TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR INSTITUTIONAL CONTRACTS

Terms of Reference for a “*Formative Evaluation of the UNICEF WASH regional and country programming strategies in the East Asia and Pacific region.*”

1. Background (Evaluation Context)

*Programming context: a rapidly developing region*

Considering the political and socio-economic developments seen over last decade, the Asia-Pacific region is often seen as the “fast changing” region. The region remains one of the main drivers of the world economy, accounting for nearly two-fifths of global economic growth. Home to an estimated 2 billion people, the region holds over half the global population and over one-quarter of the world’s children – around 580 million children in total. Many countries in the region have achieved middle income status, with a steady decline in extreme poverty from 80% in 1981 to 4% in 2015 (World Bank, 2015). In some countries, this has led (or is expected to lead) to a reduction in external development assistance, including decreased funding for UNICEF operations.

In many countries, the government as well as the private sector has gained financial, human and technical capacities. They have invested in many economic and basic services including water supply, sanitation and hygiene (WASH). Households themselves are more willing and able to pay for/invest in better WASH facilities and services. Various stakeholders are now active in the WASH sector, leading to a necessary repositioning of traditional players. Opportunities arise, technological innovations are available and new programmatic strategies are now possible or required. However, a diversity of country situations persists in the region, with some having more capacities or more fragilities than others.

*Regional WASH progress and remaining challenges*

In UNICEF, the ‘East Asia and Pacific’ (EAP) region covers 15 countries with a UNICEF country office, and the Pacific Islands (group of 14 countries overseen by one multi-country office).1 The EAP Regional Office (EAPRO2) is located in Bangkok, Thailand. This region has made good progress in increasing access to improved drinking water supply and sanitation and hygiene over the last 25 years. Between 2000 and 2015 the region has made better progress than the world as a whole, with 94% of the population of the region now using at least basic drinking water facilities compared to 78% in 2000. The number of piped connections is growing, even in small towns and, to a lesser extent, in rural areas. Just 1% of people rely on surface water sources. In terms of sanitation, three-quarters of the population of the region now use improved sanitation, and 4% of the region’s population practice open defecation.

However, significant challenges remain: regional averages mask significant differences across countries. For example, between 2000 and 2015 the region has made better progress than the world as a whole; three-quarters of the population of the region now use improved sanitation however, 4% practice open defecation. Despite these progress, improved sanitation is still unavailable for a significant proportion of households in the East Asia and Pacific (EAP) Region, hence contributing to the high child mortality, under-nutrition and stunting, and large disparities persist between rural and urban households.

---

1 The UNICEF EAP region covers 16 countries/entities including Japan, China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Korea, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Pacific Islands (14 Countries overseen by one multi-country office), Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam.

2 Website: [https://www.unicef.org/eapro/](https://www.unicef.org/eapro/)
- Seven EAP countries still have significant open defecation problems (Solomon Islands has as high as 54% of the population practicing open defecation, followed by Cambodia with 47% open defecators), and a few countries have high rates of consumption of surface water (for example, 15% of the Cambodian rural population rely on untreated surface water for drinking).
- Because of the high population of the region, low percentages of people drinking unsafe water and practicing open defecation mask high numbers. For instance, 75 million people are estimated to practice open defecation in the region, including 31 million in Indonesia and 6.4 in Cambodia.
- Access to and use of WASH infrastructure, and the level, quality and sustainability of the service remain low in some areas within countries, especially in rural areas.
- Some populations face affordability issues or other obstacles, e.g. marginalized communities, and among the poorest households.
- Reliable data on sanitation and hygiene in schools and health facilities are insufficient, but existing information indicates that coverage is low.

Overall, the quality of the service, sustainability and inequities constitute three of the most critical WASH challenges in the region. These explain why despite progress, WASH is still a significant contributing factor to high child mortality, under-nutrition and stunting in the region. This represents an unfinished development agenda for government and their development partners including UNICEF: expanding WASH goods and services to the last mile, moving up the ladder, supporting options and mechanisms to increase service quality and sustainability, and advocating for government and private investment to be made where it is needed.

The 2030 international agenda and the new UNICEF Global WASH Strategy
The Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) targets 6.1 and 6.2 set the ambitious target of achieving universal access to water and sanitation for all by 2030. Together with goal 4a, they also set a similar objective of universal access for schools. The SDGs pay particular attention to the "reaching the last mile" through an equity lens by calling for the provision of at least a basic level of service to the most vulnerable and disadvantaged populations. They also emphasize the need for quality and sustainable WASH services.

This international development agenda constitutes an agenda for UNICEF. The current vision of UNICEF is laid out in its Global WASH Strategy 2016-2030, with objectives and timeframe aligned with the SDGs. It presents how UNICEF intends to contribute to the achievement of the SDGs. It commits UNICEF to continue learning and adapting in the area of water safety, sustainability, and improved access; progress in certain areas such as strengthening the enabling environment for WASH, inter-sectoral programming, and accountability mechanisms; and move in new directions including climate resilient programming, (peri-)urban areas, and the private sector (see snapshot)

3 Seven countries have a prevalence of over 30 per cent of children stunted, and two countries with a staggering 50 per cent. The poorest and most deprived children are much more stunted than their wealthier and urban peers. An estimated 18 million children under 5 years are affected in the region.

4 Available at: https://www.unicef.org/wash/files/UNICEF_Strategy_for_WASH_2016-2030.pdf
below). WASH will continue to be a corporate priority in the upcoming UNICEF Strategic Plan 2018-2021.

**UNICEF WASH programming in the EAP Regional Headline Results**

In 2016, the EAP region represented 5% of UNICEF’s global investment in WASH (slightly less than 50 million USD) with more than half being spend on development programming (and the remainder on humanitarian)\(^5\). WASH is however one of the programmatic priorities for UNICEF in the region. At the regional level in UNICEF, the “Headline Results” for the period 2014-2017 stress the universal access to safe drinking water, sanitation and hygiene as the cornerstone in realizing the right of every child and particularly the most vulnerable to survival and development in a safe and sustainable environment, and set WASH specific result monitoring indicators\(^6\). In the regional plan under development for the period in 2018-2021, WASH is also linked to emerging programmatic areas such as climate change, disaster risk reduction, and urban inequities – largely in line with the Global WASH Strategy.

At the country level, UNICEF supports WASH programmes as an integral part of the respective UNICEF Country Programme Document in 12 EAP countries. In each of these countries, UNICEF has technical staff working with partners in support of governments to achieve its national goals on WASH and contributing towards the attainment of international development goals. This is typically done through a mix of different types of interventions.

Guided by Global, regional and country programme strategies, UNICEF support has been intending to progressively evolve from a service delivery model (providing financial and technical support for developing WASH infrastructure/services and improving WASH practices in the field) to more focus on upstream support (system strengthening, and reinforcing the enabling environment for WASH). The aim of the upstream component is to develop and enforce national policies and strategies for WASH; increase budgeting and financing; improve institutional arrangements for coordination, service delivery and regulation and accountability; reinforce planning, monitoring and review processes; and build capacities at all levels (national and subnational)\(^7\). UNICEF also aims to provide partners access to the best available evidence of most effective WASH policies and programming approaches with a focus on reaching the poorest and most vulnerable children, and identify, develop and/or test models to inform its policy advocacy and mainstreaming efforts. The overall regional development and WASH progress, the new/remaining WASH challenges, the actual or expected reduction in donor funding, the emergence of new players, and the resulting need for strategic repositioning of traditional development agencies, all pose a new equation for UNICEF WASH programming in the region going forward.

2. **Purpose, objectives, audience, and expected use**

In light of the above describe context, the UNICEF EAP Regional Office decided to commission an independent, regional evaluation of its WASH programming with focus on relevance. The overall purposes are to evaluate and guide UNICEF’s WASH programming in the region **at a strategic level:**

- Assess the extent to which UNICEF’s WASH programmes in the region are well adapted to the rapidly changing context and new challenges,

---


\(^6\) “Early moments matter (% of population using safely managed sanitation services, including hand-washing facility with soap and water)” and “Children grow up in a safe and sustainable environment (% of population using safely managed drinking water services).”

\(^7\) See the UNICEF website on developing the WASH enabling environment [https://washenablingenvironment.wordpress.com/](https://washenablingenvironment.wordpress.com/), and in particular the Guidance Note published in 2016 [https://washenablingenvironment.files.wordpress.com/2015/11/wash-guidance-note-draft-updated-lr1.pdf](https://washenablingenvironment.files.wordpress.com/2015/11/wash-guidance-note-draft-updated-lr1.pdf) in particular the Enabling Environment Framework (Figure 3 page 12)
- Inform any re-positioning efforts deemed necessary at the country level, by suggesting the most relevant priority areas to focus on and identifying relevant and tailored strategies depending on the country/local context
- At regional level, identify what strategic approaches, programmatic components and intervention modalities can help better position UNICEF in a fast changing EAP region and in support of country programming in achieving the SDG agenda within the strategic directions defined in the new UNICEF Global WASH Strategy

Considering the main purpose of this independent formative evaluation being learning, forward looking and re-positioning, this evaluation will assess the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of WASH programming strategies and interventions according to national priorities and the 2030 agenda 2030. The evidence-based findings and recommendations will prospectively identify regional WASH strategic approaches, programmatic components and intervention modalities to help better position UNICEF in a fast changing EAP regional context in support of national governments in achieving the their national goals and targets (and contribute to the SDG agenda, especially SDG 6.1 and 6.2 ) with regard to access to high quality water, sanitation and hygiene services in sustainable and equitable manner for especially the poorest and most vulnerable families, communities and children. The primary audience of this evaluation is UNICEF EAPRO and CO Management and WASH teams; the secondary audience includes governments’ development partners and donors, implementing partners. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations will also be used to inform the new ROMP WASH rolling work plan and new country programme documents as well as in advocacy and leveraging partnerships in the region.

The broad objective of this assignment is to:
- Provide evidence on whether regional and country WASH strategies are relevant, effective and sustainable in each context (considering county social-economic status, capacity, fragility etc.)
- Help adapt and tailor relevant strategies to the specific diverse country contexts
- Define the most relevant priority area to focus on
- Contribute to country, regional, and global learning and UNICEF’s accountability

The primary target audience, therefore, is the UNICEF Regional Office and the EAP country offices. The secondary audience is the national governments with which UNICEF partners in the countries, UNICEF in HQ and other regions, as well as the broader WASH sector.

The findings, conclusions, and recommendations will be used by country offices to inform the development or implementation of their country programme documents, and adjust their WASH strategies and implementation modalities when necessary. At regional level, it will inform the implementation of the WASH component of the new regional office management plan, the new and future WASH rolling work plans, and as well as the regional policy advocacy and partnerships leveraging efforts.

This evaluative undertaking will also strengthen and update the knowledge and evidence base on UNICEF WASH programming in complementarity with other initiatives recently completed, ongoing or recently launched by UNICEF in the region such as:
- Annual Regional Analysis/Snapshots on i) water supply, ii) sanitation and hygiene and iii) WASH in the Pacific respectively (completed)
- A regional review of Community-Led Total Sanitation programmes in EAP (completed)
- A regional study on equity in public financing for WASH (completed)
- A regional study on Menstrual Hygiene Management (stock-taking and good practice guidance) (completed)
- A regional assessment of WASH enabling environment functions and Sanitation and Water For All collaborative behaviours and building blocks (starting)
- An evaluative case study on Cambodia’s rural water supply programming 2006-2016 (completed)
3. **Scope of the evaluation**

- **Time boundaries:** from 2014 to 2017
- **Organizational level:** country offices and regional office
- **Geographical scope:** particular focus on countries with new Country Program Documents (CPD), i.e. where UNICEF CPD have ended in 2015 or 2016, and where recent evaluation evidence is particularly missing.
- **In-country geographical coverage:** national and sub-national, rural and urban
- **Type of WASH interventions:** both upstream (enabling environment and system strengthening work) and downstream WASH programming strategies and approaches, in sanitation, water supply, WASH in schools and health centres. The actual performance in emergency responses will not be included in the evaluation but the WASH emergency preparedness of the country office will, in terms of risk and evidence-informed strategy, programmatic priorities, and resources including staff capacity.

4. **Evaluation design and method**

The evaluation requires an analysis both at the regional and country level. Considering the strategic level focus, it is expected that the evidence will be collected primarily through an extensive / comprehensive desk review, complemented by interviews of rights stakeholders and indirectly duty bearers through online surveys, internet searches and remote interviews with key stakeholders.

The evaluation will be a non-experimental, mixed methods, utilization-focused evaluation. Evidence will primarily come from the documents and data already available in UNICEF, from key informants (through interviews and surveys), and from country case studies. Whenever possible, a comparative and external perspective is to be factored into the evaluation for each evaluation criteria, identifying potential variations/differences between WASH programme components, across WASH country programmes, and between UNICEF and other development partners.

The evaluation will occur in three phases, which are further described below: 1) inception phase, 2) data collection and analysis phase, and 3) reporting and communication phase. The following offers guidance on the evaluation process and UNICEF’s expectations and thinking. It should be commented on, further developed and improved by the bidders in their respective proposals. Alternative approaches can also be proposed. The methodology will be further specified and finalized by the selected evaluation team in collaboration with UNICEF during the inception phase.

A big part of the desk review will entail an analysis of the regional context, including but not only WASH-specific, and an analysis of how this context impact UNICEF as a whole and UNICEF WASH programming in particular, both at the regional and country level. This analysis will also look at new requirements posed by the SDGs and the new UNICEF WASH Strategy. To this will need to be added a prospective analysis: where/how the region and various country groups are going to evolve in the next 5-10 years, including a perspective of how the key stakeholder and mainly the government will evolve as this will guide how UNICEF will have to position itself vis-à-vis these key stakeholders. Such an analysis will allow the evaluation team to use this thinking/framework as a basis for considering information / data gaps, strategies to complement this, and possible country visits,
Sources of evidence: The evaluation will build on the knowledge and evidence base on UNICEF WASH programming as documented in recently completed, on-going or recently launched by UNICEF in the region as outlined in section 2 above. In addition, the evaluation will also be able to tap into studies, evaluations etc. completed by other stakeholders as World Bank, ADB, Plan International, Water Aid Australia etc., as well as ongoing studies / evaluations in the region through UNICEF such as:

- IDInsight / UNICEF study on scaling up CLTS (Zero Open defecation) Approach in the Philippines
- End-line evaluation of the BMGF grant on “Community rural sanitation” in Indonesia
- Randomized control Study on impact of WASH in Schools in Lao PDR
- Rural Water Supply Case study in Cambodia

A survey (on-line with remote follow-up) may also be considered to complement the evidence collected through such data collection tools.

- UNICEF staff (Regional and country level)
- Regional /Country Office WASH partners
- National or subnational governments
- Development partners
- Resource partners and donor groups
- Private sectors
- Youth groups / organizations
- Women’s groups
- Education, gender, and health sector partners

Since Lao PDR and DPRK have recently evaluated WASH programs already, the focus will be on obtaining necessary documentation from countries as Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Pacific and Vietnam. No country visits is envisaged at this stage, hence bidder need to outline the methodology for obtaining recent and relevant data and evidence from respective countries through internet search, n-line surveys and remote follow-up.

The evaluation will also look at the economic development (e.g. LICS, MICS, and HICS), nexus and fragility, and combination of successful and challenging contexts. However, this evaluation will not consider the efficiency and impact of the UNICEF WASH Strategies. Also, it will not assess the UNICEF actual performance in emergency responses but will look into the emergency preparedness of the country office in terms of resources including staff capacity, and programmatic priorities in providing emergency response.

Based on the above mentioned purpose and scope of the evaluation, the bidder is expected to submit a proposal for methodologies including data sources and selection criteria among WASH regional and country programming strategies as well as the set of key evaluation questions. Additionally, the bidder should explicitly state the limitations of the selected methods. As mentioned above, no country visits are envisaged at this stage. However, the based on the preliminary scan of available resources at the bidding stage, the bidder may suggest rationale, selection and prioritization criteria to identify the eligible countries; the identification of the selection criteria and possible country visits will be finalized during the inception phase.

Findings conclusions and recommendations should be based on triangulated evidence. Three types of triangulation methods are envisaged: 1) cross reference of different data sources (interviews and documentation); 2) investigator triangulation through the deployment of multiple evaluators; and 3) review by inquiry participants through the respondents’ validation meeting and consultation with UNICEF and government key respondents during the report drafting process. The triangulation efforts will be tested for consistency of results, noting that inconsistencies do not necessarily weaken the
credibility of results, but may reflect the sensitivity of different types of data collection methods. This is to ensure validity, establish common threads and trends, and identify divergent views.

The evaluation needs to follow the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluations (2016) as well as UNICEF ethical guidelines. It also needs to respect UNEG Guidance on integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation and the UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicators.

Below are preliminary evaluation questions which will be finalized with the Evaluation team during the inception phase. Prioritization of questions, additional sub-questions and any new areas of enquiry across will be also developed and discussed during the inception phase.

5. Evaluation criteria and questions

The evaluation will focus on i) relevance, ii) effectiveness, iii) sustainability, equity and scalability of UNICEF WASH programming in the region. These criteria are mainly inspired by the ones recommended by the OECD DAC for evaluating development assistance.

The evaluation will not look at the efficiency and impacts of the UNICEF’s WASH programmes because these criteria are not directly linked with the main objectives of this evaluation, and analysing these aspects would imply the use of a complex methodology that lies beyond the scope, budget and timeline for this evaluation for each proposed criteria. They can be commented on and adjusted by the bidders in their technical proposal. They will be finalized during the inception phase, including prioritization of questions, more specific sub-questions, and any additional areas of enquiry. The final decisions will be made based on the following principles: feasibility; importance and priority; usefulness and timeliness; answerability and realism; actionability.

Relevance
The appropriateness of plans and strategies as well as design of Regional Office Management Plan and Country programs (WASH component) in regards to the changing context and needs.

- To what extent are the objectives, strategic approaches and implementation modalities of UNICEF WASH Strategies in this region well adapted to the current and future (applying a more forward looking perspective with this evaluation) regional and country contexts?
- To what extent are they aligned with the 2030 SDG agenda (with emphasis on increasing focus on scaling up successful interventions/models, making programmes more equity-focused, and improving the level, quality and sustainability of services)?
- To what extent are they aligned with the new UNICEF Global WASH Strategy?
- To what extent do they appropriately respond to the current and, with a prospective view, to future challenges and needs of the country WASH sector?
- To what extent have these strategies and implementation approaches contributed to position UNICEF as a key player in the respective national and regional development agendas?
- How can the new Country Program’s objectives, approaches and modalities be more relevant and adapted to the fast-changing overall environment (economic, social, aid-related) and WASH-specific context in the region?
- Where should UNICEF position itself to strengthen its added and make better use of its comparative advantage, e.g. positioning/niche/added-value vis-à-vis: the government; the private sector; national NGOs and private initiatives, whose capacities and engagement are growing? Vis-à-vis other donors?

Effectiveness
Extent to which the country programs are on track and contributing to scaling up innovations introduced by UNICEF.

- With regard to innovations, perhaps emphasis on areas as:
- **Supporting access to water for the poor**: innovative financing mechanisms, cross-subsidies mechanisms, output-based aid, microfinance, etc.
- **Supporting services that last**: RWS service models, engagement with the private sector, private sector participation in sanitation, hygiene, water supply – linked with the partnership question below
- **Monitoring the quality of the service and providing incentives** for increasing the quality: real-time monitoring, accountability mechanisms at the community/service level, operators’ national regulation, benchmarking etc.

  - How has been RO support to the Country Offices been taken up, in terms of knowledge generation and sharing/utilization, technical assistance and capacity building, policy advocacy etc.?
  - What are the operational implications of the strategic shifts (challenges and adaptations) needed from UNICEF (e.g. in terms of HR, skillsets, funding sources and mobilization strategies, and new areas of work) due to the evolving programming context and strategic shift in WASH programming?
  - To what extend has there been a progressive evolution of CO WASH programmes from downstream to more upstream (modeling, innovation, system strengthening etc.)? Has this evolution materialized whenever it was appropriate and feasible?
  - What are the most and less effective strategic approaches at regional and country level for achievement the program strategies and results? (upstream vs. downstream, single sectors vs. multi-sectors)

**Sustainability, equity and scalability**
To what extent is the UNICEF WASH program results within the broader policy environment in the countries and region; evaluation questions include:

  - What are the major factors which influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability and what are the options/solutions and in which context do they work particularly well?
  - What can UNICEF learn from its existing partnerships in the countries? How can UNICEF establish stronger partnership in achieving the SDGs, i.e. with the private sector, central governments, subnational authorities, civil society organizations, academic organization?
  - How is UNICEF intending to go from piloting models in the field to scaling up? Is there a well-thought strategy in place from the onset to allow for this process to happen? What are the upscaling pathways: policy mainstreaming, organized replication by UNICEF and its partners, spontaneous diffusion in the field? Are the scalability factors put in place by UNICEF and its partners to allow for either of these pathways to materialize?

**6. Deliverables**

Total estimated working days – 75 days (15 weeks)

  - Of which around 10 weeks can be done remotely and around 5 weeks in Thailand (at EAPRO).
  - The assignment is envisaged over a 15 week period, starting around December 2017 and completed preferably by mid-May 2018.

A comprehensive outline of the main and specific tasks for this assignment is presented below:
# Estimates for contracting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Tasks</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Number of Working Weeks Remotely</th>
<th>Number of Working Weeks at EAPRO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Preparation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Deliverable 1:</strong> Final Inception report submitted to EAPRO by end January 2018</td>
<td>Start from December 2017 - End January 2018</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Desk review and consultative meetings (1st inception mission of the Evaluation team to EAPRO Bangkok)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Preparation of draft 1 inception report with prioritized evaluation questions, methodology and proposed workplan / timeframe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Evaluation Reference Group review the 2nd draft of inception report once the comments shared with EAPRO etc. have been incorporated in the 1st draft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Data Research / Collection</strong></td>
<td><strong>Deliverable 2:</strong> Comprehensive list of relevant references, with summary of on-line survey if implemented</td>
<td>February - early March 2018</td>
<td>5 weeks</td>
<td>0 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Undertake data research and conduct key informant interviews/on-line surveys etc. to fill information gaps,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Summary of references and surveys/ interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Data Processing, Analysis and Validation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Deliverable 3a:</strong> Zero Draft Evaluation Report + country profiles to UNICEF by end March 2018</td>
<td>March – early April 2018</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Data cleaning, consolidation/tabulation, analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Development of preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations in zero draft of Evaluation report and max 4 page country profiles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Consultation workshop with UNICEF, evaluation reference group, and other stakeholders (validation workshop if applicable, virtual meetings) to validate findings, conclusions and strengthen recommendations (2nd visit Evaluation Team to EAPRO Bangkok envisaged).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Development and finalization of evaluation report</strong></td>
<td><strong>Deliverable 4a:</strong> Advanced Draft Evaluation Report to UNICEF by mid-April 2018</td>
<td>Mid-April 2018</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>0 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Preparation of Advanced Draft of Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Finalization of the Evaluation Report following review / comments from the Evaluation Reference Group of the Advanced Draft of Evaluation Report (max 60 pages)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverable 4b:</strong> Final Evaluation Report to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimates are based on one person working days*
### Main Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Number of Working Weeks</th>
<th>Number of Working Weeks at EAPRO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF by mid to end April 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Launch/Presentation of Final Evaluation Results and Recommendations

5.1 Preparation of presentation materials including development of evaluation brief max 4-6 pages, a Powerpoint Presentation
5.2 Finalization of the presentation materials including evaluation brief and summary PowerPoint following UNICEF review
5.3 Final Presentation at EAPRO (3rd visit to EAPRO, only Team Leader)

Deliverable 5: Final versions of PowerPoint presentation, Evaluation Brief and Final Evaluation Report to UNICEF and key stakeholders, in soft version

Mid-May 2018 1 week 3 days

#### Total Estimated working weeks

10 weeks 5 weeks


### 7. Evaluation Management and quality assurance

The evaluation will be conducted by an external evaluation team recruited by UNICEF EAPRO. The evaluation team will be led by a team leader, whose role will be to:

- Oversee and manage the other team members;
- Manage communications with UNICEF;
- Ensure adequate workspace, work equipment, accommodation, international and in-country travel, food, security and insurance arrangement to all evaluation team members;
- Orient and train team members where applicable;
- Organize and facilitate key meetings and workshops;
- Ensure that deadlines are met and all draft and final evaluation products and deliverables are of the required quality as per UNICEF standards (format and content).
- If necessary, the team leader will mobilize a dedicated quality assurance person for additional quality review.
- All draft and final deliverables submitted by the evaluation team leader will be accompanied by a detailed comment matrix describing whether and how earlier comments received have been incorporated, and when they have not been fully included, providing an appropriate justification.

The evaluation team will operate under the guidance and supervision of an evaluation management team comprised of the Regional Evaluation Adviser (Mr. Riccardo Polastro) and the Regional WASH Adviser (Mr. Chander Badloe). The evaluation management team will be responsible for the contractual aspects, day-to-day oversight and management of the evaluation as well as evaluation budget. They will facilitate the communications with the country offices, the reference group members (see below), and other relevant stakeholders. They will be also responsible for the quality of the evaluation, and provide the first round of comments to the evaluation team before submission of the revised draft to the reference group. They will check whether the findings and conclusions from the evaluation are relevant and recommendations are implementable, and propose improvements to the recommendations. They will approve all deliverables and payments. In addition, the team will
contribute for dissemination of the evaluation findings and to follow-up on the evaluation recommendations with a management response.

Support / facilitation will be provided by the WASH Specialist at the regional office (Ms. Anu Paudyal Gautam), and for country-level work, by the respective country office Planning-Monitoring-Evaluation (PME) Chiefs/Specialists and WASH Chiefs/focal points.

The role of the country office WASH and PME Chiefs, especially in those countries that will be visited by the evaluation team, will be the following:

- Designate a focal point for supporting the evaluation,
- Provide the evaluation team with all information, resource documents and contacts necessary for the evaluation,
- Facilitate the communication and coordination between the evaluation team and UNICEF’s implementing partners in-country,
- Organise / facilitate logistics, security, meetings and workshops; any related costs will be part of the regional evaluation and not from county office budgets,
- Provide comments on the key deliverables to minimize factual errors, misinterpretations, and omissions

UNICEF will provide quality assurance on all evaluation tools and documents based on the UNEG’s and UNICEF’s norms, standards, processes and tools and as well as on other best practices related to WASH programme evaluations. Once approved, the final evaluation report will be submitted to the UNICEF’s global evaluation reports oversight system (GEROS) for an independent quality rating. The report and the review will be made available on the UNICEF Internet website, in compliance with the commitment for transparency of evaluation findings.

All deliverables must be in professional level standard English and in compliance with UNICEF Style Book 2015 and UNICEF Brand Toolkit 2012. They must be language-edited / proof-read by a native speaker.

All reports will be in Microsoft Office Word format while all presentations will be in Microsoft Office PowerPoint. No PDF or hard copy will be submitted by the evaluation team. No page limit is set but all deliverables should be of the necessary length but not longer, and should be reader friendly. The use of bullet points, tables, graphs, photos, and other visualization methods is encouraged. The use of annexes is required for the evaluation tools, for all secondary information that is not directly related to the evaluation findings, as well as for any long technical documentation intended to a specific audience. PowerPoint presentations must include notes below each slide to make them easy to understand for people who could not attend the meeting.

All data collected, documentation gathered, and photos/videos taken and analyses produced for the purpose of the evaluation are to be made available to UNICEF in the appropriate format. Graphs and maps must be in editable format for layout purposes. All key deliverables will be made available on the UNICEF public website and widely disseminated to all target audience.

8. Evaluation team: Role and qualifications/experience

The core evaluation team may be comprised of three (3) experts, while UNICEF is flexible in the team’s composition so long as the evaluation work is of high quality. A gender balanced and culturally diverse team composition is strongly encouraged. Examples of profiles could be as follows:

- **Team Leader, evaluator by profession** – with 5-7 years of expertise and experience in development program evaluation preferably with a multidisciplinary background, strong strategic and analytical skills, familiar with the East Asia and Pacific regional socio-economic context, and with experience in conducting UN evaluations, As team leader, he/she is responsible for preparing the overall work plan, ensuring coherence of the analytical approach, and that all evaluation outputs are produced in an acceptable and timely...
manner. He/she will also be responsible for ensuring cross-cutting issues e.g. gender equality and human rights, including child rights are well considered; also ensuring integration of the inputs of the other team members into a coherent Regional and Country Program Evaluation Reports.

- **WASH Evaluation Specialist** – with extensive expertise and 5-7 years of experience in conducting WASH strategic and sector development program evaluations, knowledgeable of institutional issues related to development programming (with excellent knowledge of UNICEF and UNICEF WASH, including the role of the UN system, partnerships, results-based management, planning and monitoring, policy, advocacy, upstream programming and sustainable development issues). Familiarity with specific equity, gender, climate and humanitarian WASH and human rights issues

- **Research associate/coordinator** – will be tasked to support coordination, data gathering, field work, and all administrative and logistical support required to implement the evaluation; experience and skills in ICT, data managements and analysis.

9. **Evaluation Management**

The evaluation will be conducted by an external evaluation team to be recruited by UNICEF EAPRO. The evaluation team will operate under the supervision of an evaluation management team comprised of the Regional Evaluation Adviser (Mr. Riccardo Polastro), the Regional WASH advisor (Mr. Chander Badloe), with support from the WASH Specialist (Ms. Anu Paudyal Gautam) at the regional office and respective country office PME and WASH Chiefs and country Evaluation Officers.

The evaluation management team will be responsible for the day-to-day oversight and management of the evaluation as well as evaluation budget. They will be also responsible for the quality and independence of the evaluation to check if the findings and conclusions from the evaluation are relevant and recommendations are implementable. In addition, the team needs to contribute for dissemination of the evaluation findings and to follow-up the management response.

10. **Evaluation Reference Group**:

A reference group will be established with the following people, and led by the evaluation management team.

- Jeremie Toubkiss – Evaluation Specialist, Evaluation Office, UNICEF HQ
- Michael Gnilo or Brooke Yamakoshi, WASH Specialists at UNICEF HQ
- A representative from the regional partners – WaterAid Australia
- A representative from LACRO Regional Office
- A DFAT or DFID representative (TBC)

The reference group will have the following roles.

- Generally, advise the evaluation management team on various aspects of the evaluation and help this team make decisions
- Contribute to the preparation and design of the evaluation
- Provide feedback and comments on the second draft of the inception report and on the technical quality of the work of the consultants
- Assist in identifying internal and external stakeholders to be consulted during the evaluation process
- Participate in review meetings organized by the evaluation management team
- Provide comments and substantive feedback from a technical point of view to ensure the quality of the second draft and final evaluation reports
- Propose improvements/inputs to the preliminary recommendations
- Play a key role in learning and knowledge sharing from the evaluation results
- Contribute to disseminate the findings of the evaluation
o Advise on the management response to the evaluation, and follow up when appropriate

11. Assessment and Scoring of technical Proposals

Technical proposals will be assessed using the assessment grid allows maximum score of 100 points; technical proposals scoring less than 70 points will be considered non-responsive; therefore, will be rejected. Content of the bidders’ technical proposal to include:

A. Table of contents
B. Presentation of the bidding institution or institutions if a consortium, including:
   ▪ Name of the institution
   ▪ Date and country of registration/incorporation
   ▪ Summary of corporate structure (organogram) and business areas
   ▪ Business areas and experience.
   ▪ Past two years’ annual turnover (in US Dollars)
   ▪ Location of offices or agents
   ▪ Number of full-time employees and type (technical experts, administrative and logistics support staff, financial staff, etc.)
   ▪ In case of a consortium of institutions, the above listed elements shall be provided for each consortium members in addition to the signed consortium agreement.
   ▪ In case of a consortium, one only must be identified as the organization lead in dealing with UNICEF
C. Narrative description of the bidding institution’s experience and capacity in the following areas:
   ▪ Programme evaluations
   ▪ Multi-country evaluations, studies and research
   ▪ WASH assignments in developing countries in general, and in the Asia-Pacific region in particular
D. List of similar/relevant past and on-going assignments carried out by the bidder in the past 7 years (use template provided in annex 3). UNICEF may contact reference persons for feedback on services provided by the bidders.
E. Full reports or preferably links to full reports listed as examples of relevant past and on-going assignments of the bidder (at least 3), on which the proposed key personnel directly and actively contributed or authored.
F. Methodology. It should minimize repeating what is stated in the ToR. There is no minimum or maximum length. If in doubt, ensure sufficient detail. Required content is as follows:
   ▪ Understanding of and comments on the context and rationale for the evaluation, and on UNICEF’s WASH programming in EAPRO, on the evaluation scope, criteria, and questions
   ▪ Understanding of, comments on, and in-depth analysis of the aspects of complexity, potential challenges, risks and ethical issues related to this evaluation exercise
   ▪ Proposed evaluation design and methodology, with a sufficient level of detail on each phase and activity of the evaluation process, including on data to be collected to answer the detailed evaluation questions, envisaged data collection and analysis methods, the proposed sampling methodology and criteria to select the final case study countries, as well as the duration of the country visits and the number of evaluation team members participating. A particular attention should be paid to the issues of: stakeholder participation; mix of quantitative and qualitative data and methods; and data accuracy and triangulation.
   ▪ Comments and additional details/suggestions on the deliverables and management arrangements described in the ToR, if any
   ▪ Internal management arrangements and quality assurance procedures
   ▪ The presence of any local researchers or others not normally full time members of the bidding institution should be indicated, with a description of how they will be engaged, trained, supported and supervised.
G. Work plan, which will include as a minimum requirement the following:
   ▪ Detailed work plan based on the one proposed in the ToR, with comments and proposed adjustments, if any. It must be consistent with the general work plan and the financial proposal.

H. Evaluation team:
   ▪ Summary presentation of proposed experts
   ▪ Description of support staff if any (number and profile of research and administrative assistants etc.)
   ▪ Level of effort of proposed experts by activity. It must be consistent with the financial proposal.
   ▪ CV of each expert proposed to carry out the evaluation

Technical proposals’ assessment grid

The submitted proposal shall be assessed using the following assessment grid matrix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization profile and capacity (aptitude, availability, previous</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience (2-3 samples of work in last 3 years), references, multi-country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presence or proposed partnerships, administrative and logistic support),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed methodology and work plan (comprehensiveness, clarity,</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevance, logic, rigor, realism, practicality, creativity, level of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effort)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team profile and capacity (experience, qualifications, references, mix</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and complementarity of expertise, availability, time allocation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Content of the bidders’ financial proposal

The financial proposal must be fully separated from the technical proposal. The financial proposal will be submitted in both PDF and Microsoft Excel format. Costs will be formulated in US Dollars and free of all taxes. It will include the following elements as a minimum requirement:
1) Overall price proposal
2) Budget by phase, by activity (listed in the workplan outlined above), and within each activity, by cost category

13. Administrative issues

The institution selected for this assignment must provide their own computers, communication devices, internet connections and workspaces. Travel cost should include 3 trips to Bangkok, Thailand (2 of the full team and 1 only the Team Leader as outlines in section on Deliverables. Travels shall be calculated based on economy class travel, regardless of the length of travel and costs for accommodation, meals and incidentals shall not exceed applicable daily subsistence allowance (DSA) rates, as promulgated by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC). Contractors will be responsible for their own bookings and travel to and from the mission locations.

The technical and financial proposals shall be given a weight of 70% and 30%, respectively, for a total score of 100%. The minimum score required for the technical proposal is 70 of 100 points. Technical proposals scoring less than 70 points will be considered non-responsive and therefore, will be rejected. Financial proposals shall only be assessed for organizations that passed the minimum required score for the technical component.
### 14. Payment Schedule

The payment will be made upon the successful submission of following deliverables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Due Dates</th>
<th>Payment Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised/agreed on updated Inception Report (after incorporation of feedback from reference group) accepted by UNICEF</td>
<td>End January 2018</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable 2: Comprehensive list of relevant references, with summary of on-line survey if implemented</td>
<td>Early March 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable 3a: Zero Draft Evaluation Report + country profiles</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable 3 b: Consultation Workshop Report</td>
<td>End March to early April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable 4a: Advanced Draft Evaluation Report</td>
<td>Mid-April 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable 4b: Final Evaluation Report</td>
<td>Mid-May 2018</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable 5: Final versions of PowerPoint presentation, Evaluation Brief and Final Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. The evaluation reports must be compliant with UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standard.