work done, examining how efficient coordination has been and whether the need for technical support to other sectors have been met.
will be limited to evaluating the Level 3 Response which was declared only in Bangladesh.

Temporal focus: The evaluation will focus primarily on the response from the end of August 2017 when the influx of Rohingya to Cox’s Bazar increased dramatically to the present. It will also analyse the preparedness actions before the L3 declaration.

Evaluation Questions

The following questions may be revised or refined during the inception phase of the evaluation.

1. What has been UNICEF’s contribution to the wider effort to provide humanitarian assistance to vulnerable people who reside in camp settings, are integrated within Bangladeshi communities, and in host communities? How has the wider effort impacted UNICEF’s work?

Objective i): assess the adequacy of the UNICEF response plan, how well it was designed according to the needs of the population, and (with a focus on certain elements of the child protection, education, WASH, and nutrition sectors) how well its operations were scaled up.

2. How well prepared was UNICEF for the influx of refugees?
   a) How does the UNICEF response timeline map against the influx of refugees?
      How fast was UNICEF able to scale-up operations, particularly in child protection, WASH and nutrition?
   b) What factors contributed to or hindered the scale-up?

3. In the four areas of focus, how appropriate have UNICEF’s strategy and programmatic choices been for responding to the crisis?
   a) What have been UNICEF’s strategies in the four sectors? (descriptive)
   b) How relevant were UNICEF’s planned interventions to the needs of the population? Taking into account UNICEF’s mandate and the division of labour established though the sector coordination system, and constraints encountered how well did UNICEF prioritize its areas of intervention? Are there areas in which there are gaps in programming? If so, what are the reasons for this?
   c) Has the strategy for each for the four sectors been clear from the outset, and modified (as appropriate) given the fast-changing circumstances, over time?
   d) How were programming priorities determined? What was the quality of the situation analyses / UN needs assessments / analysis of caseloads on which UNICEF planned its interventions? How did UNICEF participate in the needs assessments? Where they participatory? How were risks identified?
e) How well were the CCCs\(^8\) contextualized?
f) Does the strategy include adequate contingency planning (compare with established best practices and situation analyses)?

**Objective ii): Within the areas of child protection, education, WASH and nutrition evaluate, as deemed relevant, effectiveness, efficiency, timeliness, coverage and quality of UNICEF’s response**

4. To what extent has UNICEF’s programmatic response in child protection, education, WASH and nutrition
   a) Been **effective**? (in achieving stated objectives)
   b) Been **timely and proportionate**? (in scaling-up for adequate coverage)
   c) Been **of high quality**? (consistent with relevant standards & policies i.e. CCCs and Sphere Standards)
   d) **Delivered for different groups**? (according to disability, gender, adolescents, ethnicity, religion, caste, refugee/host-community)
   e) Been **accountable to affected populations**? (in an effective, pro-active and culturally respectful way)
   f) **Efficient**? (compared to alternatives)

(and what were the constraining or enabling factors?)

5. How well supported has the UNICEF programmatic response been?
   a) How well was the programmatic response of the four focus areas supported by supply, funding, monitoring and knowledge management?
   b) How have the L3 SSOPs\(^9\) been applied and with what effect?
   c) How well did the surge mechanism work?
   d) How well was the response supported by different levels of the organization?
   e) Were the accountabilities between offices clear and did the management arrangement work well?

**Objective iii: determine how well UNICEF worked with others (including implementing partners, other agencies and government)**

6. How well has UNICEF performed its **system-wide coordination, leadership and advocacy roles**?
   a) How well did UNICEF lead and coordinate the sectors (de facto clusters), build coalitions? What were the constraints and how were these addressed?
   b) How well did it influence the wider response through its advocacy with the HCT and with government?

---


7. How well has UNICEF worked with implementing partners to deliver the programmatic response?
   a) Who are UNICEF’s implementing partners (in the four focus sectors)? (descriptive)
   b) Did UNICEF identify and establish partners the right partners to execute its response plan?
   c) What were the constraints? How were these addressed?
   d) To what extent did UNICEF provide adequate training/capacity building, monitor and address partner performance and establish minimum standards?
   e) To what extent did UNICEF build capacities of its implementing partners to strengthen resilience and preparedness in the programme sectors?

Objective iv: to determine how well UNICEF has initiated efforts towards the long term while addressing the current humanitarian challenge (bridging the humanitarian-development ‘divide’)

8. How well has UNICEF initiated efforts to address long term goals while responding to the current challenges?
   a) How effective are the efforts, particularly in education and child protection, to link the emergency response to longer-term development goals?
   b) What steps are being taken to strengthen resilience and preparedness in the programme sectors?
   c) How well is the emergency response strengthening national/local systems?

Objective v: Based on the above, to identify areas of strengths and weakness and actions to improve the response.

9. Overall, what effects did UNICEF contribute to?
   a) What have been key success factors and limiting factors?
   b) What actions are required now in order to improve the response?

Approach and Methods
This evaluation will use a methodology the Evaluation Office called ‘Rapid and Timely Humanitarian Evaluations’ (R&THE). In R&THE, the phases of more traditional evaluations are compressed. Essentially, there are three phases: 1) scoping, inception and preliminary data collection, 2) data collection and verification which will result in the sharing of preliminary findings, 3) report writing, recommendation development and dissemination. All three phases will take place within three months of contracting consultants. An additional element of R&THE is that an Evaluation Office staff member will be embedded in the evaluation team, as a team member.
The evaluation will rely, where relevant, on the Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action as its framework.\textsuperscript{10} It will primarily use qualitative methods and quantitative methods to answer the evaluation questions, taking care to verify data and triangulate all findings.

While recognizing the constraints of time, and being sensitive to the burden an evaluation can place on staff response, it will start with existing information and analysis. This will include undertaking a document review of programme reports, monitoring data, situation analyses, existing baseline data, meeting minutes, SITREPS, the after-action review, notes from staff missions, and programme information that is available at the BCO, the RO or within HQ Divisions. In addition to the document review, the evaluation will collect qualitative primary data. This will include qualitative and quantitative data collection from the affected communities as well as key informant interviews with current and former staff and partners in HQ, ROSA, BCO and Cox’s Bazar. The methods and sampling framework will be developed during the inception phase.

**Limitations of the evaluation**

The following limitations of the evaluation can be identified at this early stage:

1. The evaluation is limited to the response in Bangladesh where the L3 has been declared which means it will not be able to provide UNICEF with a complete picture with regard to its response to the overall Rohingya crisis.
2. Given the constraints of time, not all sectors will be looked at. Despite that UNICEF has a large role to play in health, work in this sector will not be included. C4D and engagement with communities will be looked at but not as a standalone sector, rather through the work being done in sectors under consideration. Similarly gender and adolescents will be considered within the sectors.
3. Despite that repatriation is an important issue for future programming, it falls outside the scope of this evaluation.
4. Monsoon season may affect the evaluation team’s ability to travel to CXB and the availability of staff to meet with the evaluation team might be reduced. During the inception phase a contingency plan will be developed.

**Management and Governance Arrangements**

Given the Rohingya crisis has been declared a Level 3 emergency, the Evaluation Office will manage the evaluation but in close collaboration with the Bangladesh Country Office, the South Asia Regional Office, and relevant HQ Divisions, per the forthcoming Evaluation Policy. The Senior Evaluation Specialist for humanitarian

\textsuperscript{10} CCC details available at: [https://www.unicef.org/publications/files/CCC_042010.pdf](https://www.unicef.org/publications/files/CCC_042010.pdf)
evaluation will manage this process, under the guidance of the Evaluation Director. The Evaluation Office will commission a team of external independent consultants to undertake the evaluation, who will be supported by an Evaluation Specialist from the Evaluation Office. The Evaluation Office is ultimately responsible for the process and final quality of the evaluation.

A small Reference Group for the evaluation has been established to ensure the relevance, accuracy and thus credibility and utility of the evaluation. The Reference Group’s main responsibility will be to review and comment on key evaluation outputs (i.e. this TOR, the inception report, emerging findings, and the draft and final reports). However, it will play an advisory role only; final decisions on the evaluation process and quality assurance of outputs rests with the Evaluation Office. The reference group will communicate primarily through email. When necessary, virtual meetings will be organized.

The Bangladesh Country Office will be responsible for hosting the evaluation team, providing a work space, and arranging interviews with key stakeholders. It will also assist with locating documentation and materials.

Ethics

The evaluation team will adhere to the UN Evaluation Group Norms and Standards for Evaluation,¹¹ the UN Evaluation Group Ethical Guidelines,¹² and the UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis.¹³ It should be noted that because the evaluation team will collect data from vulnerable groups, the methodology and associated data collection tools (described in the inception report) will be reviewed by an Ethical Review Board. The Evaluation Office will facilitate this process.

Quality Assessment

Per the Evaluation Office procedures, the final report will be shared with and rated for quality by an external body as part of the Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System.¹⁴

Timeframe, Tasks and Deliverables

The evaluation will be undertaken from March 2018 to June 2018. The table on the following page shows the dates for various tasks and deliverables.

---

¹⁴ https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/indexGEROS.html
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Tasks &amp; Deliverables</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Compiling of documentary archive</td>
<td>Evaluation Office to lead and ask for assistance, when necessary, from ROSA and BCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Dissemination and use plan developed</td>
<td>EO with help of reference group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team contracted – March 10</td>
<td>Background reading and desk review</td>
<td>Evaluation team with assistance of EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10</td>
<td>Desk review, plan for inception mission including data collection tools, inception report outline submitted.</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 11 – March 22 [note, these dates are tentative and will remain so until the team is contracted]</td>
<td>Inception mission to BCO and Cox’s Bazar, (possibly also ROSA) including presentation to all key stakeholders. Photos and videos produced to assist with dissemination.</td>
<td>Evaluation team, EO staff member, BCO/CXB to host</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 26</td>
<td>Draft Inception Report submitted, data collection begins</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 26 – April 2</td>
<td>Review and comment on Inception Report</td>
<td>Evaluation Office, Reference Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6</td>
<td>Final Inception Report submitted, sent to Ethical Review Board</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15 – May 3</td>
<td>Data collection mission to BCO and Cox’s Bazar, (possibly also ROSA) concluding with onsite debriefing Photos and videos produced to assist with dissemination.</td>
<td>Evaluation team, EO staff member, and possibly reference group member, BCO/CXB to host</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3 – May 18</td>
<td>Data analysis and report writing</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18</td>
<td>First Draft Report submitted</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18 - 25</td>
<td>Review and comment on draft report</td>
<td>Evaluation Office, Reference Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 28 – June 1</td>
<td>Address feedback in draft report, Team Leader to organize and lead a workshop to discuss report and finalize recommendations</td>
<td>Evaluation team, participation in workshop: all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of June 4</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Team Composition and Responsibilities

UNICEF will recruit a team of six external consultants to conduct the evaluation: one team leader, three senior evaluators and two national consultants. Individuals that meet the following requirements, and are available for the evaluation period indicated, are invited to apply. \textit{Individual contracts will be issued to each team member.}

The team leader will commit to working on this evaluation full time from contracting to the week of June 4, 2018. S/he will be awarded a contract for 60 days. S/he will be responsible for managing and leading the evaluation team, in designing the evaluation, undertaking the data collection and analysis, conducting the debriefing session and recommendations workshop, as well as preparing the evaluation deliverables and reports.

The three senior evaluators will be awarded contracts for 40 days each. They will be responsible for helping design the evaluation, undertaking the data collection and analysis, and drafting elements of the report.

The two national consultants will be awarded contracts for 30 days each. They will be responsible for carrying out data collection in the field and assist with data analysis. They will also be responsible for translation, where required.

Required Qualifications

\textit{Team Leader}

i) extensive experience in emergency response, preferably with a UN agency
ii) experience evaluating humanitarian action, evaluating L3 emergencies preferred
iii) knowledge of latest methods and approaches in humanitarian evaluation, especially participatory methods and accountability to affected populations
iv) familiarity with UNICEF’s emergency response, including the Core Commitments to Children preferred
v) excellent oral and written communication skills
vi) knowledge of qualitative and quantitative methods
vii) experience evaluating refugee response preferred
viii) experience working in South Asia preferred
ix) experience managing a team
x) expertise in WASH, Education, Child Protection or Nutrition
xi) experience with the ethics of evidence generation; experience collecting data from vulnerable groups; familiarity with ethical safeguards

\textit{Three Senior Evaluators}
i) extensive knowledge of one or more of the sectors or themes being evaluated: WASH, Education, Child Protection or Nutrition

ii) extensive experience in emergency response, preferably with a UN agency, including knowledge of HR, supply, budget management, etc.

iii) a minimum of five years’ experience evaluating humanitarian action

iv) knowledge of latest methods and approaches in humanitarian evaluation (as evidenced by recent publications about new methods or evaluations that employ new methods)

v) familiarity with UNICEF’s emergency response, including the Core Commitments to Children

vi) knowledge of qualitative and quantitative methods

vii) experience with the ethics of evidence generation; experience collecting data from vulnerable groups; familiarity with ethical safeguards

Two National consultants

i) experience working on research, studies or evaluations

ii) experience in primary data collection in affected communities; including leading focus group discussion and participatory methods

iii) qualitative data analysis skills

iv) experience in programme monitoring

v) fluency in Rohingya and Chittagong languages is an advantage

vi) experience with the ethics of evidence generation; experience collecting data from vulnerable groups; familiarity with ethical safeguards

How to apply

Interested individuals should send the following by midnight EST on February 25, 2018 to evalofficeapplications@unicef.org, with copy to Koorosh Raffi (kraffii@unicef.org) and Laura Olsen (lolsen@unicef.org). Candidates should indicate which position they are applying for (team leader, senior evaluation consultant, national consultant) in the subject of the email.

a) Cover letter, indicating the position you are applying for, availability, qualifications and daily fee.

b) CV/Resume

c) completed Personal History Profile (P11); a blank P11 can be found at http://www.unicef.org/about/employ/files/P11.doc

d) For team leader and senior consultants, an example of previous work of a similar nature
For any questions or clarifications, kindly contact: Laura Olsen, Evaluation Specialist; (lolsen@unicef.org) with copy to Koorosh Raffii, Senior Evaluation Specialist, (kraffii@unicef.org).