unicef ✿ | **for every child**

SRI LANKA COUNTRY OFFICE - TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)
FOR INSTITUTIONAL CONTRACTORS
Final evaluation of 'Promoting Reconciliation in Sri Lanka'

Requesting Section: *Education Section - UNICEF Sri Lanka*

1. Background:

Context

UNICEF together with UNDP and WHO plans to commission a final evaluation of 'Promoting Reconciliation in Sri Lanka" which is supported by the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) within the framework of the Sri Lanka Peacebuilding Priority Plan (PPP) – a vision and policy document developed by the Government of Sri Lanka with the support from the United Nations in response to the commitment made under the UNHCR resolution 30/1. Other donors and the Civil Society were consulted during the PPP development process.

Since the end of the Civil war in 2009, the Government of Sri Lanka has stated a strong commitment towards taking forward reform processes aimed at building peace and reconciliation. Whilst this has included the setting up of an institutional framework, which includes a combination of institutions and policies focused on issues of peacebuilding, reconciliation and transitional justice, it has also included a strong commitment to ensure that the education system and the provision of psychosocial support to promote peace.

In 2015, the Government established two Ministries, whose mandates were to promote national integration and reconciliation, and national dialogue, co-existence and official languages. Further, the Government also set up the Secretariat Coordinating Reconciliation Mechanisms (SCRM) and the Office of National Unity and Reconciliation (ONUR) at the national level, with a view towards promoting and coordinating transitional justice and reconciliation initiatives. Civil society also played a key role through actively engaging in the reforms and peacebuilding processes, both in partnership with the government institutions, as well as independently. Given the number and diversity of stakeholders involved in these processes, coordination, and the building of consensus and cohesiveness between and amongst these stakeholders on a national agenda for governance reform and dialogue is crucial. However, the Presidential election held in November 2019 led to changes in the Government, requiring a transition period, which has had an impact on both the scope and timeframe of certain activities. A few key counterparts for Peace and Reconciliation, such as the Ministry of National Integration and Resettlement and the Secretariat for Coordinating Reconciliation Mechanisms (SCRM) were dissolved, leaving no alternative arrangements under the present interim Government. Meanwhile, the Ministry of Defense has been vested with some of these roles, including rehabilitation and resettlement.

In Education, Peace building and reconciliation in Education continues to be a critical component in the Government's agenda. Following the review of the National Policy on Education for Social Cohesion and Peace (2008), in 2017 the Government has established a relatively new unit for Peace Education and

Reconciliation (PERU) within the Ministry of Education (MoE) to oversee and coordinate the work in the area of Education for Social Cohesion (SC). Further, the MoE with support from Office for National Unity and Reconciliation (ONUR), UNICEF and GIZ developed a National Action Plan for Education for Social Cohesion (ESC), which included interventions under key thematic to address implementation gaps (namely: curricula revisions; language and communication; co- and extra-curricular; teacher education; school level strategy; equality strategy; and research, monitoring and evaluation). This action plan was reviewed and approved by the Inter-Ministerial Steering Committee in July 2017. The action plan formed the basis for developing programmes and mobilizing funds in the area of Education for Social Cohesion. The activities under outcome 2 of this project are directly in-line with this action plan and contribute to national Reconciliation initiatives and processes. However, overall implementation of the above action plan has been lagging due to lack of coordination among concerned entities at all levels.

As a country emerging from a pro-longed civil conflict, the need to address the negative emotional and psychological impacts among the people was critical to ensure lasting peace and reconciliation. In the context of Sri Lanka, the existing government systems and ad-hoc project related support programmes in this area have been struggling to provide services to the community in a coordinated manner with minimal information systems and feedback mechanisms. The inequalities in access to social and health support services, continue to affect vulnerable populations, including those affected by the conflict. Increase in deliberate self-harm, substance abuse and interpersonal violence are evident (through available research pieces) among these communities as they struggle to get their lives back on track.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, under the present circumstances, the evaluation will factor in the restrictions and limitations associated with conducting a full-fledge evaluation. Therefore, a possibility of a remote evaluation can be considered. Further, following the presidential election in Nov 2019 and the general election in Aug 2020, the change in government has led to dismantling of some key state institutions that were closely engaged in the development and the implementation of the project. This includes the Office for National Unity and Reconciliation (ONUR), Secretariat for Coordinating Reconciliation Mechanisms (SCRM), Ministry of Resettlement, Ministry of National Integration. As such there will be challenges in accessing some of the key state institutions who have driven the project since its inception.

Against this backdrop, UNDP, WHO and UNICEF in partnership with the respective line ministries piloted an integrated package of support through three different but essential components to foster reconciliation. The first component focuses on establishing dialogue mechanisms to promote social cohesion and prevent conflict, the second at promoting the reconciliation process through Education reforms, and the third at strengthening psychosocial support systems to address conflict related mental health issues. Sri Lanka being an eligible country to receive support under the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), the project is funded by the PBF in support of the implementation of the Sri Lanka's PPP where Reconciliation is identified as one of the four key pillars. A total of USD 1.6 million was received for this project as part of the PRF. The Project developed targeted interventions to promote social cohesion and conflict prevention, with a strong focus on measures aimed at building understanding, countering violence and respond to mental health issues in partnership with different government entities and CSOs. Some other initiatives supported by different donors have complimented the project activities. This includes the European Union's support to peacebuilding project, World Bank funded General Education Modernization project, GIZ's project on Education for Social Cohesion etc.

As per the project document, the following are the project objectives and outcomes:

Outcome 1: Processes and mechanisms promoting social cohesion and conflict prevention, including through dialogue and early warning, institutionalized at national and sub-national levels.

Output 1.1: Key institutions promote peacebuilding and reconciliation at the national and subnational levels in line with the PPP

Output 1.2: Civil society and local authorities pilot and scale up dialogue and early warning mechanisms to address existing and emerging conflicts in targeted locations.

Outcome 2: Education system supports inter-personal and inter-group understanding and interaction among teachers, students, parents and communities.

Output 2.1: Basic and higher education curricula and resource materials are revised and implemented to strengthen the development of competencies related to conflict resolution, civic engagement and conflict prevention

Output 2.2: Principals, teachers and school communities have enhanced capacities to prevent and resolve conflict, and promote civic engagement

Output 2.3: Research, monitoring and evaluation inform policies and programmes towards promoting peace through Education

Outcome 3: Conflict-related mental health issues are addressed to reduce inequalities and promote greater state and civic engagement in reconciliation processes

Output 3.1: Coordination and coherence among offices within State institutions at central, provincial and district levels in delivering psychosocial services

Output 3.2: Research and analysis of primary data inform policies and programmes towards promoting mental health

Output 3.3: Increased capacity at community-level to promote more peaceful approaches to conflict within and among individuals

The peacebuilding survey (2016) and project specific fact-finding assessments have provided the baseline data for the project. This proposed joint independent project-end evaluation of the project seeks to ascertain the project's results and impacts in-line with its results framework. It would also serve as means of consolidating lessons learned through this project that could inform future peacebuilding initiatives. As such, the evaluation will be a participatory, multi-stakeholder process guided by Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) along with participant UN agencies – namely UNDP, UNICEF and WHO.

Project document can be downloaded here:

2. Objectives and Purpose

The **primary objectives** of the evaluation are to:
- Assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of interventions implemented and results achieved in line with Theory of Change (ToC) and results framework.
- Document the best peacebuilding practices and lessons learnt
- Assess to what extent the PBF project has made a concrete contribution to reducing conflict factors in Sri Lanka as identified in the conflict analysis.
- Assess whether the project has been implemented through a conflict-sensitive approach.
- Evaluate the project's implementation strategy, institutional arrangements as well as its management and operational systems and value for money.

- Given that the PPP is coming to an end, recommendations should be forward-looking considering the COVID-19 and the new political context.

The primary intended users for this evaluation will be the following stakeholders, but not limited to:
- Govt. counterparts (Ministries & Departments): Ministry of Education, National Institute of Education, Departments of Education in the provinces and zones, University Gants Commission, Ministry of Health and Indigenous medicine, Ministry of Woman and Child Affairs, Ministry of Defense, Ministry of Justice
- UNDP, UNICEF and WHO and CSO partners implementing the project.
- Development actors working in the area of Peacebuilding and reconciliation, including PBSO/PBF.

To carry out the assignment, UNICEF together with UNDP and WHO wishes to hire the consultancy services of an experienced and qualified institution.

3. Estimated Duration of Contract:

Start date: 15 September 2020   End date: 31 December 2020

4. Evaluation governance:

The evaluation will be managed by UNICEF's Country Office Evaluation focal point, with the support of UNICEF'S Regional Evaluation Specialist and key technical inputs provided by UNDP, WHO, UNICEF's Education Section.

An **Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)** will be established with subject matter experts to provide technical inputs to assure quality of the deliverables in ensuring the technical soundness. The ERG will also support in reviewing of the inception report, draft report and final evaluation report. The ERG membership will include representatives from the three UN agencies, government and CSO partners.

UNICEF as the contracting agency will approve the related payments up to the level of final report. The inception report, draft report and the final report is subject to the technical clearance from the evaluation manager and the PBF (UNICEF Sri Lanka will ensure that the evaluation is conducted in line with the established procedures governed by UNEG Standards and Norms as well as UNICEF's Evaluation Policy and the PBF's evaluation guidelines.

6. Evaluation Scope

Scope

- **Geographic scope**: For *outcome 1*, the interventions have been primarily implemented at a national level, while piloting of campaigns and awareness raising initiatives have been implemented across North, East, South, West and Central provinces. Many of the activities under *outcome 2* have been carried out at the national level since they relate to system strengthening in Education. Meanwhile, certain pilot initiatives and targeted trainings will be implemented in Northern, Eastern, Central and Uva Provinces. *For outcome 3,* the geographic focus has been in North, Central and Uva Provinces, particularly in the districts of Mannar, Batticaloa, Nuwara-Eliya and Moneragala.
- Thematic scope: The evaluation will cover all the three outcome areas mentioned above especially from a peacebuilding angle.

- The evaluation review period will cover the programming period from April 2017 to December 2020.
- Given the current context of COVID, the PBF and UNICEF guidelines for evaluations discourages social contacts for staff or hired consultants. Virtual data collection methods are to be deployed as alternatives for face-to-face data collection. As this is a sensitive project, and given the current political context, it is important that this evaluation can be safely as well as rigorously conducted remotely. An assessment of risk and protection issues need to be taken under with an overall do no harm approach in planning the evaluation, in view of COVID-related issues as well as those pertaining to sensitivities related to the project's topic.
- The evaluation will integrate gender equality and human rights based approaches and be guided by the principles of do no harm, impartiality, transparency, inclusivity and participation.

- **Sampling Scope**: The evaluation will be limited to the interventions implemented under all three outcomes of the project by UNDP, UNICEF and WHO targeting children, adolescents, youth and adults in the provinces/districts mentioned under 'project location'. Interventions under outcome 1 have been implemented in the Northern Eastern, Western and Southern provinces targeting war widows, youth and ex-combatants in the war affected areas. Further, capacities of District Planning Officers and CSOs were build. Interventions we also implemented at the national level benefitting civil servants and conflict affected communities across the island. Outcome 2 included interventions both at national and sub-national levels. School level interventions are being implemented in around 600 schools directly reaching education administrators, child-care duty bearers and wider school communities including principals, teachers, students and patents in North, East, Uva and Central provinces. National Level interventions are delivered through the Ministry of Education, National Institute of Education and the University Grants Commission. Under outcome 3, the project targeted community mental health professionals, Public Health Inspectors (PHIs) and civil society stakeholders. In addition, staff of the Mental Health Unit of the District Hospitals and RDHS Offices in Mannar, Nuwara-Eliya and Moneragala districts were reached through the project. The staff the Directorate of Mental Health received capacity development interventions and convened the interventions at national level. Overall, the project evaluation would include 10 Focus Group Discussions (FDGs) and 20 in depth interviews with key Informants. Further, the Sampling methodology to be discussed and agreed with UN agencies during inception stage.

Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation will assess the project's results and evaluate the *relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, Impact & sustainability* of the actions – sample set of questions are given below:

Relevance
- How relevant is the design of the project in reaching its peacebuilding objectives? This includes the relevancy of the outcomes, outputs and the activities proposed at the outset of the project in achieving the specified peacebuilding objectives.
- To what extent were the project interventions relevant to national and local peacebuilding contexts? Did the project factor in the local contexts in developing the design intervention/logic?
- What is the validity and the relevance of the Theory of change?
- Was the project relevant to the needs and priorities of the target groups/beneficiaries? Were they consulted during design, monitoring and implementation of the project?
- To what extent did the PBF project respond to peacebuilding gaps?
- To what extent was the Project able to contribute towards conflict transformation, greater enjoyment of rights and promote institutional reforms through its support to institutional mechanisms in place to promote peace, justice and reconciliation?

Efficiency

- Have financial and human resources been allocated sufficiently and strategically to achieve project outcomes?
- To what extent was the project able to leverage Government or other resources and partner with the Government to enhance the efficiency of the project?
- Were outputs delivered on time? What constraints/delays were encountered during implementation, why and how were these addressed? What has been the impact of COVID-19 on the programme implementation and has there been any need for reprogramming due the emerging evidence on the socio-economic impact of the pandemic?
- To what extent did UN agencies coordination/partnership strategies and practices support the delivery of results?
- To what extent the UN agencies have been able to efficiently mobilize CSOs for creating awareness and understanding of reconciliation among targeted communities and enhance their access to services
- Was PBF funding used to leverage political windows of opportunity for engagement?

Effectiveness
- To what extent did the output level interventions translate into progress towards outcomes?
- How effectively did the three pillars of the project's intervention work together to achieve common outcomes?
- Were the planned activities consistent with the overall project peacebuilding objectives and purpose?
- What were the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement of the planned results? What are the principal factors that influence or influenced achievement or non-achievement of the results?
- How were resources allocated to reduce gender disparities, address gender norms and enable access to services in the targeted communities?
- To what extent the project contributed to greater enjoyment of rights of the target beneficiaries/ groups, and their ability to access remedies and redress?
- To what extent did the project make timely adjustments to its strategy to maintain its relevance and effectiveness? To what extent target beneficiaries were involved in decision-making on those adjustments?
- How has the project adopted to changing socio-political environment during the implementation timeframe? Has the project been able to adapt to changing needs of target beneficiaries/ groups?
- What was the role and contribution of key stakeholders and UN entities towards achieving peacebuilding results? What was the degree of integration of project activities within UN strategic frameworks at country-level and how did it contribute to their implementation?
- What efforts were made within the project to ensure gender equality and women participation across the implemented activities?
- To what extent the project integrated a human rights based approach?
- •How novel or innovative was the project approach? Can lessons and good practices be drawn to inform similar approaches elsewhere?

Sustainability
- What is the degree of sustainability of project benefits? What systems have been put in place to ensure sustainability of project interventions/outcomes? This includes *inter alia* capacity building, local ownership at decentralized GoSL levels, resource mobilization and integration of the project's activities into government systems, policies, local plans and stakeholders' projects?
- Are the activities and their outcomes likely to continue when external support is withdrawn?
- Are local stakeholders willing and committed to continue working on the issues addressed by the project? How effectively was the project in building national ownership?
- Are local stakeholders able to continue working on the issues addressed by the project? How effectively has the project built necessary capacity?

- What interventions/strategies are to be more widely replicated or adapted and have the potential for scale up?

Impact
- To what extent did the project achieve its peacebuilding results/outcome impacts?
- Were there any unexpected results or unintended consequences of the results both positive and negative?
- To what extent was the project catalytic (financial /programmatic such as for scaling up, increasing convergent programmes, building resilience etc.)?
- What evidence is there that the project interventions resulted in improvements in the enjoyment of rights? What has been the contribution of the project to the achievement of these results?

Has PBF funding been used to scale-up other peacebuilding work and/or has it helped to create broader platforms for peacebuilding?

Conflict-Sensitivity
- Did the project have an explicit approach to conflict-sensitivity?
- Were the UN entities internal capacities adequate for ensuring an ongoing conflict-sensitive approach?
- Was the project responsible for any unintended negative impacts?
- Was an ongoing process of context monitoring and a monitoring system that allows for monitoring of unintended impacts established?

Method/Process

- The evaluation will be carried out in four phases: **1) Inception 2) Data collection 3) Analysis and Reporting and 4) Validation**
- The detailed methodology should be discussed and agreed during the inception. The methodological design should include: an analytical evaluation framework; a strategy for collecting and analyzing data; a series of specifically designed tools; sampling plan; and a detailed work plan. Given the particular challenges presented by the current global pandemic, the Inception Report should make clear how it will approach data collection – whether remotely or in person – while maximizing stakeholder participation and safety, and ensuring quality delivery of the evaluation.
- The evaluation should utilize mixed methods and draw on quantitative and qualitative data. After the desk review, virtual primary data collection should be carried out to gather firsthand information for analysis. Then all information should be analyzed, and necessary triangulations done to prepare the final report.
- Data should be disaggregated by relevant criteria (wherever possible): age, gender, marginalized and vulnerable groups, etc. All findings to the largest possible extent be triangulated (use of three or more sources of information to verify and substantiate an assessment) and validated.
- Before finalizing the report, **a virtual participatory validation workshop** should be organized, during which main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation will be discussed, validated and finalized.

Phase 1: Inception Phase

During the inception phase a detail evaluation methodology should be designed to include the analytical framework; a strategy for collecting and analyzing data; a series of specifically designed tools; and a detailed work plan. More specifically, the inception phase will involve:
- A comprehensive **desk review** of external and internal documents such as the approved project documents, log frame, needs/conflict/baseline/end-line assessment, monitoring and progress reports, relevant policies. On the request of the consultant, these documents will have to be handed over by the agencies involved to the consultant.
- **A Sampling plan** enabling the selection of locations and interventions for evaluation.
- A List of **key stakeholders and beneficiary groups to be interviewed.**

- **Finalization of the Evaluation design** – further refinement of the evaluation **objectives, scope** and the **list of evaluability questions.** This needs to include primary data collection from beneficiaries to answer the evaluation questions.
- The finalization of the **tools** which details out the specific evaluation question against the evaluation criteria.
- A **concrete work plan for the entire evaluation.**
- The Inception Report should capture in detail the methodology which will include the sampling protocol, detailed methodology, analysis plan, a proposed work plan with detailed timeline, clearly defined roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team members, and a general outline of the final evaluation report etc. (content page).

Phase 2: Data Collection Phase/Assessments and Analysis

This phase will involve:
- An extensive round of **Key Informants Interview (KII) and Focus Group Discussions (FGD)** with key stakeholders (local government, NGO's, UN agencies, beneficiaries) conducted virtually, where appropriate. First-hand information of the implementation of projects and programmes to be gathered via virtual means in the selected provinces/districts. The questionnaires finalized should guide the interviews and discussions.
- Triangulation of various data collection methods will help to inform the full picture as per the evaluation objectives and criteria. As much as possible the groups/areas selected should differ from one another in terms of context (i.e. type of stakeholders, remoteness, composition of ethnic groups etc.), the type of interventions & the challenges faced, i.e. a cross-section of all types of possible localities should be covered.

Phase 3: Validation and Reporting

- In this phase, the **draft report** should be prepared, and a **validation meeting** held to validate major findings of the draft evaluability assessment report. The purpose is to discuss and comment on the evaluation findings, checking for factual errors or errors of interpretation.

- In preparing the evaluation report, the findings should be evidence based and should have clear references to the source. The conclusions and recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis, be relevant and realistic and presented in a comprehensive manner that makes the information easy-to-understand by the intended audience. The final report in hard and electronic copies should be in standard format for printing.

- A **PowerPoint presentation** highlighting the key components of the final report.

The structure of the evaluation report (approx. 50 pages) should be as follows:
- Title page, Foreword, Table of contents, Acknowledgements, limitations
- Executive Summary (2-3 pages)
- Introduction (1 pages)
- Background/context (2-3 pages)
- Purpose of the evaluation, key questions and scope of the evaluation with information on limitations (3-5 pages)
- Detailed description of methodology (2-3 pages).
- Analysis of the findings against each of the evaluation criteria (20-25 pages).
- Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (5-10 pages).
- Report annexes.

Phase 4: Validation

The evaluators are required to produce a summary presentation of key peacebuilding achievements, lessons learnt and best practices for validation. The contracting agency will support the evaluator in organizing a virtual discussion/meeting with stakeholders to seek responses for the findings.

Key Deliverables

Phase -1 Inception report – On the submission of the inception report to the evaluation manager by the consultant, comments should be submitted by the agencies involved within 3 working days.

Phase 2- Data Collection and Analysis Phase- The consultant will start field data collection taking into account the comments from the agencies on the inception report.
  * Presentation of the preliminary findings and recommendations (approx. 10 slides)

Phase 3 & 4– Draft report, Validation, final report- the first draft will be submitted for comments to UNICEF, UNDP, WHO and PBSO/PBF. These comments will be incorporated to the final report by the evaluator together with the feedback from the validation meeting. Agencies are required to provide their comments to the first draft report within 3 working days.

Work Plan

Tasks	Deliverable	Timeline
Inception Phase		
Briefing Meetings	N/A	September 2020– week 3
Desk review/ research design and tools & preparation of inception report.	Draft of inception report	September 2020 –week 3, 4 and October 2020 – week 1
Provide Comments to draft Inception Report	Audit trail of draft inception report	October 2020 – week 2
Finalize Inception Report	Final inception report	October 2020 – week 2
Data Collection Phase & Analysis		
Conduct virtual data collection in the selected areas	Interview protocols/questionnaires	October 2020 – week 3 & 4
Analysis of findings & Exit meeting – to validate data collection & any initial findings.	PowerPoint presentation of the initial findings	November 2020 – week 1
Validation and Reporting Phase		
Analysis of findings & Prepare first draft report	First draft of report	November – week 2
Provide comments to first draft of report	Audit trail of first draft of report	November – week 3
Revise report, provide comments	2nd, 3rd report as required	December 2020 – week 4
Validation meeting (Virtual)	PowerPoint presentation of evaluation findings Audit trail of validation meeting	December 2020 – week 1
Prepare Final report and submission of electronic and hard copy of final report.	Final Report with all annexes – both softcopy and in hardcopy format	December 2020 – Week 2

7. Reporting Requirements:

Quality Assurance: Every stage of the evaluation process will be subjected to review and clearance by the evaluation focal point of UNICEF, UNDP, WHO and PBSO/PBF.

Adhere to UNICEF's Reporting standards - The service providers are required to adhere to UNEG and UNICEF Evaluation Reporting Standards which will be shared during the inception phase.

8. **Qualifications for the bidding institution/agency for the assignment:**

- Be a legal entity with a valid registration such as Business Registration Certificate or registration with the NGO Secretariat
- Proven record of undertaking evaluations with reputed organizations, governments, giving details of jobs undertaken and completed, name of the organizations with their contact numbers, duration, coverage of such survey work, etc.
- Experience in high quality data collection and analysis and evaluations

The contracting agency will form an evaluation team lead by a qualified consultant (national/international) with a peacebuilding and an evaluation background . The proposed team and their respective CVs should be presented in the technical proposal. The technical proposal will be evaluated according to the point scale shown at the end. Therefore, agencies submitting proposals are required to ensure that these components are well addressed in their technical proposals. The Team Leader will be responsible for the quality of the evaluation, and other two consultants shall support the team leader in data collection and analysis.

Contracting Agency:

Should be a leading research/evaluation agency with proven expertise in managing and delivery high quality evaluations, demonstrable track record of producing reliable data, quality reports, and having an adequate pool of researchers, other staff such as translators, field staff to support with evaluation logistics and copy editors to produce publication quality reports.

The bidding agency should identify an adequate number of evaluators having expertise in project sectors and should be available for virtual consultations and to attend field missions (if required only) to conduct interviews and discussions with stakeholders and beneficiaries. Change of the evaluation members will not be accepted without prior approval from UNICEF.

The Lead Consultant (local/International)
She/he will ensure the quality of the evaluation process, outputs, methodology and timely delivery of all products. She/he will lead the design of the evaluation and ensure key stakeholders are in agreement with the inception report. She/he will have the responsibility for conducting/overseeing the evaluation. She/he will have the responsibility for shaping the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report, as well as for the overall editorial quality of the final product. His/her qualifications should be as follows:
- At least ten years' experience in leading peacebuilding/human rights evaluations.

- Additionally, work experience in conducting research on reconciliation processes and evaluation initiatives.
- An advanced degree and minimum 15 years of extensive experience in programme/project management and sectoral expertise in areas such as peacebuilding, social sciences, development studies, education etc.
- Good understanding and experience with evaluating human rights-based approach to programming and results-based management.
- Knowledge of UNEG evaluation standards and norms and proven familiarity with the OECD/DAC criteria (for team leader or at least for one other team member)

- Good communication, presentation and report writing skills including the ability to express ideas and concepts concisely and clearly in written and oral form are required.
- Fluency in English.

Local Consultants

She/he will facilitate the preparation for virtual meetings, conduct interviews and discussions with stakeholders and beneficiaries as part of the data collection process. The national consultants will contribute substantively to the work of the team leader, providing substantive advice and context in the data collection and analysis. His/her qualifications should be as follows:

- At least five years' experience in conducting research and analysis on issues relating to peacebuilding, social sciences, development studies, education etc.
- Proven knowledge with evaluation principles and methods.
- Prior experience in supporting to conduct of evaluations and data collection.
- Ability to engage effectively in the official language of the country and to engage effectively with various stakeholders.
- Fluent written and spoken communication in the local language and knowledge of English.

9. Conditions:

- The end product and all intellectual outputs pertaining to this assignment remains the exclusive property of PBF, UNICEF, UNDP, WHO. All data should be handed over to UNICEF at the end of the assignment, in a format conforming to secure data transfer practices.
- The contract will include all costs to be incurred and UNICEF will not be liable to pay any charges extraneous to the contract value.
- The service provider should adhere to UNICEF Evaluation Policy (https://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/files/Revised_Evaluation_Policy_Interactive.pdf) and the UNEG's ethical guidelines for UN evaluations (http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102) in conducting the evaluation.
- UNICEF reserves the right to withhold all or a portion of payment if performance is unsatisfactory, if work/outputs is incomplete, not delivered or for failure to meet deadlines.
- In case of unsatisfactory performance, the contract will be terminated by notification letter sent 5 days prior to termination. In the meantime, UNICEF will initiate another selection in order to identify an appropriate Institution.
- Payment schedule on acceptance of the inception report (40%), draft report (40%), final report (20%)

10. Prepared by: (Name/Signature/date):   Reviewed by :**(**Name/Signature/date):

Kanchana Perera

_____   _____

Luxmy Sureshkumar -Education Officer   *Supply Officer*

11–09–2020

11

***11.* Approved by** (Name/Signature/date):		
Takaho Fukami (signature)	10-09-2020	
_____		
Takaho Fukami – Chief of Educaion		
12. Authorized by (Name/Signature/date):		
Emma Brigham (signature)	11-09-2020	
_____		
Emma Brigham - Deputy Representative		

1. **TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA AND WEIGHT ALLOCATION BETWEEN TECHNICAL AND PRICE PROPOSAL**
(The ratio between the technical and the commercial criteria established in the RFPS depends on the relative importance of one component to the other. e.g., 60/40 (technical/commercial) or 70/30 (technical/commercial).

   Annex I - Technical Evaluation Criteria

Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Max. Points Obtainable
1	**Overall Response**	**10**
1.1	Completeness of response: *Does the overall technical proposal address the core aspects in the terms of reference*	10

12

2	Company and Key Personnel	40
2.1	Does the consulting firm have evaluation experience with peacebuilding evaluations A list of previous work in similar capacity attached < 2 years = 2, 2 - 3 Years 3, 4 Years = 4, > 4 Years = 5 *Note to bidders: please provide a comprehensive list of similar work undertaken	20
2.2	How satisfactory are the 2 sampled work submitted for scrutiny (The consulting firm will also provide soft copies of 2 samples of previous similar work. The proposals will not be considered without the sampled work. The contracting agency takes the responsibility for maintaining the confidentiality of this work)	10
2.3	Key personnel: relevant experience and qualifications of the proposed Does the team members have the required qualifications and experience to execute the evaluation	10
3	Proposed Methodology and Approach	20
3.1	Soundness of the technical proposal: methodology and implementation plan proposed (proposed analytical framework, data collection methods, sampling strategy, enumerator training and field strategy, workplan, risks and limitations ..etc). It understood that it is not feasible to propose a detailed methodology at the proposal stage. However, the selected evaluator is expected to present a detailed methodology including a revised sampling plan in consultation with the client at the inception stage)	20
	TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORES	**70**

Minimum technical required score:49