TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION OF
THE UNITED NATIONS SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP
FRAMEWORK FOR BRAZIL (2017-2021)

Location	Home-based
Expected Duration of Assignment	90 days

1. Evaluation Context

The United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership Framework 2017-2021 is the central planning document for the United Nations (UN) activities in Brazil. The current Framework was elaborated by the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) and the Brazilian Government, represented by the Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC, in Portuguese: *Agência Brasileira de Cooperação*). It was signed in 2016 by 23 agencies, funds and programmes and the ABC and is organized around the five pillars of 2030 Agenda: People, Planet, Prosperity, Peace and Partnership. Each pillar has at least one outcome that synthetizes the UN System work to support the development of Brazil (for more details, please refer to the abovementioned link).

The process of evaluation is an important part of the results-based management cycle and a mandatory part of the current Partnership Framework that adheres to UNEG Norms and Standards and ethical guides. Its focus is both on the development results achieved, as well as the identification of internal gaps and overlaps. The United Nations understand that evaluation improves accountability for results and provides learning in terms of what has worked, what has not and why.

The evaluation will examine whether the UN Country Team (UNCT) is prioritizing support and contributing to the country's development, based on its national priorities. The evaluation will also identify synergies, gaps, overlaps and missed opportunities. It will ultimately assess whether the UNCT has contributed to transformative change that goes beyond the scope of programmes and projects to help Brazil progress towards achieving the SDGs. It will advise on the overall strategic positioning of the UN Development System in Brazil and on priorities and considerations for future support. The evaluation will not evaluate the individual programmes or activities of UNCT members, but rather build on the programme and project evaluations conducted by each agency.

A particular use of evaluation is for course correction to strengthen programmes by realigning priorities, strategies and interventions. Evaluation-based evidence and recommendations can also be used for resource leveraging and partnerships. Through evaluation, the UNCT, the host government and other UN stakeholders learn from the process of documenting good practices which can then be used for the benefit of other countries as well.

The process of evaluation is an external, independent exercise aiming at generating an independent assessment of results, successes, challenges and lessons learnt throughout this cycle and feed into the next programming cycle covering 2022 – 2026. The evaluation process should be conducted in an inclusive manner, promoting national ownership through the meaningful engagement of relevant national partners. It will be guided by the Companion Pieces of the new Cooperation Framework, including its annexes and evaluation guidelines.

The final report will provide valuable information for strengthening programming and results at the country level, and the management response elaborated by the UNCT in response to the evaluation recommendations will serve to inform the planning and decision-making for the next programme cycle and for improving UN coordination at the country level. This process became even more strategic with the United Nations General Assembly resolution 72/279, that elevated the new UNDAF (now renamed the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework) as "the most important instrument for planning and implementation of the UN development activities at country level in support of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (2030 Agenda)" and, in order to learn from past and current work and to inform the future UNSDCF design and implementation, the UNCT decided to launch the Evaluation prior to the start of the subsequent UNSDCF design cycle.

2. Brazilian Context

Brazil is a country with over 210 million people, ruled by a Constitution, and structured as a federation, with non-subordinate levels of governments. The three instances, (Union, states and municipalities) have autonomy and responsibilities in implementing a wide array of public policies. Local initiatives are implemented in addition to the national ones and each municipality has its own institutional and governance structure.

Brazil has made important progress in the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) since their adoption in 2015 and before that of the Millenium Development Goals. The Brazilian progress on SDGs can be found on the official website (https://odsbrasil.gov.br/). A significant decline in poverty levels was observed until 2014, as well as progress in the reduction of inequality among men and women and between white and blacks, as informed in the National Household Sample Survey (PNAD) of 2013 and compiled by the Institute of Applied Economic Research (IPEA). However, this progress has not been steady and more recent data show a drop in some of the achievements.

In the last decade, Brazil has experienced slow economic growth, with the GDP growth rate averaging 1% per year between 2017 and 2019. With COVID-19, the World Bank estimates a fall of 5.4% of the GDP in Brazil in 2020, a rate that is similar of those estimated by other international institutions such as the IMF. This is an unprecedented shrink of the economy, as these estimates mark the largest drop in GDP in over a century in Brazil.

The consequences can be seen, among others, in the unemployment rate, which is at 14.6% of the population from 6.2% in 2013 and has an increasing tendency due to the socioeconomic impacts of COVID-19. Poverty is also increasing, with 4.5% living below US$ 1,90 PPP (2011) in 2014 and 6.5% in 2019. Regarding the US$ 5,50 PPP (2011) poverty line, 22.8% of the population were poor in 2014 and 25.3% in 2019.

 Economic inequality is also increasing. According to data from the Human Development Report 2019, the share of the 10% richest in Brazil amounted to 41.9% of the country's total income, and the share of the 1% richest was 28.3%, putting Brazil at the second place of the highest income concentration in the world of this kind, only after Qatar (29%). The Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE) states that the income gap between white and Afro-Brazilian workers increased in 2019, reaching the highest level since 2016: the average monthly income of Afro-Brazilians is equivalent to 55.8% of that of white individuals – and black women's income corresponded to approximately 40% of white men. Regional inequalities also remain acute, marked by gender and racial inequalities.

Violence remains a grave challenge, especially armed violence. According to the latest available data from the Ministry of Health, 65,602 people were killed in 2017 in acts of violence, compared to 61,517 in 2016. However, more recent data from the Brazilian Public Safety Yearbook shows that murders in Brazil fell 11%, while deaths at the hands of the police increased by 19%. Deaths in clashes with security forces also increased over the previous year. According to the report, the victims of the Brazilian police are mainly men (99%), blacks (75%) and youths (78%).

The United Nations System has been present in Brazil since 1960, and over the past few decades has supported Brazil in the development of human and institutional capacities to face the challenges of overcoming social and economic inequalities, the full exercise of citizenship and human rights and the promotion of initiatives associated with the sustainable development of the country. The current UN Sustainable Development Partnership Framework has transcended through important political changes. Its elaboration started with the Government of President Dilma Rousseff in 2015, it was signed in 2016 under acting Vice-President Michel Temer, who after the presidential elections in 2018 was replaced by President Bolsonaro in 2019. The change in the political landscape in 2019, along with the humanitarian response to the Venezuelan migration crisis in the North of the country and the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 have required alignment of the programme portfolio and the assessment of UN activities.

The COVID-19 pandemic has had severe health, economic, social and environmental impacts in the country, as it is exacerbating the described, pre-existing inequalities and exposing vulnerabilities in the social, political, institutional, economic, and biodiversity systems. In addition to over 5.4 million people testing positive and more than 157,000 people being registered to have died by COVID-19 so far with immediate impacts on the health system, the necessary preventive measures to save lives have caused losses for businesses, and increased the unemployment rate even further, resulting in numerous families losing their main sources of income, despite the Government's successful emergency cash programmes, which will however run out eventually. Schools, in their majority (public), continue being closed countrywide since March, affecting millions of children that have also lost their daily school meal, and many of which are at risk of having to work to help their families. Unpaid care work has increased, as children are out-of-school, older or dependent persons have heightened care needs and health services are overwhelmed, resulting in a particularly high burden on women. Other vulnerable populations have been affected in a similar disproportionate way, amplifying the consequences of the pandemic by deepening the abovementioned economic and social stress. Coupled with restricted movement and social isolation measures, domestic and gender-based violence are increasing significantly. Indigenous peoples and people of African descent are suffering disproportionate impacts of COVID-19, and other vulnerable groups such as children and adolescents, women, *quilombola* and other traditional populations, refugees and migrants, older persons, persons with disabilities, people living in poor communities and informal settlements, persons in detention or in institutionalized settings, people living with HIV/AIDS and other pre-medical conditions are also at higher risk of facing more severe consequences.

Given the magnitude of the needs generated by the COVID-19 crisis and the urgency of the response, the United Nations System in Brazil, in consultation with the Government of Brazil, counterparts and partners, and responding to the pandemic's impact in line with the Secretary-General call for realignment of priorities at the country level, repurposed the existing development portfolio into interventions that support the socio-economic response to COVID-19. The Socioeconomic Response and Recovery Plan (SERP 2020-2021) elaborated for the country reflects the UN System priority assistance efforts.

In view of its importance in assessing the results of the past programming cycle and its role in informing the future UNSDCF design and implementation, the evaluation will have to be conducted in the light of the described context above.

3. Purpose, objectives and scope

The purpose of this evaluation is to provide accountability to the actions of the UN System in Brazil, focusing on lessons learned and best practices to address the new Cooperation Framework cycle.

The object of the assignment is to carry out a formative evaluation of the United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership Framework (also known as UNDAF) 2017-2021 for Brazil, assessing the relevance, coherence, appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency of its outcomes in support to national priorities, as well as the UN System's internal coherence to support its strategies.

The main expected objectives of the exercise are the identification of key lessons learned, best practices and challenges, as well as to find preliminary evidence of UN's capacities to support transformational changes in the country with sustainable effects, providing recommendations for the way forward and for the coming programming cycle.

The preliminary scope of the evaluation focuses on the design and the implementation strategy of the UNDAF 2017-2021 for the national and sub-national levels and on the indicative contributions to UNDAF outcomes by the UNCT resident and non-resident agencies, as well as its strategic interlinkages with the Socio-Economic Response and Recovery Plan – SERP 2020/2021 elaborated to repurpose programmatic efforts in response to the Covid-19 pandemic.

The primary users of the evaluation are the decision-makers within the UNCT, including non-resident UN agencies, their respective executive boards and key government counterparts.

4. Evaluation Questions and Methodology

Evaluation Approach

The evaluation will focus on its utilization and on the expectations of the main users. Within this general approach and its delimitations, the exercise is expected to be conducted in an inclusive manner and to promote national ownership through the meaningful engagement of key national partners throughout the evaluation process. It should be transparent, inclusive, as well as gender and human rights responsive. It should consider methods in which possible contributions (rather than attribution) of the UNCT could be traced regarding the achievement of the planned outcomes. The overall approach is expected to be theory-based (using the Partnership Framework theory of change), promoting participation of the evaluation stakeholders and interested parts as feasible. The evaluation should integrate gender equality and human rights approach throughout the evaluation.

The evaluation is independent and adherent to UNEG Norms and Standards[1]. Each Evaluation Team member will need to follow the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators[2], which provides ethical guidelines for the conduct of evaluations.

The evaluation will follow the guidance on the integration of gender equality and human rights principles as established in the UNEG, which entails not only analyzing the evaluation questions through a gender and race lens, but also the process itself should be transparent, participatory, inclusive and ensure fair power relations. In line with the UNCT System-Wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) on gender and race equality, data collection methods and the process should consider gender and race perspectives. The final report should be compliant with UNEG quality checklist of evaluation reports and acknowledge how inclusive stakeholder participation was ensured during the evaluation process and any challenges to obtaining the gender and race equality information or to addressing these issues appropriately. Data should be systematically disaggregated by sex, race/color and age and, to the extent possible and other contextually relevant markers of equity. Adherence to a code of ethics and a human right based and gender and race-sensitive approach in the gathering, treatment, and use of data collected should be made explicit in the inception report. In that sense, other references are: How to design Equity-Focused evaluations; How to manage gender responsive evaluation; UNEG Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations.

Methodology

Methods:
In general, the evaluation team is expected to utilize a mixed method approach and draw on both qualitative and quantitative data available to increase data sources for triangulation. The main elements of the methodology will be refined and further developed during the inception phase in line with the evaluation team's initial findings and in close collaboration with the Consultative Group and with DCO guidance and support.

Inception Phase:
Given that the Partnership Framework outcomes are set at a higher strategic, long-term level and are expected to be achieved by the work of many stakeholders (not only the UN), establishing the attribution of UN interventions to an observed result at Partnership Framework outcome level is unfeasible. In this sense, the inception phase should include an evaluability-oriented analysis, conducted to examine the UNDAF's design, Theory of Change, implementation strategies and relevant data available to assess if it provides the necessary elements for a reliable and credible evaluation within the initially outlined scope. This analysis will also help to determine the availability of documentation, the quality of the results framework and indicators, and gaps in information, which in its turn will inform the complete evaluation design to be registered under the inception report (contents outlined on item 5-Expected deliverables of this ToR).

Based on the abovementioned description, the below mentioned methodologic elements and evaluation design elements are indicative and will be finalized during the inception phase between the evaluation team and the evaluation commissioners, as well as with the responsible parties described at item 7 of the ToR below, as applicable to each of their roles.

Evaluation Matrix:

---

[1] UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016).
[2] UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system

During the inception phase, the evaluation team will propose a detailed evaluation methodology, including the presentation of an evaluation matrix at the inception report to evidence the links between data collection methods, evaluation questions, sources, risks and assumptions, indicators, etc.

The methodology described in this section is indicative and bidders are expected to interrogate the approach and methodology set out in the ToR and propose improvements on this along with detailed methodology to suit the task. Bidders will need to develop an appropriate sampling strategy to suit the nature of this evaluation; and include details of evaluation design; approaches to be adopted; data collection and analysis methods; and an evaluation and analytical framework. In their proposal, bidders should also refer to triangulation, sampling plan and methodological limitations and mitigation measures.

Data:
Followings are the main sources of data available for the evaluation, as well as the standards and considerations for data analysis and data collection:

Data sources:
o Interviews with main stakeholders
o Interviews with UN staff in Brazil
o United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership Framework 2017-2021
o Joint Workplan 2017
o Joint Workplan 2018
o Socio-economic Response Plan for COVID-19 2020-2021
o Joint Workplan 2020
o Progress Report 2017, 2018 and 2019
o UNCT summary results 2017, 2018 and 2019
o Gender and Race SWAP Scorecard Report 2020 (currently in elaboration)
o UN agencies evaluations, especially UNICEF, UNFPA and UNDP evaluations (currently in elaboration)
o The evaluation team should also consider a desk review, including literature review as well as international benchmarks and best practices

Data Analysis:
o Provide credible answers to the evaluation questions.
o Ensure that the information collected is valid, reliable and sufficient to meet the evaluation purposes, scope and approach and that the analysis is logically coherent and complete (and not speculative or opinion-based).
o Use a mixed method, employing the most appropriate qualitative and quantitative approaches, data types and methods of data analysis.
o Ensure triangulation of the various data sources to ensure maximum validity, reliability of data and promote use.
o Apply participatory and utilization-focused approach to involve key stakeholders, guarantee representation of most vulnerable groups, and boost ownership of the evaluation should be adopted.
o Ensure a Leave No One Behind lens, particularly gender equality and human rights.
o Ensure the linkage with the SDGs.

Data Collection:

o Document review focusing on planning documents, progress reviews, annual reports and past evaluation reports, strategy papers, national plans and policies and related programme and project documents. These should include reports on the progress against national and international commitments.
o Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor community members, diverse groups of women, representatives of key civil society organisations (especially those representing the most vulnerable populational groups), UNCT members, and implementing partners.
o Surveys and questionnaires including right holders meant to benefit from development programmes, UNCT members, and / or surveys and questionnaires involving other stakeholders.
o Focus Group discussions involving groups and sub-groups of stakeholders, decisionmakers.
o Other methods such as outcome mapping, observational visits, photo stories, etc.

In addition, the precise data collection methods should be identified following:
• Analysis of availability of existing evaluative evidence and administrative data.
• Logistical constraints (travel restrictions imposed by the pandemic, costs, time, etc).
• Ethical considerations (especially when evaluating sensitive topics such as GBV and when consulting specific populations, such as indigenous peoples).

Important observation on data collection: Given the current COVID-19 context, data collection and related preparatory activities involving direct person-to-person contact is not expected and should be de-prioritized until the UN declare it is safe to resume with such direct contact. The methodology should explore alternative virtual means to gather information, while assessing their feasibility in the context of COVID-19[3]. It should seek alternatives to face-to-face data collection and make full use of pre-existing secondary data such as administrative datasets and previous survey datasets to answer some evaluation questions.

Quality assurance:
The evaluation should use and indicate in the evaluation matrix the validation methods that will be used to ensure that the data, information and conclusions made carry the necessary depth. A mandatory mechanism should be sharing findings, conclusions and recommendations with the evaluation Consultative Group and Evaluation Steering Committee, as applicable to their roles (described in item 7 of the ToR).

Main Stakeholders

Stakeholder mapping will be part of the inception phase to be implemented by the evaluation Team with technical support and inputs from the UNCT. An indicative outline of stakeholders to be considered under this evaluation exercise are:
(I) The resident and non-resident Agencies, funds and programmes that compose the UN System in Brazil;
(ii) The Brazilian Cooperation Agency of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (ABC/MRE), as the main UN System counterpart for strategic level international cooperation;
(iii) Other key governmental sectoral stakeholders, to be identified during the evaluation assessment in coordination with ABC/MRE;
(iv) Subnational governmental stakeholders;
(iv) Civil society organizations, to be mapped by the UNCT in Brazil;
(v) Private Sector organizations, with the support from the National Global Compact Network.

---

[3] Refer to UN agencies, funds and programmes specific guides on adapting evaluation to the COVID-19 pandemic, such as UNFPA Evaluation Office Guide on Adapting Evaluations to the Covid-19 pandemic.

Sampling of these stakeholders will be jointly defined by the evaluation team and the commissioners, based on methodological aspects and searching for a balanced representation of each segment, but also considering feasibility aspects such as timeframe, accessibility, relevance to the evaluation scope and others.

Questions

For Cooperation Framework evaluations, the evaluation questions should assess the following dimensions.

a) Relevance and appropriateness of the UN system support

✓ Has the UN system supported the achievement of national development goals and targets, in alignment to relevant national plans and frameworks?

✓ Has the UN system addressed key issues and development challenges identified by the UN Common Country Assessment in the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals?

✓ Has the UN system remained responsive to emerging and unforeseen needs of the country and the people in most vulnerable situations?

✓ Has the UN system paid proper attention to emergency needs in cases of humanitarian crisis, while considering the inter-relationships between development and humanitarian support (development-humanitarian nexus)?

✓ Has the UN system contributed to the realization of international Human Rights and Gender, Race and Ethnicity Equality norms and agreements (e.g. CEDAW, UDHR, CRPD, Beijing Platform for Action, CERD, Durban Declaration and Plan for Action, International Decade of People of African Descent, Convention 169, UN Declaration on Indigenous Peoples Rights), as well as to national and local strategies to advance Human Rights and Gender, Race and Ethnic Equality?

b) Coherence of the UN system support and the efficiency and effectiveness of the Cooperation Framework

✓ Has the Cooperation Framework strengthened the position, credibility and reliability of the UN system as a partner for the government and other actors, and used effectively as a partnership vehicle?

✓ Has the Cooperation Framework strengthened the coherence of support by UNCT members towards the common objectives and to deliver quality, integrated, SDG-focused policy support?

✓ Has the Cooperation Framework reduced transaction costs for partners through greater UN coherence and discipline?

✓ What has been achieved in each UNSDCF outcome and where were the gaps?

✓ In what extent were the Cooperation Framework implementation strategies adequate to facilitate their achievement?

c) Supporting transformational changes

✓ Has the UN system support extended in such a way to build national and local capacities and ensure long-term gains?

✓ Has the UN system supported the country and the most vulnerable people in strengthening economic and individual resilience and contributed to reducing vulnerability against shocks and crises, especially regarding the Venezuelan influx and the COVID-19 pandemic, considering the Refugee and Migrant Response Plan 2020 (RMRP) and the Socio-economic Response Plan 2020-2021 (SERP)?

✓ Has the UN system contributed to reducing the underlying causes of inequality and discrimination, contributing to implement the principle of leave no one behind?

✓ Has the UN system contributed to the empowerment of rights holders to demand and duty bearers to fulfil Human Rights and Gender Equality norms?

d) Conformity with the crosscutting principles/ UN guiding principles

✓ What has been the relevance of the UNSDCF design to diverse women and other groups?

✓ Has the UN system been effective in achieving results/changes explicitly regarding gender, race and ethnic equality or within the larger scope of LNOB?

✓ Has the UN system contributed to changing attitudes and behaviours towards Human Rights and Gender, Race and Ethnic Equality?

✓ Has the UN system support extended in such a way to promote gender equality?

✓ Has the UN system support followed the Human Rights principles?

✓ Has the UN system support designed and delivered in consideration to environmental implications?

Risks and limitations

The evaluability assessment to be elaborated in the first phase of the evaluation should try to identify risks and limitations for this exercise. However, an initial list of anticipated limitations can be indicated:

Context: the governmental transition of 2019 can have effects at the data collection phase since the previous counterparts (individuals and organizational structures) may no longer be available. Current governmental priorities may also differ from the ones under which the UNDAF was based, what can also cause the same effect upon data collection.

Access and reliability of data: The broad scope of UNDAF's outcomes and the lack of one unified monitoring system for all agencies, funds and programmes is a limitation for the exercise.

COVID-19: the outbreak will require the evaluation to develop innovative and remote ways to connect to main stakeholders and counterparts of the United Nation System in Brazil and the evaluation team will be required to follow health and safety guidelines. In a general manner the main stakeholders for this evaluation are receptive to these kinds of arrangements.

However, the risk that these arrangements may limit access to certain stakeholders, lowering the quality of interview data and losing the option of unobtrusive observation is a possibility that should be considered. One way around this is to rely more heavily on the expertise of (local) consultants with the right substantive and expertise in Brazilian context.

Time limitation: despite the broadness of the evaluation subject, this exercise is inserted within the elaboration of the new UNSDCF 2022-2026 for Brazil, serving as one of the main technical inputs for its design. Considering that all UN agencies, funds and programmes depend on its development to further establish its individual programmes, it is crucial that the UNSDCF is elaborated within its planned timeframe (1st semester of 2021). In this sense, the indicated duration for this evaluation (90 days) is expected to be observed and, as such, its timely execution should be an important criterion for the final evaluation design.

5. Expected deliverables

The evaluation will be executed in four distinct stages:

(i) An inception phase that will allow the evaluation team to fully understand: the evaluation criteria and the objectives of the evaluation, as well as the limitations to the evaluation and will help refine evaluation purpose, scope and questions Inclusion of key users in this stage will be key to ensure a participatory and effective utilization approach; Preliminary findings will lead to the revision as needed of the evaluation methodology in close agreement with the evaluation managers; A brief *inception report* will capture all the changes and include tools for collection of data, an evaluation matrix as well as a more detailed and up to date evaluation timeline.

(ii) A data collection phase will entail a more in-depth desk review and interviews. The data collection analysis methods should be human rights-based and gender sensitive and the data collected is expected to be disaggregated by sex, race, ethnicity, age, disability, etc. The Resident Coordinator Office will support the evaluation team to identify and contact key stakeholders.

(iii) An analysis and reporting phase where data collected will be systematized, triangulated and analyzed. Some follow up remote interviews may be required. A *first draft evaluation report* will be *presented* to the reference group for validation and comments. A *final report* will be prepared incorporating all comments and findings. An *Executive Summary* including key findings, conclusions and recommendations will be developed in English and Portuguese.

(iv) A use and follow up phase will set up the last stage of the evaluation. Once the report is final, the Steering Committee and the UNCT will coordinate the preparation of the formal Management Response for the Evaluation, focusing on the use for the design process of the new Cooperation Framework. It should contain general remarks on the content of the report, followed by a response to each recommendation (normally prepared in tabular format) and a follow-up mechanism.

The consultants will provide necessary inputs to the evaluation process and ensure technical assistance for production of the following deliverables:

- An evaluability-oriented analytical exercise, not exceeding 10 pages, with the conclusion of this exercise. The initial guiding questions are: to what extent is the UNDAF design clearly defined, with a robust Theory of Change and results framework in place, and

relevant to the country context?; the measurability to what extent are there appropriate indicators, tools, systems and resources established and in use for monitoring, reporting and learning on progress and results? Are critical data sets available that are suitable for the intended scope of the evaluation?; and the context: what contextual factors and cycles (political, social, seasonal, internal priorities, major evaluation initiatives of other stakeholders) need to be considered when conducting the Evaluation, and what risks and assumptions been identified concerning these?

- <u>An inception report</u> not exceeding 20 pages, excluding annexes which sets out: evaluator's understanding of the issues to be evaluated (scope), questions[4] that the evaluation intends to answer, and the evaluator understanding of the context in which the evaluation takes place; including of a comprehensive stakeholder analysis; any suggested deviations from the TOR; an evaluation matrix showing selected criteria of analysis, questions and sub-questions, the indicators; proposed and sources of information; an overall methodological approach and design for the evaluation, including details of gender analysis and triangulation strategy; data collection and analysis tools that will be used to conduct the evaluation; any limitations of the chosen methods of data collection and analysis and how they will be addressed; explanation of how the views of various stakeholders, including vulnerable and marginalized groups, will be addressed during the evaluation; fieldwork plan, timeline for the evaluation, draft dissemination strategy of the evaluation results. The inception report will include a reconstruction of the Theory of Change that could be tested and validated throughout the evaluation. The evaluator needs to clearly identify any potential ethical issues and approaches, as well as the processes for ethical review and oversight of the evaluation process.
- <u>A first draft report</u> for circulation and identification of factual corrections from UNCT and main stakeholders;
- <u>A presentation with preliminary findings</u> to be shared and presented in a meeting with UNCT and key stakeholders;
- <u>A final report</u>, including an Executive Summary. The final report must be kept short (maximum 40 pages maximum excluding annexes), with an Executive Summary up to 5 pages. A provided template will serve as a standard outline for the evaluation. This should be considered during the inception phase and taking account of the specific scope and focus of the evaluation, a detailed outline of the evaluation report should be included in the inception report. More detailed information on the context, the programme or the comprehensive aspects of the methodology and of the analysis will be placed in the annexes.

All the documents should be elaborated in English, with a Portuguese version for the final Executive Summary. The report will be prepared in accordance with UNEG guidance.

Expected deliverables and suggested timeline:

Action/Deliverable	Timeline	Payment
1. Inception Phase: Evaluability-oriented analytical exercise	20 days after the signature of the contract	15%

---

[4] The questions should be comprehensive enough that they raise the most pertinent evaluation questions, while at the same time being concise enough to provide users with a clear overview of the evaluation's objectives

2. Inception Phase: Inception Report	35 days after the signature of the contract	15%
3. Analysis and Reporting Phase: Draft Evaluation Report	65 days after the signature of the contract	35%
4. Analysis and Reporting Phase: Presentation with key findings to stakeholders	75 days after the signature of the contract	
5. Analysis and Reporting Phase: Final Evaluation Report	90 days after the signature of the contract*	35%

*NOTE: The commissioners will analyze the report and request final adjustments within the last 10 contractual days.

6. Management and Conduct of the Evaluation

Composition of the Evaluating Team and Management Arrangements

The **Team of Evaluators** will be determined by the bidders and will be consist with the expected deliverables and suggested timeline. The expectation is that the team is composed of at least 2 evaluators, including one senior team leader and one national specialist. The team will bear the overall responsibility for provision of the deliverables outlined in this Terms of Reference.

An **Evaluation Steering Committee** is responsible for the proper conduct of the Evaluation. The Committee will consist of the UNCT and Government representatives, under the leadership of the Resident Coordinator and ABC/MRE Director.

A **Consultative Group** will be established under the leadership and supervision of the Evaluation Steering Committee comprising UNCT members and M&E focal points. The Consultative Group will review and provide inputs and feedback to the evaluation design report.

The **Evaluation Manager** appointed by the Evaluation Steering Committee, will facilitate access of evaluators to information sources and provide comments on the main deliverables of the evaluation process. This Evaluation Manager should have adequate professional capacities and no current/potential conflict of interest (implementation involvement) towards the Cooperation Framework under evaluation.

The **Evaluation Advisor** will be designated by the UN DCO and will safeguard the independence and quality of the evaluation, liaising with the Evaluation Manager and the Evaluation Team for that end and participating in the review process of each phase. The Advisor will also provide technical support to the decision-making processes involved throughout the exercise and to risk mitigation strategies when needed.

The phases of this exercise will be subject to **review processes** that include: (i) the participation of the Consultative Group and the Evaluation advisor in the revision and input provision for all phases and deliverables; (ii) the validation of key phases and deliverables – Inception Report and Evaluation report – by the Steering Committee and the UNCT, as well as provision of strategic guidance during the whole process whenever needed.

Duties and Responsibilities of the Evaluators

The exact composition of the Evaluation team will be defined by the consulting firm, in agreement with RCO. The expectation is that the team is composed of at least 2 evaluators, including one senior team leader and one national specialist. The Team of Evaluators will fully adhere to all aspects of the UNEG and UNSDCF evaluation guidelines and will report to the UNCT through the Resident Coordinator Office and will receive their overall guidance and support. The team should be gender balanced and culturally diverse, making use of national/regional evaluation expertise.

In addition to the overall evaluation team's reporting responsibilities to the UNCT, the selected experts will:

- Delivery of the products respecting the agreed deadlines.
- Review relevant documents;
- Conduct interviews and surveys;
- Carry out fieldwork and data collection as per the inception report and Terms of Reference;
- Conduct an analysis of the outcomes, outputs, Join Work Plans and other related materials;
- Participate in meetings with the Evaluation Steering Committee, the Consultative Group and the Evaluation Manager, as requested;
- Among other similar tasks.

7. Qualification Requirements

TEAM LEADER (minimum 1 professional)

Education:

- Advanced university degree (Masters or equivalent) in social sciences, development studies, economics, international relations, public management or related field.

Competencies:

- Strong analytical, research and writing skills with demonstrated ability to think strategically;
- Ability to focus on impact and results for the client, promoting and demonstrating an ethic of client service;
- Ability to synthesize information in an easily understandable written way;
- Ability to write clearly and convincingly, adapting style and content to a diverse audience;
- Demonstrated ability to produce high quality outputs and in a timely fashion;
- Excellent organizational skills and ability to work independently;
- Ability to work with different stakeholders and multi-cultural environment.

Required Experience

- A minimum of 10 years of professional experience in the area of evaluation, with a strong record in designing and leading evaluations;

- Excellent and proven knowledge in a wide range of Evaluation design and approaches, as well as qualitative and quantitative data collection methods, including participatory approaches and methods;
- Prior experience in working with multilateral agencies evaluations;
- Proven knowledge of 2030 Agenda, UN role and UN programming at the country level;
- Proven knowledge and experience in evaluating gender, race, ethnic equality and/or human rights interventions, to be evidenced by working.

Desirable experience:

- Knowledge of the UN's human rights, gender equality and equity agendas and application in evaluation would be an asset.

Language:

- Fluency in English is required. Working knowledge in Spanish or Portuguese is required. Fluency in Portuguese is a highly desirable asset.

EVALUATION TEAM (minimum 1 professional)

Education:

- Bachelor's degree in social sciences, development studies, economics, international relations, or related field. Advanced university degree (Masters or equivalent) is an asset.

Competencies:

- Strong analytical, research and writing skills with demonstrated ability to think strategically;
- Ability to focus on impact and results for the client, promoting and demonstrating an ethic of client service;
- Ability to synthesize information in an easily understandable written way;
- Ability to write clearly and convincingly, adapting style and content to a diverse audience;
- Demonstrated ability to produce high quality outputs and in a timely fashion;
- Excellent organizational skills and ability to work independently;
- Ability to work with different stakeholders and multi-cultural environment.

Required Experience:

- A minimum of 4 years of professional experience in conducting evaluations, experience with evaluations within the UN system is an asset;
- At least one team member should be national and demonstrate in-depth knowledge of Brazil's national context and public policies;
- At least one team member should have knowledge of the UN's human rights, gender equality and equity agendas and application in evaluation.

Language:

- Fluency in English. Fluency in Portuguese is required for at least 1 professional.

Consulting Company Portfolio Requirements:

- At least two quality certificates of similar nature and complexity implemented over the last 5 years, issued by the Client who received the services, assuring the implementation within time and quality expected for qualification purpose.
- Proven availability of office technology equipment, IT tools, including videoconferencing tools., as well as any other technological tools that may be utilized during the evaluation as part of its methods.

8. Duration of the Contract

The contract must be completed after 90 days, with the submission of a final report.

9. Application process

Applications must include:

- A **technical proposal**, including 1) the methodological approach that will be applied to guarantee quality and timely deliverables; 2) a risk assessment (i.e. what are the main risks that may come to hamper progress and what precautions will be taken to diminish such risks?); 3) a detailed work plan with dates and information on implementation within the given timeframe, including roles and responsibilities of each team member; 4) the firm's portfolio, including the team composition and profile of all professionals that will be involved in the evaluation; 5) The CV of the Evaluation Team, including diploma and certificates;
  Observation: the contractor may invite bidders for a brief online presentation of their submitted technical proposals in order to facilitate its understanding. In this case, please note that the presentation would take place in mid-January and would not configure a mandatory requirement. The written proposals presented within this Term of Reference are the official source from which the technical evaluation will be based upon.
- A **financial proposal** containing the breakdown of costs and total amounts. All costs foreseen by the company for the implementation of this ToRs should be considered.

 NOTE: Files should not exceed 10.0MB limit

Evaluation Criteria for Technical and Financial proposal

Only the technical proposals of eligible and qualified bidders will be evaluated and scored as follow:

Summary of Technical Proposal Evaluation Forms	Points Obtainable
1. Bidder's qualification, capacity and experience	20
2. Adequacy of Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan	50
3. Prior work experience within related fields	30

Total		**100**

Technical Proposal (100 points)

Evaluation Criteria	Sub-criteria	Maximum Points
Technical Proposal (Adequacy of Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan)	Clear understanding of the objectives of the consultancy and relevance to the expected results.	20
	Risk assessment – acknowledgement of risks/challenges of the chosen methodological approach and proposed methods to manage such risks/challenges.	10
	General clarity on the proposal, adequacy to the research methodology, work plan is realistic and efficient, foreseen dates of deliverables, in line with this Terms of Reference.	20
Bidder's qualification, capacity and experience	Company/Institution's experience in undertaking evaluation for multilateral organizations, including UN agencies.	20
Prior work experience within related fields	CV of team leaders and team composition and profile.	30
Maximum Punctuation of Technical Proposal =>		100

The table below shall be considered for punctuation of relevant experience of the Firm/Institution, the Technical Team and technical proposal:

SCORE
[100%]: Excellent evidence of the ability to meet and exceed the requirements

> **[90%]: good evidence of the ability to meet and exceed the requirements**
>
> **[70%]: satisfactory evidence of the ability to meet the requirements**
>
> **[40%]: marginally acceptable / weak evidence of ability to meet requirements**
>
> **[10%]: insufficient: no evidence to meet the requirements**
>
> **[0%]: no information submitted or unacceptable according to the requirements**

The proposals will be evaluated by a Committee composed of at least three and at most five members.

Note: The Bidders that do not achieve the minimum technical score required (70% of total score) will not have their financial proposal evaluated.

The proposal with highest Combined Score (TP Rating x 70%) + (FP Rating x 30%) will be selected.

Special Considerations

I. For the purpose of assessing the qualification and experience of the institution:

   a. Submission of documents, such as certificates of technical capacity and declarations certifying the implementation of a project or consultancy, with sufficient information to allow a proper analysis of the experiences to be included in such documents. Relevant information about the issuer with reference to contact must also be included.

II. For the purpose of assessing the academic and professional experience of the technical team:

   a. Experience and education qualifications: The professional experience must be proven by means of a signed curriculum vitae, informing the workplaces and respective contacts, the function performed, the period of realization, etc. Other documents that provide evidence of professional experience, such as information on published books or articles, detailed information on the scope of services performed, signed contracts, studies or reports performed, etc., should be attached to the curriculum. Copies of certificates and diplomas shall be presented

Note: The team responsible for the procurement procedures reserves the right to make inquiries with, and request documents from, bidders to clarify any information necessary, presented in the proposal, and/or incompatible with the descriptions made.

Final Classification

The Final Result (RF) is the combined scores of technique and commercial proposal, up to 100 points, in order to establish the final grid of classification and know the winning bidder.

The proposal that achieves the highest Final Result (FR) will be selected.

The following formula will be used for the calculation of the financial proposal note:

$$NF = 100 \times PM/PA$$

Where:

NF = Note to financial proposal

PM = Lower price proposal

PA = Price proposal in evaluation

The lowest price proposal will have a score of 100 (one hundred). The Final Result (RF) is the combined analysis of technique and price in order to establish the final grade grid and know the winning bidder. The Final Result (RF) will be the sum of the Final Technical Note NT (weight 70%) with the Financial Note NF (weight 30%), ie: RF = NTx0.70 + NFx0.30 The proposal that achieves the highest Final Result (RF) will be selected.

Tiebreaker Criterion

In case of a tie, the highest ranked bidder will be considered the one who obtains the highest number of points referring to the "Qualification and Experience of the Technical Team".

If the tie persists, the Bidder that obtains the highest number of points referring to the "Work Plan, Methodology and Approach" will be considered the highest ranked.

Financial Proposal (30 points)

The company/institution should present a proposal for the whole consultancy. Prices presented by the candidates should include all possible costs (taxes, fees, etc). The company/institution should include all deliverables and services on the budget, for the full delivery of the contract. Additional fees and budgets will not be taken into consideration.

Services that are not foreseen in the Terms of Reference will not be subject to later inclusions or amendments. If any, doubts or questions should be submitted up to 7 working days before deadline of application, specified in this TOR. A Q&A section will be held, and specific date and time will be informed previously of the deadline of the application.