1. Overall Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of this formative evaluation is to review and assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation of the programme on the prevention and reduction of incidents of violence against children in the school setting and the creation of a safe educational environment in Kyrgyzstan. Furthermore, it is to evaluate the role, contribution and impact of every component of the programme in order to feed the process of further improvement, adjustment/revision, and finalization of the programme. Evaluation results and recommendations will inform key decision makers such as Ministry of Education and Science, other line ministries (Ministry of Social Development, Ministry of Interior, and Ministry of Health), schools including those piloting the programme (pupils, teachers), parents and local communities as well as the wider population. The results will be shared with media and donor community in order to garner more support for child violence prevention initiative and its potential scale up by the Ministry of Education and Science.

2. Background

Country Context

Kyrgyzstan is a former Soviet country in mountainous Central Asian region. The country has a population of five million, of which ethnic Kyrgyz make up the majority (71%); while Uzbeks (14%) and Russians (8%) are the largest minorities. The population is heavily concentrated in rural areas of the country, and only one-third of the people are living in cities. In terms of vulnerability, children from rural and remote areas are more prone to poverty, ill-health, and abandonment. Children in rural areas are also often vulnerable to migration of parents, natural disasters and poor access to social services including health care and education. Nearly half of the children in Kyrgyzstan live in poverty.1 In 2010, the Southern part of the country was affected by interethnic violence that resulted in displacement of over 300,000 people.

Poverty and inequity are concentrated in certain districts, because of lack of access to basic social services, underfunding and strong financial and social disincentives for professionals to work in remote areas.

---

1 UNICEF. Situation Assessment of Children in the Kyrgyz Republic, 2011
Even where the Government of Kyrgyzstan does offer Soviet-era social welfare and benefit systems, these are no longer adequate. In one estimate, the “Monthly Benefit” Programme – the only general benefit option available to poor families with children – at best currently reaches 10% of the population and only 38% of the poorest quintile. In any case, benefit levels have not kept up with inflation in food and fuel costs, covering only 7% of basic household consumption needs. The benefit is difficult to obtain and requires excessive documentation. The absence of birth certificates is a particular problem for many of the poorest families as is the expense of travelling to district headquarters to authorize or notarize their documents before they can become eligible even for the meagre benefits available.

Remittances from citizens working abroad in Russia and Kazakhstan help but are usually barely enough to raise living standards to acceptable levels, while also being unreliable, seasonal and insecure. Estimates vary but it may be that as many as 20% of the male population in poorer households may be away at any one time, with labour migration from the south generally acknowledged to be particularly prevalent. Absences have adverse side effects. Men are away for long periods, affecting agriculture and livelihoods and adversely weakening family cohesion, particularly by removing constraints on gang culture as a provider of discipline and role models for youth.

Violence against children is a widespread problem in Kyrgyzstan, which happens silently as the families and communities struggle to acknowledge the problem of violence against children in the Kyrgyz society.

In 2010, UNICEF commissioned a national study on the prevalence and dynamics of violence against children in the school setting. According to the findings of the study 83% of children reported about the occurrence of violence in secondary schools. Among the most prevalent forms is psychological violence, school bullying, exploitation and physical violence. Violence exists between pupils and between teachers and pupils within schools as well as between pupils of different schools. In regards to gender dimensions, both boys and girls are subject to various forms of violence in/between schools. The full report (in Russian) is available at www.baldar.kg.

Violence inflicts not only physical wounds but also leaves mental scars on children. It affects their physical and mental health, compromise their ability to learn and socialize and undermine their development and growth to their full potential. It can also hinder school attendance as found by the UNICEF study on out of school children. Violence may be a result of a cycle of inequities, such as poverty and family vulnerabilities and/or distress, poor parenting skills and lack of awareness, abandonment and negligence to child wellbeing.

The above figures are a wake-up call and require carefully planned responses to reduce and prevent violence against and among children. It requires the development of an appropriate legal framework and social policies to ensure an effective response to child abuse and neglect, as well as programs and services for the prevention and protection to assist child victims and parents, and strategies to bring about changes in attitudes and behaviors.

To comprehensively address this problem, UNICEF in collaboration with the Ministry of Education and Science, Ministry of Social Development, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Health, the Institute of

---

3 The November 2011 crisis over thousands of migrant Tajik workers in Russia initiated by the jailing of two Russian pilots in Tajikistan is evidence of the general insecurity of such employment
Ombudsman and civil society organization “Child Rights Defenders League” have initiated in 2011 an implementation of a violence prevention programme in 4 schools, which gradually grew to 38 schools in 2014 throughout the country under the slogan “School without Violence”. This includes 7 schools in Jalalabad province (Suzak and Bazarkorgon districts), 12 schools in Osh province (Nookat, Aravan, Karasuu districts & Osh city), 3 schools in Batken province (Batken district, Batken town), 1 in Talas province (Talas town), 1 in Naryn province (Naryn town), 7 schools in Issyk Kul province (Aksuu, Djeti-Oguz, Tiup districts, Karakol town), 4 in Chui province (Alamedin district, Tokmok town). There were 4 schools in 2011, 16 in 2012, 8 in 2013 and 10 in 2014. The geographical distribution and the selection of schools were subject to criteria (rural-urban, private-public etc.) and funding availability for specific municipalities and provinces.

Its main premise is to support schools and local communities to create a protective network for schoolchildren and provide an enabling school environment conducive to children’s learning and development nourishing non-violence, understanding and respect for others.

In particular, the objectives of the programme are:

a) to reduce the incidents of violence in schools implementing the programme;
b) to raise awareness among pupils, teachers, parents, social pedagogue etc. on the problem of violence against children, understanding of various types of violence and the different ways to address them;
c) to build and develop capacities of involved stakeholders on various types of violence and ways to prevent and respond to violence through mechanisms offered by the programme;
d) to create institutional mechanisms to address the issue of violence against children – such as adoption of the Special Protocol on protecting children from violence in schools, school rules, establishment of teams and creating a mechanism that will ensure continual implementation in the school as well as monitoring of the situation of violence in schools including mediation;
e) to contribute to positive social norm change, where the pupils feel safer in school environment and pupils, teachers, parents and local community take a zero tolerance attitude to violence against children.

Major interventions of the programme

The programme is implemented through following activities/components:

a) application procedure – each school applies for the programme,
b) research – survey among all staff and children in the school,
c) trainings for staff and teachers – 3 defined areas,
d) implementation of prevention workshops with children,
e) development and application of school rules,
f) establishment of internal network and its functioning – roles and responsibilities, restitution and documentation, classroom management,
g) establishment of external network and its functioning,
h) peer support and peer programmes including peer mediation and composition of School Reconciliation Service,
i) education and co-operation with parents,
j) self-assessment – to see progress and possible certification of the school,
k) public campaign and awareness raising,
l) training and coordination of mentors.

The implementation of the programme is governed by a Technical Committee comprised of key line ministries and organizations involved. The former is comprised of management of the organization and the latter is
represented by technical level civil servants/staff. Various issues and questions pertaining to the implementation are discussed by the Technical Committee, chaired by the Institute of Ombudsman with secretarial support from Public Fund “Child Rights Defenders League”, i.e. UNICEF implementing partner. The Committee in average meets once a month.

Key stakeholders and their role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNICEF</strong></td>
<td>Provision of technical guidance including knowledge sharing/exchange with Serbian counterparts on the programme implementation and financial support contracting the implementing partner. Provision of a platform for dialogue for Technical Team. Contracting media companies for implementation of communication activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National level</strong></td>
<td>Leadership roles were to be assumed by the Ministry of Education and the Institute of Ombudsman. Representatives are members of the Technical Team. Active support to be provided by the Ministries of Health, Social Protection and Interior and their territorial divisions in pilot districts. Provision of monitoring and coordination support. Establishing procedures for certification of schools as safe schools for children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementing partner</strong></td>
<td>Implements the project with guidance from UNICEF and financial support for all the components of the project. The project was primarily implemented with funds from the DFID and UNICEF thematic funds. Implementing partner served as a secretariat for the Technical Team and provided/facilitated all the training to the schools as well as coordinated the whole process starting from the selection of the schools, surveying, monitoring etc. Within the project, drafting texts for bylaws on interagency cooperation for protection of schoolchildren from violence; developing mechanisms for identification and response to violence within schools; provision of methodological support for informational campaigns and educational workshops on violence prevention in schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local/district level</strong></td>
<td>Recipients of the knowledge and information about the programme. They establish school teams, reconciliation service, carry out awareness raising activities, conducts/supports survey implementation, creation of protection network (internal, external), develop school rules on non-violence, register cases of violence, disseminating new knowledge about new ways of solving conflicts through training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The programme is in line with the Social Protection Development Strategy of the Kyrgyz Republic (2012-2014), State Programme on Development of Justice for Children (2014-2020), National Education Development Strategy of the Kyrgyz Republic (2012-2020), National Strategy and Action Plan on Achieving Gender Equality (2012-2020), and National Strategy on Sustainable Development of the Kyrgyz Republic (2013-2017). Implementation of this programme is premised on the norms set out by international treaties, i.e. UN CRC, UN CEDAW, ratified by the Kyrgyz Republic. The programme is based on the good practices in CEE/CIS region, in particular Serbia, which has successfully implemented this programme to address violence in schools from 2005. The programme was modified and adapted to the local context.
Empowering children and teachers to advocate for less violence in schools has been an effective approach in reaching the higher levels of government. As such, during the Kyrgyz government dialogue with the CRC Committee in May 2014, the School without Violence Programme was mentioned by the Deputy Minister of Education and Science as a method for combatting violence against children and that it would recommend its nation-wide scale up.

In order to corroborate results achieved by the programme, UNICEF is now commissioning a formal evaluation of the programme envisaged by this TOR.

3. Evaluation purpose and objectives
1. The overall objective of the Evaluation is to assess the extent to which the programme is implemented efficiently and effectively, hereby achieving the goal and objective of the programme, which is implemented from 2011 to 2014. Whether the overall methodology is efficient and sufficient in preventing and reducing violence against children and in creating safe and protective environment in schools. Assess against each objective of the programme:
   a. Prevention of violence (reduction of incidents of violence) based on the indicators of frequency and type of violence;
   b. Increasing the awareness of existing violence and the need to effectively react/respond to it including the correlation with its reporting;
   c. Capacity development to prevent through children’s participation in violence prevention/reduction, promotion of non-violence values, value of school rules, peer support to violence prevention, adopting positive role models of non-violent behavior;
      Capacity development to respond through detection and reporting, timeliness of interventions to incidents of violence, role of School Reconciliation team and mediators, mobilizing internal and external protective network, confidentiality boxes.
   d. Institutional mechanisms through changes in school regulation (school rules), establishment of teams, coordinator roles, mechanism in place for its continual implementation.
   e. Changes in social norms and behaviors – attitude of no tolerance to violence, greater involvement and participation in the initiative. Pupils and teacher’s feeling of being safer in school and more supported through created mechanisms.

2. Identify internal school/system and external/local community factors that impact, i.e. support or negatively affect the situation of violence in schools. What affects the pace of implementation of the programme in schools?
3. Assess value of each and identify the most important components as well as weak or missing components that could be strengthened/incorporated in order to achieve the goals of the programme.
4. Assess role and capacity of the management of the programme, including the role of the Ministries, Technical Team, implementing partner and UNICEF. Assess the ownership of the programme by pupils, teachers, school teams for prevention of violence and school administration/teacher perception of the programme, its intensity, easiness (user friendliness), real potential to be incorporated into every day school life; assess whether the materials and trainings have been useful and sufficient in understanding the programme.
5. Analyze programme recognition, role and contribution within existing education system as well as social protection system.
6. Assess the contribution of the programme to conflict reduction and peacebuilding as well as building resilience of pupils.
7. Elaborate recommendations for programme improvement and finalization with institutionalization and scaling up by the Government to other schools including costing of the programme.

The key evaluation questions grouped by the evaluation criteria are as follows:

| Relevance | • What is the relevance of the programme for schools, children and their families, communities?  
|           | • How the project fits into the government education, social protection and child protection policy in terms of enabling policy environment, acceptability of project methodology, adaptability and integration into the existing structures? |
| Effectiveness | • What real difference has the programme made to the beneficiaries? To what extent were the programme objectives achieved?  
|           | • What will the comparison of the baseline research conducted in 2010 by CAIC Consulting and baseline surveys for each school collected by implementing partner piloting the programme and 2014 results tell us about the prevalence and incidence of violence after four years of the programme implementation?  
|           | • What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives? What are the gender aspects, geographical and school type dimensions affecting the programme performance? |
| Efficiency | • Was the programme implemented in the most efficient way?  
|           | • Were key programme activities cost-efficient?  
|           | • What was the role and contribution of various key stakeholders and how it can be improved? |
| Sustainability | • To what extent the positive changes will continue after programme funding ceased?  
|           | • Are there political will and available resources by MoES or other donors to bring the project to scale and mainstream further the school without violence approaches into the education system?  
|           | • How can this be reflected or might be reflected in MoES annual and/or long-term programme planning and budgetary allocations? |
| Impact | • To what degree (percentage) the programme, implemented from 2011 to 2014 contributed to reduction of violence against children in schools?  
|           | • To what extent the school without violence contributed to lessening of tensions in communities over the medium/long term, i.e. for peacebuilding efforts?  
|           | • To what extent the programme increased the awareness of children and what is the correlation with reporting of violence in these schools? |
The evaluation questionnaire development should take into consideration the research questionnaire conducted in 2010 by CAIC Consulting within the national study\(^5\) and to survey questions designed and collected by UNICEF implementing partner to assess each school before the start of the programme. However, the questionnaire would be supplemented with questions that are important from the point of view of new knowledge during programme implementation.

The potential limitations of this evaluation are the level of consistency and comparability of the survey data gathered through national study on violence in schools done by a national research company and of the data for each school before start of the programme and the interim progress. The latter data was gathered by the implementing partner as part of the project implementation. Where necessary, the reliability of the data and the methodology is to be assessed and validated by the research team.

Research shall include a control group and a disaggregated data by gender, location (urban/rural), type of school etc. in order to arrive to conclusions regarding the attribution and to be able to compare between the schools.

Separate quantitative data shall be available for the twenty target schools that were implemented under the DFID programme.

Due to a sensitive nature of the topic of violence, the evaluation team must pay special attention to the ethical considerations throughout the evaluation and data gathering process.

The Evaluation is expected to identify good practices and lessons learnt in the implementation of the programme as well as determine barriers and bottlenecks with recommendations to improve the programme in future. Good practices and barriers that influence conflict prevention and peacebuilding at large should also be emphasized.

4. Scope of the Evaluation

The Evaluation is to evaluate the process, role, capacity and contribution of the programme in creating a safe and an enabling environment in target secondary schools of Kyrgyzstan. It requires both quantitative and qualitative analysis and therefore appropriate methods and tools shall be designed.

The Evaluation focuses on four criteria defined by OECD/DAC:

- Relevance and estimated influence/impact of the programme,
- Efficiency – correlation between time, effort, knowledge, money invested (cost benefit analysis) and results achieved,
- Effectiveness – results and outcomes, main enabling and hindering factors in achieving the targets and goals and impact of the programme interventions.
- Sustainability of the programme; ownership by schools, local communities; main enablers and bottlenecks that can enhance/inhibit sustainability of achieved changes and phase out strategy for UNICEF.
- Impact – the programme meets or exceeds the stated outcomes/expectations.

\(^5\) Full report is available here in Russian language [http://baldar.kg/files/Violence_In_School_Ru(1).pdf](http://baldar.kg/files/Violence_In_School_Ru(1).pdf)
To serve the interest of UNICEF, these criteria should be applied in the framework of UNICEF’s Equity-based Approach\(^6\), Human Rights Based Approach as well as Results Based Management.

The expected period of coverage is from 2011 to 2014 and the geographical scope is throughout Kyrgyzstan.

5. **Sources of Information**

- Report on the findings of the research on prevalence and dynamics of violence in schools in Kyrgyzstan 2010;
- Situation Analysis of Children in Kyrgyzstan 2014;
- Baseline survey data on violence on each school piloting the programme carried out by implementing partner in 2012, 2013 and 2014;
- List of schools and information on each school regarding implementation of the programme;
- Detailed explanation of the programme objectives, outline and activities by the implementing partner including progress and final reports;
- Reports from the Ministry of Interior on the violence occurring in selected schools;
- Reports from the Ministry of Education and Science on the profile of schools to be selected for the control group;
- Minutes of the Technical Team meetings;
- Materials from capacity building interventions including pre and post test results;
- Data collected through survey questionnaires, interviews with key stakeholders, focus group discussions.
- Other documents

6. **Evaluation Process and Methods**

The proposed Evaluation team shall be comprised of one or two lead international evaluator(s) with (education or psychology background as well as expertise in the area of child rights) with subcontracting of a local research team or company (with background in carrying out research among children and expertise on the educational system of Kyrgyzstan) for collection of data in order to make it cost-effective. The composition of the team should be gender balanced and ethnically diverse. The lead evaluator(s) will be responsible for all components of the evaluation including development of the evaluation methodology (subject to UNICEF approval); selection, training and overseeing field work of the researchers (for both qualitative and quantitative components) and quality assurance of the process of data analysis and report writing.

The evaluation process should start with the in-depth desk review of available related documentation that will be mainly provided by the implementing partner and UNICEF. A detailed design and methodology with relevant and high-quality tools for data collection and analysis is expected to be developed. Approval of the UNICEF team is required prior to implementation. Key stakeholders and informants are to be identified within the design. The evaluation should follow the evaluation criteria mentioned above with appropriate additions to cover the scope of the evaluation. The approach should be participatory, gender and human rights responsive with a special focus on equity aspects.

---

\(^6\) Please see guidelines at [http://mymande.org/content/how-design-and-manage-equity-focused-evaluations](http://mymande.org/content/how-design-and-manage-equity-focused-evaluations)
During the data collection phase, evaluation questionnaire, in-depth interviews, focus group discussions or other relevant measures, such as structured observations and review of official records will need to be used to gather needed information for the evaluation from the key stakeholders.

UNICEF and Ministry of Education and Science will ensure access to schools being surveyed. UNICEF and implementing partner as well as the Technical Team members will provide all necessary contacts to the evaluators.

A budget for the evaluation should be offered including costs for printing of approximately 50 versions in English and 450 in Russian, as well 200 copies of two pager in Russian and 50 in English shall be budgeted in the offer.

7. Deliverables

The below shows a preliminary evaluation schedule that may be subject to change during the process in agreement with UNICEF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline (Prelim.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation – inception phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review of the existing documents</td>
<td>Contractor, UNICEF and implementing partner</td>
<td>1 week from the date of signing contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the evaluation methodology, instruments and work plan (including the questionnaire) Consultations with the Coordinator of the School without Violence programme, Technical Team during the process of evaluation methodology and plan development</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report(^7) (including evaluation work plan and timeline, presentation of methodological approach, instruments to be used, annotated outline of final report), to be presented and approved by UNICEF and Technical Team</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation – implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Surveying of selected schools (field visits, meetings, interviews, focus group discussions) - Coding and data entry - Data processing and analysis</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation – report preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim evaluation report (draft findings with comprehensive quantitative and qualitative analysis, conclusions and recommendations from all data sources used in the evaluation)</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback and comments from UNICEF, Technical Team and Ministry of Education and Science</td>
<td>UNICEF, implementing partner</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation of recommendations from UNICEF and Technical Team after review</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final evaluation report (including summary), subject of approval by UNICEF in Russian and English languages and printing</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^7\) The inception phase will clarify the methodology and approach to be taken for this evaluation; depending on this there might be some changes to the contract initiated with the company.
Presentation of the research findings to key stakeholders with preparation of presentation materials and two page summaries for the public including printing (presentation event is organized by UNICEF)  
Contractor/UNICEF  
1 week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of evaluation findings:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of the final report to all partners and stakeholders and discussions on further improvement of the programme and next stages</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final products to be delivered to UNICEF should include:

Final report (appr. 50-70 pages) consisting of the following chapters and in line with the UNICEF Evaluation Report Standards and the Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System:

- Executive summary
- Country context and the description of the evaluated object.
- Description and evaluation of the methodology (including a discussion of its limitations)
- Description of main findings, analysis, conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations: short, medium and long-term accountabilities
- Body of the text that covers all the components of the programme (defined by School without violence programme objectives), including the institutionalization of the programme, sustainability and key constraints;
- List of activities that are implemented
- Annexes: case studies, evaluation instruments (questionnaires, focus group reports), list of schools, institutions/organizations and individuals that participated in the process, bibliography and any quantitative database developed as part of the evaluation;
  - Complete database/data sets (filled out questionnaires)
  - Dissemination materials (two pager containing main findings in both languages, power point presentation)

The report should be provided in both hard copy and electronic versions in Russian and English languages.

8. **Accountabilities, Reporting**

The lead evaluator will lead the evaluation process and the research team at all stages and coordinate with national experts, stakeholders, especially with the Technical Team. The evaluator is responsible for provision of deliverables listed above in time and with good quality. The evaluator will report to UNICEF Child Protection Officer and the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer as well as the Child Protection team.

The evaluator should act with integrity and respect to all stakeholders according to UNEG Ethical Guidelines for research. In the report, the evaluator should not refer to any personal data that shows during the evaluation. The evaluator should not share any findings with media in Kyrgyzstan or abroad concerning individual children, families or individual institutions.

At all times it is important to voice to the schools and all participants of the evaluation that their evaluation does not refer to individual assessment of their work and failure to implement some components of the programme would not be considered their personal failure.

---

UNICEF staff will review and approve the deliverables listed below and provide relevant documents.

9. Qualification Requirements (Selection Criteria)
   - High quality project proposal as per the requirements of the ToR, including methodological aspects. (compliance with the ToR)
   - Proven expertise and experience of the company in carrying out evaluations and/or assessment of development programmes/projects (4-5 years);
   - Excellent knowledge of monitoring and evaluation methodologies (demonstrated by previous evaluations carried out by the company; a sample report to be enclosed);
   - Staff qualifications: Advanced university degree in evaluation/assessment, psychology, education or related humanities science of the lead evaluator(s) and education expert/psychologist;
   - Excellent analytical report writing skills (demonstrated through a sample report provided);
   - Excellent written and spoken Russian and English required (demonstrated through sample reports provided);
   - Good communication and presentation skills (reference letter to be provided)
   - Experience in work in school environment or a good understanding of the education system is an asset;
   - Knowledge of the country context and development programmes in Kyrgyzstan/Central Asian region is an asset;

10. Duty station and Official Travel Involved

The company is to include in the budget costs for official travel in relation to this evaluation including travel within Kyrgyzstan.

11. Duration

January 12, 2014 – April 3, 2015

12. Performance Indicators:

Criteria for performance are quality of work, timeliness (ability to keep to strict deadlines), accuracy, initiative, responsibility, competence and communication.

13. Estimated cost (optional)

To be proposed by the applicant. Budget should be derived based on the deliverables mentioned above and the required tasks for the evaluation. The evaluation company will be selected based on the “best value for money” approach. The company will be paid upon successful completion of assignments and submission of the deliverables in accordance with the following payment schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Percentage of payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signing of contract and upon approval of the evaluation methodology</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(inception report)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of the evaluation and submission of the final reports in both Russian and English languages, endorsed by UNICEF</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. **UNICEF recourse in case of unsatisfactory performance**

The payments may be reduced if the assignments/deliverables are not fulfilled to the required standard. In case of serious dissatisfaction with the performance of the company the contract may be terminated in line with UNICEF procedures and as spelled out in the institutional SSA.

**Source of funding/PBA reference (date of expiration of the PBA):**

| SC120134(DFID) | Expiry date 31.03.2015 |

*Note: In all cases, consultants may only be paid their fees upon satisfactory completion of services. In such cases where payment of fees is to be made in a lump sum, this may only be payable upon completion of the services to UNICEF’s satisfaction and certification to that effect, and any advance on the lump sum may not exceed 30% of the fees. In such cases where payment of fees is to be made in installments, the final installment may not be less than ten per cent (10%) of the total value of the contract, and will only be payable upon completion of the services to UNICEF’s satisfaction and certification to that effect.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drafted:</th>
<th>Venera Urbaeva, Child Protection Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed:</td>
<td>Elena Zaichenko, Child Protection Officer/Head of Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed:</td>
<td>Muktar Minbaev, M&amp;E Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed:</td>
<td>Jamila Jusaeva, Operations Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td>Yukie Mokuo, Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>11 December, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>