

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR INSTITUTIONAL CONTRACTORS



Title of the assignment

Country Programme Evaluation for Serbia (2016-2020)

Background and Justification:

UNICEF developed its Country Programme Document (CPD) jointly with Government partners for the period 2016-2020. The CPD was designed to be aligned with key Government strategies notably the EU accession process, the SDGs, and the UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017. The CPD 2016-2020 is to a large extent a continuation of strategies endorsed by the previous country programme and the comprehensive Mid-Term Review conducted in 2013.

In 2015, Serbia was making good progress in legislative and public sector reforms and working towards meeting international standards in the fields of education, social protection, health, justice and anti-discrimination. National averages for this middle-income country looked relatively good. However, disaggregated data showed significant inequities associated with poverty, rural areas and significant discrimination associated with ethnicity and disability.

Key data

In 2013, 8.6 per cent of the population lived in absolute poverty, 3 with higher rates in rural areas, including for children up to 13 years (11.9 per cent). According to EUROSTAT, 30 per cent of children under 18 were at risk of poverty, compared with 24.6 per cent of the general population. Despite a reduction of child mortality rates at the national level, regional disparities persisted: the 2014 Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS)5 found that among Roma, the infant and under-five mortality rates, at 13 and 16 per 1,000 live births, respectively, were twice as high as the national average. Ten per cent of Roma children under five were underweight (as opposed to a 2 per cent national average), and 19 per cent stunted (average 6 per cent), while only 13 per cent were fully vaccinated (compared with 71 per cent national average). The 2014 MICS confirmed that children living in poverty lack adequate nutrition, are twice as likely to be underweight, and have less access to health care and lower education achievement.

The demand for early childhood development (ECD) services remained largely unmet, affecting in particular children with developmental difficulties. The 2014 MICS findings show that early learning programmes were attended by half of boys and girls aged 3-4 on average, but only by 9 per cent of the poorest children and 6 per cent of Roma. Only 1.2 per cent of CWD attended preschool.

The 2014 MICS also shows that only 69 per cent (63 for boys and 76 for girls) of Roma children have timely primary school entry and 64 per cent complete primary school, compared with 97 and 93, respectively, for all children. The proportion of adolescents attending secondary school is 89 per cent for the general population, yet it is only 22 per cent of Roma children (15 per cent girls). Administrative data show that 88 per cent of girls and 81 per cent of boys have completed secondary school in Serbia. However, one third of pupils aged 15 are functionally illiterate. This pointed to an education of inadequate quality that required modernization of the curriculum and teaching methods and intersectoral coordination to support inclusion and prevent dropout.

In 2013, 6,047 children were separated from their parents and placed in formal care. The proportion of children placed in institutions compared to alternative care is decreasing, but the total number of children placed in formal care had continued to grow, with a 36 per cent increase between 2000 and 2013. Roma children represented 26 per cent of all children in formal care, while CWD made up 59 per cent of all children in residential care. Boys accounted for 60 per cent of children in residential care. Community services were not yet fully sustainable and therefore reached only a relatively small number of children.

Violence against children was increasingly recognized and reported. MICS 2014 shows that 44 per cent of boys and 42 per cent of girls up to 14 years of age experienced violent discipline at home, with almost half of all cases of family violence involving child victims. Reports of neglect were most numerous, followed by physical and emotional abuse, with less reporting on sexual violence. In addition, 70 per cent of boys and 68 per cent of girls (grades 6-8) experienced gender-based violence in school. Despite the progress made in establishing a legal and policy framework for the advancement of women's rights and gender equality, women, particularly girls, remained vulnerable to discrimination and violence.

The application of diversion measures for juvenile offenders remained scarce (5 per cent of reported cases), alternative sanctions aimed at supporting the reintegration of juveniles were few, and legally defined procedures for the protection of child victims/witnesses were not uniformly implemented.

There was a growing number of registered asylum seekers: for children this increased from 1,387 in 2013 to 2,774 in 2014. In addition, major flooding and landslides in 2014 highlighted the exposure of Serbia to natural disasters: 1.6 million people (270,000 children) were affected, especially those from the poorest socioeconomic strata. Despite the rapid response in 2014, the emergency pointed to weaknesses in the coordination and overall capacity for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and preparedness.

Further analysis revealed a number of structural barriers that hampered the situation of children in each of these fields.

Goal of country programme

Therefore, the overall goal of the country programme is to support the efforts of Serbia to promote and protect the rights of all children and to give all children equal opportunities to reach their full potential. The country programme focuses on supporting vulnerable children from the very start of life and enhancing the social welfare system's capacity to prevent vulnerable families from falling below the poverty line.

The country programme seeks to address key bottlenecks and barriers to equity through e.g. the following strategies:

- Sharing of technical expertise and advice on adequate human resources and budgetary allocation;
- Intersectoral cooperation;
- Effective child rights monitoring that enables improved policy implementation;
- Developing social change strategies fostering non-discriminatory social norms, supportive programmes and services and strengthening the accountability of service providers with a focus on reaching vulnerable children, thus enhancing the coverage and quality of social services;
- Empowering vulnerable families to become more aware of their rights and entitlements and to demand them;
- Innovation is currently being explored as a potential additional strategy.

In addition, in 2015 Serbia found itself on the European migrant route, and UNICEF responded with humanitarian assistance and strengthening of national response systems for the medium and longer term, especially in the areas of child protection, education and infant and young child feeding, which branched out into a humanitarian response programme. As an unanticipated development, the migrant crisis impacted UNICEF's results, human resource capacities and funding.

The projected [budget for the country programme 2016-2020](#)¹ is \$21,451,000.

¹ https://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/2015-PL16-Serbia_CPD-ODS-EN.pdf

The country programme (CP) is implemented through close partnerships with relevant ministries and other State bodies at all levels, and other United Nations agencies, emphasizing intersectoral cooperation. Continued cooperation with the EU is prioritized through joint support for policy implementation and for child rights to be adequately prioritized within the EU accession process.

The release of the EU Strategy for the Western Balkans in February 2017 sets out a roadmap for EU enlargement of the Western Balkans countries with 2025 given as the date for potential accession by Serbia. In light of this, the Ministry of European Integration initiated the process of redrafting of the multi annual planning document

Programme component	CPD / BAB			Financial investments									Total by component
	Regular resources	Other resources	Total	2016		2017		2018		Total 2016 -2018			
				RR	OR	RR	OR	RR	OR	RR	OR		
Child rights monitoring and justice for children	1,124,000	3,157,000	4,281,000	146,501	529,838	196,755	563,221	279,383	260,515	622,639	1,353,574	1,976,213	
Strengthening vulnerable families	475,000	4,467,000	4,942,000	141,903	917,374	118,640	734,231	92,173	595,038	352,716	2,246,643	2,599,359	
Young child well-being	878,000	2,595,000	3,473,000	141,879	323,680	182,213	270,572	278,733	411,260	602,825	1,005,512	1,608,337	
Quality and inclusive early learning and pre-university education	703,000	4,975,000	5,678,000	123,158	1,088,996	100,539	1,001,619	122,100	1,290,167	345,797	3,380,782	3,726,579	
Public advocacy, partnerships and social mobilisation for CR (& Special Purpose Outcome)	353,000	1,607,000	1,960,000	60,319	260,201	173,473	267,068	82,477	43,898	316,268	571,167	887,435	
Cross-sectoral (& Programme Effectiveness Outcome)	737,000	380,000	1,117,000	39,625	44,013	83,230	52,712	30,687	18,045	153,543	114,770	268,313	
Total	4,270,000	17,181,000	21,451,000	653,385	3,164,101	854,850	2,889,423	885,552	2,618,924	2,393,788	8,672,449	11,066,236	
				3,817,487		3,744,273		3,504,476		11,066,236			

for international development assistance covering the 2019-2025 period and indicating the national development priorities and measures where co-financing by development assistance will have the maximum impact.

Both the EU Accession Process and the Agenda 2030 are potentially powerful levers for reform and social change in EU enlargement countries. The complementarities between the EU Accession Process and the SDGs, as well as the renewed focus on the “social dimension” on the EU Agenda (Sofia Declaration) offer important opportunities for promoting children’s rights. It will be important to make full use of these opportunities as well as to address the anticipated challenges in building and maintaining political traction for the Agenda 2030.

In addition, in May 2018 the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) adopted a resolution (72/279) aimed at aligning the UN development system with the 2030 Agenda, which among other things sets out a vision for a ‘new generation’ of UN country teams, a reinvigorated role of the Resident Coordinator (RC) system, focus on strategic direction, oversight and accountability for system-wide results and changes in funding the UN development system. This reform will impact the next generation of development partnership frameworks.

The Evaluation of the UNICEF Country Programme 2016-2020 (hereafter ‘the Evaluation’), coming in the last trimester of the CP cycle, will offer the opportunity to critically assess the strategies applied in the current Country Programme, identify their relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and estimated impact in achieving planned results, and draw on lessons learnt. However, the weight of its intent is on learning and specifically, to inform the design and provide recommendations for the development of the new CPD 2021-2025 between UNICEF and the Government of the Republic of Serbia.

The [Country Programme Document \(CPD\)](#)² streams from key priorities identified in the [United Nations Development Partnership Framework \(UNDPF\) 2016-2020](#)³ signed between the UNCT in Serbia and the Government. In 2019, the UN system in Serbia is likely to start the preparation of the new UNDPF cycle 2021-

² https://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/2015-PL16-Serbia_CPDP-ODS-EN.pdf

³ http://rs.one.un.org/content/dam/unct/serbia/docs/Publications/DPF_ENG_30_May_2017_FINAL_SIGNED.pdf

2025 and to initiate an evaluation of the current UNDPF. The UNICEF Country programme evaluation is likely to feed into the Evaluation of the UN Development Partnership Framework and will further contribute to the UNDPF 2021-2025 planning.

The proposed evaluation will therefore have the characteristics of both a summative and a formative evaluation. Three in-depth evaluations have been conducted over the current programme cycle, covering justice for children, social welfare and inclusive education: a "[Formative evaluation of implementation of inclusive practices in the education system in Serbia \(2009-2014\)](#)", a "[Summative evaluation of child care reform in Serbia](#)", and a "[Summative evaluation to strengthen implementation of justice for children system in the Republic of Serbia \(2010-2017\)](#)" which the country programme evaluation should capitalize on, thus giving more attention unevaluated components of the country programme - child rights monitoring, violence against children, early childhood development and preschool education, and areas of intervention that are developed as part of an emerging country context, such as health and nutrition, refugee and migration response, as well as interventions that were initiated despite not being anticipated in the CPD, such as those related to youth and adolescents, and child marriage.

In parallel, early 2019, UNICEF will initiate the new Situation Analysis process assessing the situation and unmet needs of children in Serbia. Further, results of a large multiple indicator cluster survey ([MICS⁴](#)) should be available by quarter 3 of 2019.

The primary intended audience of this evaluation is the UNICEF team in Serbia and the Government of the Republic of Serbia (including relevant line ministries and state bodies). Other relevant audiences include partner UN agencies under the joint umbrella of the UN Resident Coordinator's Office, independent bodies and CSOs, international financial institutions and key donors including the European Union (e.g. European Commission, and European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations – ECHO), Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation - SDC, and a number of public and private donors (GlaxoSmithKline, Swiss Natcom, Belgian Natcom, Korean Natcom etc.).

Purpose of the assignment:

The object of this Evaluation will be the Country Programme for the Republic of Serbia 2016-2020 implemented by UNICEF (country office but also the contribution, where relevant, of UNICEF regional and global human, normative and financial assets) in partnership with the Government of the Republic of Serbia. More particularly, the evaluation will look at the relevance of the design and strategic focus of the country programme vis-à-vis identified unmet needs of children in the Republic of Serbia in the period 2015-2019.

Objectives of the Evaluation

- Assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, coherence, coverage and, to the extent possible, impact of the strategies adopted to achieve the Country Programme's results. Assess to the extent possible UNICEF's contribution to the reduction of inequities. (This will require the reconstruction of a country programme theory of change by the evaluation team.)
- Identify and document lessons learnt in relation to type, combination and way of implementation of the strategies, considering the country context and UNICEF's comparative advantage as well as strategies that were not utilized but could have been relevant in the given context (particularly e.g. communication for development, capacity building, public financing for children, capitalizing on links between private sector fundraising and programme, cross-sectoral approach)

⁴ <http://mics.unicef.org/>

- Assess whether UNICEF CO has been “fit for purpose”, in terms of the current staffing structure and skills mix, to deliver the CPD - and to suggest what adjustments may need to be made going forward to respond to emerging challenges and opportunities.
- Assess significant and promising interventions and additional strategies implemented between 2016 and 2019, to inform the next programmatic cycle – in particular the scaling up of successful pilots/models.
- Provide recommendations to guide/inform UNICEF and UNCT strategic planning in the Republic of Serbia (development of the new UNICEF Country Programme 2021-2025 and the new UNDPF), based on the lessons learnt, good practices and successes of the current Country Programme.

Scope of the Evaluation

The Evaluation will assess key results achieved and strategies applied within the current UNICEF Country Programme 2016-2020, as articulated through CPD Outcomes and Outputs defined for the period 2016-2019. The current CP was a logical continuation of the previous one and a number of program components foundations and approaches of program interventions were set in the previous program cycle. Hence it will be important, where appropriate, to look back up to 2013 and the last mid-term review.

The geographical scope will include mostly national level but a sample of sub-national level interventions should be included as a basis to assess modelling and capacity building efforts.

Evaluation Questions

The Evaluation will focus on the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. Early signs of impact will also be assessed, to the extent possible, given the fact that this is partly also a summative evaluation and that it is taking place one and a half years before the end of the CP.

- A) Assessing relevance.** The Evaluation will seek to assess the extent to which the objectives of the Country Programme are consistent with Government policies, children’s needs, global UNICEF priorities and partners’ policies. It will assess whether the objectives of the Country Programme and its design were and if they remained appropriate.

Specific questions will refer to:

- To what extent are UNICEF strategies aligned with national priorities, national and international partners’ policies (particularly Chapters of the EU Accession process and Sustainable Development Goals) and UNDPF?
- To what extent is the CPD aligned and contributes to the achievement of the UNICEF’s regional priorities and Strategic Plan (previous and current 2018-2021)?
- Is UNICEF using the right strategies/playing the right roles?
- Were the set results realistic given the available resources and the context? Have monitoring and evaluation information sufficiently informed programme adjustment and planning?
- To what extent is the CP strategy linked to and achieving synergetic effects with other interventions of UN agencies (e.g. Common chapter, joint programme on violence against women, migration response)
- To what extent is the Country Programme strategy linked with other interventions in the country so that they form a synergetic set that is relevant to achieve programme results, especially for the most vulnerable? (Are we using an appropriate strategy within the most relevant set of strategies?)
- To what extent is the Country Programme strategy relevant and sufficient to address critical bottlenecks to the realization of child rights – in terms of the enabling environment, supply and quality of services and demand factors?
- How relevant is the CO’s strategic approach to address the challenges of equity and gender equality?
- To what extent was the Country Programme strategy implemented in partnership with the relevant stakeholders? And at the right level (local, national)?
- To what extent has the Country Programme strategy implemented a relevant and effective combination of national and local interventions, including considerations of normative changes vs. scale-up of implementation and considerations of financing scale-up?

- To what extent is the overall portfolio of strategies applied throughout the CP relevant, given the evolving socio-economic and institutional situation in the country?

B) Assessing effectiveness. The Evaluation will assess the extent to which the CP results were achieved and whether UNICEF demonstrated a reasonable contribution at the outcome or system level.

Specific questions will refer to:

- Is the programme achieving satisfactory results in relation to its stated objectives?
- To what extent is there preliminary evidence of improved performance at the Government institutional/organizational level?
- To what extent did the Country Programme interventions contribute to reducing bottlenecks and barriers in realization of children rights, especially the most vulnerable ones?
- To what extent is there evidence that CO's equity-based programmatic approach has reached the most deprived children and women?
- What were the most effective engagement strategies? Were there any missed opportunities (e.g. public-private sector linkages, partnerships with CSOs etc.)
- What were the main factors that promoted or hindered the effectiveness of the Country Programme (CP)?
- Where there any unexpected or unplanned results achieved? (particularly e.g. emergency response, child marriage, pre-school education etc.)
- Did effectiveness of the Country Programme increase because of achieved synergies with national priorities and other development partners' programmes? Were synergies sought?

C) Assessing efficiency. The Evaluation will measure how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time etc.) were converted to results. It is also understood as the way in which UNICEF manages its partnerships, to operationalize its strategies, implementing activities and delivering outputs.

Specific questions will refer to:

- Did the programme use the resources in the most economical manner to achieve its objectives?
- Could the same results have been achieved using different strategies (or set of strategies) that could have been implemented with less resources?
- To what extent are there operational bottlenecks relating to UNICEF's strategic approaches that impede, or threaten to impede, the delivery of UNICEF's work?
- To what extent were the strategies, as reflected in the CP result matrix, evaluable, taking into account the establishment – or expectation of the establishment – of baselines, and efficient monitoring and reporting systems?
- Are the available human and financial resources appropriate in relation to the expected CP results?
- To what extent has UNICEF established partnerships with a wide range of stakeholders, including government, civil society, NGOs and other national development partners, in support of its strategic approaches?

D) Assessing sustainability. The Evaluation will assess the extent to which continuation of benefits from Country Programme interventions was ensured, including degree of probability of continued long-term benefits.

Specific questions will refer to:

- Are the activities and their impact likely to continue when UNICEF's support is withdrawn? What are the contributing or constraining factors to make a durable change?
- Have the strategies contributed to improving existing governmental systems, mechanisms, and policies? Will the strategies be more widely replicated or adapted? Is it likely for initiated interventions to go to scale? (particularly e.g. support to primary health care centres and development counselling centres, local protocols on violence against children, diversionary schemes, family outreach service, drop-out prevention, development of preschool education, inclusive education, quality of education etc.)

- What opportunities and risks to the sustainability of the Country Programme intervention exist in the short and long term?
- Did the strategy contribute to promote ownership over the different programme areas and correspondent results by national stakeholders? To what extent has the government created, or indicated its commitment towards creating, an enabling environment for the replication of the UNICEF-supported interventions?

E) Assessing impact. The evaluation will assess potential positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the Country Programme, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

Specific questions will refer to:

- To what extent has the CP contributed to achieving (or not) the expected impact level results in the concerned programme areas?
- To what extent has the strategy contributed to reducing the equity gaps in the correspondent programme area in favour of the most vulnerable children?

F) Assessing the application of the *Equity, Gender Equality and Human Rights Based Approach*. The Evaluation should determine the extent to which the design and implementation of the Country Programme, the assessment of results and the evaluation process itself incorporate an equity, gender equality and human rights based perspective. The evaluation report should use gender-sensitive, child-sensitive and human rights-based language throughout, including data disaggregated by sex, age and disability.

Specific questions will refer to:

- How well were equity, HRBA and GE goals and processes incorporated into the planning documents of the Country Programme?
- How well did Country Programme intervention succeed in involving women, men, children, adolescents and other rights-holders, especially the most disadvantaged and marginalized ones, such as Roma and right holders from the poorest quintile?
- How well did the Country Programme intervention succeed in involving duty-bearers?
- To what extent did different groups, including children and those worst-off, benefit in different ways from the Country Programme?
- To what extent did different groups, including children and those worst-off, increase their capacity to relate differently to other groups supported by the Country Programme?

Key stakeholders

A range of stakeholders have interest in, and influence over UNICEF's programme in Serbia:

- The primary stakeholders are the primary rights holders – girls and boys, women and men in Serbia. While the evaluation is unlikely to be of direct and immediate concern to them, they ultimately are the main focus of this evaluation.
- For UNICEF corporate interests and stakes for this evaluation include: UNICEF's ownership of a country programme in a geopolitically and strategically important country and the wider implications and findings of this evaluation for UNICEF's role in a transitioning/middle income EU accession context.
- The UNICEF staff in the Serbia office are a key stakeholder in this evaluation and while the evaluation is not one of the UNICEF Country Office itself, it is of the decisions and choices made by it within selected strategies, as influenced by the external and internal context at the time.
- For the Government of the Republic of Serbia (including Ministry of Employment, Veteran and Social Affairs, Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Trade, Tourism and Telecommunications, Ministry of European Integration, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Office for Human and Minority Rights, Gender Coordination Body, Coordination Body for Monitoring the Implementation of the Strategy for Social Inclusion of Roma, Child Rights Council etc.) and independent bodies in the Republic of Serbia (National Assembly, Ombudsman,

Commissioner for Protection of Equality) their interest and stake in the evaluation relates to UNICEF's commitments to support in realising children's rights, particularly for the most vulnerable. Whilst for this evaluation, learning is the key aim, there is also the dimension of holding UNICEF to account for the resources and interventions provided. Most critically, however, the evaluation aims to inform the future programme of cooperation between the Government and UNICEF.

- The interests of partner UN agencies (UNDP, UNHCR, WHO, UNFPA, UN Women, IOM etc.) under the joint umbrella of the UN Resident Coordinator's Office, international financial institutions (World Bank etc.) include the contribution of UNICEF results to the wider UNDAF commitments and intended outcomes and UN system-wide efforts on the realization of child rights and wider human rights commitments including gender.
- Donors including the European Union (e.g. European Commission, and European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations – ECHO), Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation - SDC, and a number of public and private donors (GlaxoSmithKline, Swiss Natcom, Belgian Natcom, Korean Natcom etc.).
- For CSOs (Network of Organisations for Children of Serbia, Child Rights Centre, National Organisation of Persons with Disabilities in Serbia, Roma Women's Network members etc.) interests in the evaluation relate to their strategic and operational relationships with UNICEF and extent to which UNICEF's commitments to human rights and gender equality have been realized.

Roles and responsibilities

UNICEF

Programme staff

- UNICEF Programme Sections will fully support the evaluation through the provision of documentation, facilitation of access to sectoral documents by the evaluation team, and full engagement in the discussion of evaluation findings and recommendations. They will also ensure operational support as required, including organization of meetings, and support in primary data collection where needed to complement what available from the existing monitoring systems and other documents.

Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)

An Evaluation Reference Group will be formed. The purpose of the ERG will be to facilitate the participation of relevant stakeholders in the design and scope of the evaluation, raising awareness of the different information needs, providing information quality assurance throughout the process and in supporting the dissemination of the evaluation results. Its inputs are expected to strengthen the quality and credibility of the evaluation. The Reference Group members will be expected to:

- Be a sounding board for feedback during the evaluation
- Enable access to key informants during the evaluation process
- Participate in an inception report presentation (date TBD)
- Participate in inception interviews with evaluators as relevant
- Review and comment on inception report
- Participate in the presentation of evaluation preliminary findings (date TBD)
- Participate in follow up interviews with evaluators as relevant
- Review and comment on draft evaluation report
- Review and comment on final evaluation report

Work Assignments and Deliverables

Deliverables:

Inception Report (10 pages), outlining the main evaluation issues that will be addressed, the relevant evaluation questions and the proposed and final methodology that has been agreed upon between UNICEF ECARO before the evaluation is set to begin. All tools will be annexed to the report. The IR will be subject to an external quality review.

Timeframe: 60 days after the start of the assignment

Presentation to ERG, to be delivered at the end of the in-country mission.

Timeframe: 20 March

Draft Evaluation Report (including an Executive Summary and Annexes): The report will be shared with the Evaluation Reference Group to ensure that the evaluation meets UNICEF expectations as stipulated in the Evaluation Terms of Reference.

Timeframe: 15 April

Final Synthesis Evaluation Report including Executive Summary (40 pages) (excluding the Executive Summary and Annexes)

Timeframe: 1 June

Power point presentation (20-30 slides) to communicate the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation. It is anticipated that the TL will present the final report at a date to be agreed between UNICEF and the consultant.

Timeframe: 20 June

The report will be subject to an external quality assurance review.

The team leader (TL) will report to the UNICEF ECA Regional M&E Advisor and be the main focal point within the evaluation team for all communications. Once the documents are prepared and delivered, UNICEF shall hold the Intellectual property right of the documents and the related materials.

Report writing, terminology, publication and citation guidelines of UNICEF should be followed. Necessary guidelines will be provided by UNICEF. All documents produced should be child-sensitive, and in line with the Convention on the Rights of the Child and other legal documents on human rights. All deliverables will be submitted in English, the content of which should be well structured, coherent and evidence-based.

Location and duration

The evaluation will take place over a 7 month period of December 2018 - June 2019 and will be remunerated against the deliverables to be indicated in the TOR.

International consultants will be home based with travels to Serbia. National consultants will be selected and appointed by the consulting company. They will only be required to do in-country travels, if need be.

Proposed Workplan

	ACTIVITY	<u>1</u> <u>0</u>	<u>1</u> <u>1</u>	<u>1</u> <u>2</u>	<u>0</u> <u>1</u>	<u>0</u> <u>2</u>	<u>0</u> <u>3</u>	<u>0</u> <u>4</u>	<u>0</u> <u>5</u>	<u>0</u> <u>6</u>
1	ToR final draft									
2	Call for Tender Issued									
3	Evaluation Institute/Team identified									
4	Evaluation Institute/Team contracted									
5	Reference Group established									
6	Draft and Final Inception report produced									
7	Evaluation Design and Instruments validated									
8	Field work									
9	Presentation of Findings and Conclusions (Validation Workshop)									
10	Draft synthesis report submitted									
11	Final report submitted. Presentation of the final report to ERG at a date to be agreed between UNICEF and the consultant.									

Travel Requirements for the Assignment

The Evaluation team will be required to complete two country missions. The total duration of the country missions should be up to 20 days. The first mission (18 days) should be attended by two of the international experts from the team and the nationally selected consultant. The second mission (2 days) should be attended only by the Team Leader (TL) accompanied by the national consultant.

Travel and daily subsistence allowances will be as per the rules and regulations of the contracted evaluation company. Any additional specific information regarding the time schedule, procedures, benefits, travel arrangements and other logistical issues will be discussed with the successful candidate evaluation company.

Reporting Requirements:

The evaluation will be managed by the ECAR M&E Regional Advisor. A Reference Group will be established to guide and oversee the implementation of the evaluation. The RG will include representatives of UNICEF in Serbia, the Government of the Republic of Serbia and other stakeholders.

The Regional Advisor on Monitoring and Evaluation will be the key focal point for the Evaluation Institution/Team. At CO level, this role will be assumed by the Child Rights Monitoring/Evaluation Specialist.

A summative and comprehensive evaluation report is required upon completion of this assignment. The evaluation report is expected to provide descriptive quantitative and qualitative results, an analytical synthesis of the findings and recommendations. The report will not exceed 40 pages, excluding the executive summary and annexes.

A complete report will include:

- An executive summary
- An analysis of the evaluation context, as it relates to UNICEF's equity agenda;

- An analysis of key issues relevant for the evaluation (excerpted from the inception report and literature reviewed);
- A summary of the methods and sample (excerpted from the inception report);
- Evaluation findings and conclusions, well substantiated by the data and evidence, cross-referenced against evaluation questions and criteria;
- A set of actionable recommendations that correspond with evaluation conclusions;
- Bibliography and list of background materials used; and
- Annexes (as relevant).

The evaluation report will be shared as an electronic copy with key national stakeholders and uploaded on the [GEROS website](#). The learnings acquired through the country programme evaluation will be shared widely by incorporating them in the next country programme document, UNDAF as well as existing reports and publications, such as the country office's annual report or other key reports.

Methodology:

Information sources

The following list includes general information sources related to the Country Programme as a whole, while specific sources will be provided in due course.

Background / situation monitoring sources:

- Situation Analysis of Children in Serbia (UNICEF, 2014)
- CRC Concluding Observations on Serbia (2017)

Planning and programme monitoring sources:

- Country Programme Document 2016-2020 (Government of Serbia, UNICEF, 2015)
- UNDPF 2016-2020 (UNCT, 2016)
- Annual Management Plans (AMP) 2016, 2017, 2018 (UNICEF)
- Bi -Annual Work Plans 2016-2017, annual work plan 2018 (Government of Serbia and UNICEF)
- Country Programme Mid Term Review (MTR) Report (Government of Serbia, UNICEF, 2013)
- Country Office Annual Reports 2016, 2017, 2018
- UNICEF Strategic Plan 2018-2025
- Donor reports
- Evaluation reports

Evaluation Approach

The evaluation methodology will be guided by the Norms and Standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG)154.

The evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner, involving key national State actors under the guidance of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that leads the planning, monitoring and evaluation of the Country Programme from the Government side. UNICEF management and key UNICEF Programme staff will also be fully involved. The participation of these stakeholders will be ensured in all phases of the evaluation, including the planning, inception, fact-finding, reporting phases as well as the management response phase when determining the concrete use the findings and recommendations, follow-up decisions, and dissemination strategies as relevant.

The evaluation will be managed by UNICEF's Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor in the Europe and Central Asia Regional Office based in Geneva, Switzerland in close collaboration with the UNICEF Country Management Team.

An evaluation Reference Group comprised of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of European Integration and relevant line ministries and stakeholders will be established. UNICEF Deputy Representative and the Child Rights Monitoring/Evaluation Specialist will coordinate the work of the Reference Group throughout the entire

process. At the same time, for specific programmatic areas, relevant State actors and UNICEF staff will also collaborate during all phases as relevant. The Reference Group will coordinate the involvement of stakeholders, particularly making sure that adequate participatory mechanisms are in place at key milestones to allow general consensus and guarantee ownership over the findings.

The overall evaluation approach will be based on a reconstructed overarching theory of change for the Country Programme, as well as on any specific theories of change. Given the multi-faceted nature of this evaluation, the methodology will have to be tailored to the specificities of each strategy under assessment and related programme areas.

Generally, the evaluation will have to use a non-experimental design. Data collection will be based on a multiple method approach including primarily desk review of reference materials (including monitoring reports and other sources providing secondary data), field visits, and interviews with different partners (Govt, donors, implementing partners, civil society), independent experts, and concerned UNICEF staff. Other data gathering approaches may be defined by the evaluation team.

Field visits, interviews (individual and focus groups as appropriate) at local level and observational methods (mainly qualitative) will also be required. Triangulation of data (combining qualitative and quantitative data as well as data from a range of stakeholders) will have to be used to increase reliability of findings and conclusions. The evaluation is not designed as a large-scale collection of beneficiary perceptions. Nevertheless, beneficiary perceptions (including those of children) will be integrated where feasible e.g. through the review of secondary material in the sectoral strategy areas and through interviews with civil society representatives at different level. It is expected that the evaluation team will spend 2.5 weeks in the country and that the team leader will return to present the evaluation report at the end of the assignment.

Given the magnitude of the object of the evaluation and its geographical scope, primary data collection will have to be used selectively. The sample of stakeholders to be interviewed and locations to be visited will need to be extrapolated based on criteria that are realistic and adequate at the same time. To this extent, criteria to determine locations for field visits will have to consider, on one hand, the opportunity to choose locations where it will be possible to combine data collection for different strategies/programme areas and to reach different stakeholders.

On the other hand, important criteria for selecting a sample that is representative of the main concerns are:

- Rural and urban localities;
- Concentration of concerned vulnerable groups;
- Level of development of the UNICEF strategy in the location.

Overall, field visits should not cover more than 3 localities in the country.

Based on these general guidelines, the methodology and the sample will be further elaborated during the Inception Phase, when the site selection criteria and evaluation questions will be refined. At this point, the evaluator(s) should also develop a more precise evaluation work plan.

Not a limit to evaluability, but an expectation to be managed, is the limited time available which will not allow for significant primary data gathering for the evaluation.

Evaluation Matrix

The Evaluation Matrix forms the 'spine' of the evaluation. It provides the main analytical framework against which data will be gathered and analysed. It is shaped around the evaluation questions and embeds the criteria above. All other enquiry tools, such as interview guides and the field study template, are geared towards it.

The Evaluation Matrix, including the evaluation criteria and associated questions, indicators and prescribed data gathering tools and methods, will be developed by the evaluation team leader and agreed by the evaluation manager prior to the start of field work as part of the inception report.

Data Collection Methods

The evaluation will apply a mixed-method approach to maximise validity and reliability. Key anticipated methods and data sources will be set out in the Evaluation Matrix, but to summarise:

Relevance

- Stakeholder mapping
- Systematic documentary review, applying structured tools
- Mapping of available contextual analyses including those related to poverty, vulnerability and child rights
- Timeline construction, including of key decision points
- Technical analysis and testing of strategies
- Semi-structured interviews (UNICEF staff and partners)

Effectiveness

- Analysis of results data from UNICEF M&E systems at country programme level
- Feasibility assessment, given scale of UNICEF assistance and challenges addressed;
- Mapping of risk analyses undertaken/ mitigation measures implemented;
- Systematic documentary / data review, particularly of UNICEF M&E systems and data
- Structured desk analysis of four selected strategies
- Semi-structured interviews with UNICEF staff and partners
- Partial contribution analysis to determine progress against intended results and pathways generated

Efficiency

- Systems analysis of management staffing structures
- Systems analysis of strategies
- Financial analysis – spend per strategy/intervention;
- Systematic documentary / data review, particularly of UNICEF M&E systems and data
- Semi-structured interviews with UNICEF staff and partners

Sustainability

- Systematic documentary review, applying structured tools
- Semi-structured interviews with UNICEF staff and partners
- Interviews with key informants, particularly national representatives

Impact

- Analysis of results data from UNICEF M&E systems
- Analysis of national indicator data
- Systematic documentary review, applying structured tools
- Semi-structured interviews with UNICEF staff and partners

Methods for ensuring validity and reliability at analysis stage will include:

- Triangulation – to confirm and corroborate results reached by different methods – e.g. confirming that the articulation of HRBAs present in documentation is reflected in organizational practice
- Complementarity - to explain and understand findings obtained by one method by applying a second. E.g. explaining and understanding the nuances around the design of particular strategies and interventions
- Interrogation - where diverging results emerge from the application of different methods – these will need to be interrogated to either reconcile, or explain, the differences apparent.
- Validation of evaluation findings and conclusions with the Reference Group and UNICEF staff.

Limitations

The most important limitations include limited availability of reliable and disaggregated data related to the situation of children across different vulnerable groups and the lack of comprehensive theory of change of the country programme. Therefore, a theory of change for the country programme will need to be reconstructed by the evaluation team as part of the evaluation inception phase. Non-systematic development and documentation of the theory of change for some programme areas may also hinder assessment of effectiveness and efficiency of the strategies.

Ethical and other considerations

The evaluation should follow UN Evaluation Group Norms and Standards – including ensuring that the planned evaluation fully addresses any ethical issues. The consultants should also adhere to UNICEF’s Evaluation Policy, to UNEG’s ethical guidelines for UN evaluations and to UNICEF Reporting Standards. Evaluation team members will sign a no conflict of interest attestation.

Key features of the ethical code to be applied are:

- Respecting gender and human rights principles throughout the Evaluation process, including; the protection of confidentiality; the protection of rights; the protection of dignity and welfare of people; and ensuring informed consent. Feedback will be provided to participants wherever possible, and data validation will take place at all levels with participant consent, including with UNICEF.
- Maximising the degree of participation of stakeholders in the Evaluation itself wherever feasible and a commitment to using participatory approaches in field studies in particular.
- Ensuring that the Evaluation matrix (above) integrates CEDAW, CRC and human rights commitments
- Disaggregating data by gender, geography, and social groups where feasible
- Ensuring that outputs use human-rights and gender-sensitive language. Special care taken in relation to any contact that the evaluation team has with children.

The evaluation team is expected to clearly identify any potential ethical issues and approaches, as well as the processes for ethical review and oversight of the evaluation process in their proposal.

The UNEG Guidance on Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation will be fully applied throughout. In addition to investigating and analysing attention to human rights through the evaluation questions, attention will be paid to human rights dimensions during identification of stakeholders and their interests, during selection of interviewees and in the selection of methods, timeframe etc.

Quality Assurance

Reports will be prepared in English, according to the UNICEF House Style and [UNICEF standards for evaluation reports](#) and Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System ([GEROS](#)) guidelines. UNICEF retains an external company who reviews TORs, Inception Reports and Final Reports using a quality matrix based on UNEG Standards. The evaluation report will not be cleared by UNICEF until the report is assessed as “green” or highly satisfactory by the external facility.

Draft deliverables will be submitted in Word format, with final deliverables delivered in both word and pdf. All objects/graphics in the ER must be editable to allow for eventual translation and/or reformatting. Presentations may use PowerPoint or other formats, as appropriate.

The Evaluation Team members takes the primary responsibility for the quality of the main evaluation products, ensuring a rigorous process of data collection, analysis and synthesis to minimise errors. The process of on-going triangulation and verification, described above, will help ensure this, as will the proposed validation session. No evaluation team member will have any potential conflict of interest with the evaluation object or UNICEF.

Dissemination

The evaluation report will be shared as an electronic copy with key national stakeholders and uploaded on the [GEROS website](#). The learnings acquired through the country programme evaluation will be shared widely by incorporating them in the next country programme document, UNDAF as well as existing reports and publications, such as the country office's annual report or other key reports.

Timing/duration of contract:

Dec 2018 – June 2019

Process and timing

The section above has set out the components of the evaluation. These will be organised according to the following process and timing:

INCEPTION (December 2018 - February 2019)

- i. Preliminary desk review and discussion with UNICEF team
- ii. In preparation for the in-country evaluation mission, all team members will participate in an introductory skype call with the UNICEF Serbia Country Office counterparts, which will be organized by the Evaluation Manager. The purpose of the introductory call is to provide the Evaluation Team with a 'light' overview of the respective programme history, changes that have taken place in terms of programming environment or changes in the lives of children, innovation, and successes
- iii. Refining evaluation questions and in-depth evaluability assessment
- iv. Preparation of the Inception Report and data collection and analysis tools

IMPLEMENTATION (March)

- i. Fieldwork in Serbia
- ii. End of mission Debriefing

ANALYSIS AND REPORTING (April-June)

- i. Data analysis and processing
- ii. Preparation and submission of draft evaluation report
- iii. Stakeholder review and submission and consolidation of feedback
- iv. Presentation by TL of final draft report in Serbia and discussion/validation meeting
- v. Submission of final report by TL

Preparation of Management Response and Dissemination July 2019.

Interaction and debriefing will take place at various points e.g.: at the inception phase, at the end of the field mission; and through a face-to-face presentation once the final report has been drafted. Further interactions will be conducted as deemed necessary throughout the evaluation period.

Terms of payment:

All payment terms will be indicated in the institutional contract upon selection of the successful company.

30 % of the payment is due after the deliverable of final Inception report.

30 % of the payment is due after the submissions of approved draft report.

30 % of the payment is due after the submission of the final synthesis evaluation report.

10% of the payment is due after the integration of any final comments and corrections to the final synthesis evaluation report.

Inception reports and final synthesis evaluation report will be considered final after satisfactory review by the external review facility and the approval of the Reference Group.

Nature of Penalty Clause in Contract

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 (fees reduced due to late submission: 20 days - 10%; 1 month -20%; 2 months -30%; more 2 months – payment withhold). All materials developed will remain the copyright of UNICEF and UNICEF will be free to adapt and modify them in the future.

The bidders are requested to provide an all-inclusive cost in the financial proposal. In all cost implications bidders, should factor the cost of the required service/assignment. Estimated cost for travel should be included in the financial proposal. Travel cost shall be calculated based on economy class travel, regardless of the length of travel. Costs for accommodation, meals and incidentals shall not exceed applicable daily subsistence allowance (DSA) rates, as promulgated by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC). Unexpected travels shall also be treated as above.

Qualifications/specialized knowledge/experience required to complete the task:

The evaluation will be carried out by a team of 2-3 international consultants (including the Team Leader) and one national expert (to be recruited by the company). The TL will be involved in the selection of all team (international and national experts) members. All consultants should have substantive expertise in leading or conducting evaluations and should not have any conflict of interest with respect to UNICEF.

The team will include members who together form an appropriate balance of expertise and practical knowledge in the following areas:

- Early Childhood Development (ECD);
- Adolescent/youth programming;
- Public finance and social policy.

The national consultant should be an expert in child rights or at least one of the above areas. Companies responding to the tender should plan to hire interpreters separately as necessary.

As a general guide, the level of effort and duration of the evaluation suggest that the Team Leader should be allocated a total of 50 days and team member should be allocated up to 40 days (depending on the distribution of work and missions across the team).

Evaluation Team: Required qualifications and areas of expertise

The evaluation will have to be conducted by a gender-balanced team comprising a sufficient number of qualifying international evaluators covering the below requirements:

- Team-leader with documented extensive experience (at least 8 full years) in conducting complex development evaluations (having conducted evaluations for UNICEF is an asset, having evaluations positively rated by UNICEF's quality assurance system is an additional asset);
- Two other evaluator(s) with documented experience (at least 5 full years) in conducting development evaluations (having conducted evaluations for UNICEF is an asset);
- At least one team member with proven expertise in each of the following areas: early childhood development (ECD), adolescent/youth programming, public finance and social policy
- At least one team member with proven extensive experience in quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis;

- At least one team member with proven experience in planning of complex programmes and exposure to UN strategic planning processes (exposure to UNICEF planning is an asset);
- All team members with experience of working in developing countries, at least one team member with experience in Western Balkans (previous work in Serbia is an asset);
- At least one team member with solid knowledge on child rights, HRBA and gender equality;
- Excellent report writing skills in English;
- Good communication skills
- Fluency in English, fluency in Serbian is an asset.

The team may be an international institution or a group of international evaluators and it should be complemented by at least one national expert and national consultants for support in translation, organization of the in-country agenda, and interpretation of findings from a country-specific stand point if needed.

The team is responsible to ensure that the process is in line with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Ethical Guidelines (<http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ETHICAL+GUIDELINES>). The evaluator(s) should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relationships with all stakeholders. Furthermore, they should protect the anonymity and confidentiality\ of stakeholders, individual information. All participants should be informed of the context and purpose of the evaluation, as well as of the confidentiality of the information shared.

Common tasks and duties for all evaluation team members

1. All team members are requested to refer attentively to the documentation made available in the evaluation shared folder, including the ToR, context information and information on and preparatory analysis of UNICEF's interventions.
2. All team members are requested to familiarize themselves with UNICEF's global normative products in the substantive areas for which they are responsible. These are available on the UNICEF website www.unicef.org.
3. Complementary to the evaluation ToR, the evaluation team leader will prepare a number of orienting documents and tools (including an evaluation matrix) in discussion with the evaluation team. These documents should be read by all team members and will be used as a framework for guiding the questions to be asked and data to be gathered during the evaluation.
4. All team members will contribute to concise written reports a) at the end of the desk review phase and prior to the start of the field mission (3-5 pages), b) at the end of the field work as contribution to the preliminary debriefing session, and c) for the draft evaluation reports for each country. Team members will also contribute to the revision of the final synthesis draft evaluation report, reviewing the report in its entirety and making suggestions.

Roles and Responsibility – Team Leader

The Team Leader has the overall responsibility for the Evaluation of the Country Programme in Serbia looking at the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of UNICEF's and other key interventions for adolescents. Specifically, the tasks of the TL include:

- Guiding the extensive desk review of existing information on the context, national policies and priorities and UNICEF's work, including all relevant programme and project documents and reports, previous studies, research and evaluations
- Developing detailed methodological guidance (inception report) for the team and coaching them in the tools and approach to be used for data gathering and analysis. The guidance will be shaped by UNICEF's MoRES framework and inquiries into UNICEF performance organized around core roles;
- Facilitate meetings/interviews with national counterparts and development/humanitarian partners;
- Provide guidance in preparing Evaluation deliverables;

- Clearly identify any potential ethical issues and approaches, as well as the processes for ethical review and oversight of the evaluation process in their proposal
- Follow the methodology described in the ToR, prepare check-lists as appropriate and consult with the Team Members as necessary on methodological issues;
- Coordinate with the Evaluation team to consolidate inputs from Evaluation team and ensure timely delivery of Evaluation products;
- Manage the evaluation work plan, respecting deadlines for specific activities and inputs described in the work plan;
- Maintain a high level of communication with the other team members;
- Review all relevant documentation related to the UNICEF support in Serbia, including inter alia secondary information available in-country such as statistics, studies and surveys related to children and programmatic areas as well as project documents and progress reports, baseline studies, other technical reports, etc;
- Take part in the evaluation mission to Serbia in March 2019, contributing specifically to information collection and analysis of development and humanitarian work of UNICEF in Serbia;
- Conduct interviews with a range of key stakeholders and informants;
- Visit accessible field programmes sites and interview field staff and ultimate beneficiaries, as appropriate and feasible;
- Assess UNICEF's work and comparative advantage in the context of policies, plans, debates and emerging issues in the Republic of Serbia – and of the work being carried out by other organizations in programmatic sectors as well as in the humanitarian context;
- Contribute to the team's analysis and discussion of evaluation questions and issues common to the whole team;
- Lead the consolidation of the team's inputs for the debriefing session(s) and in the presentation of the draft findings to stakeholders;
- Submit the Inception Report upon completion of the Desk Review, the mission (field visit) an aide memoire upon completion of the Field Mission, the Draft and Final reports, and the a power point presentation on the main findings and recommendations emerging from the evaluation.

Note that the inception reports and end reports will be subject to an external quality assurance review prior to being cleared by UNICEF as final deliverables.

Evaluation Team Members

- Pre-mission review of all core documents and documentation specific to the team member role within the team and sectoral focus. Preparation of a 3-5 page desk review, highlighting key questions for the evaluation team.
- Participation in the evaluation pre-mission preparatory skype discussion, the evaluation mission and end of mission debriefing.
- Clearly identify any potential ethical issues and approaches, as well as the processes for ethical review and oversight of the evaluation process in their proposal
- Systematic and rigorous documentation of findings, preparation of a 8-10 page contribution to the evaluation report, written feedback on the consolidated overall evaluation report.

Selection criteria:

Interested companies are requested to submit their technical and financial proposals by 30 November 2018.

After the opening, each proposal will be assessed first on its technical merits and subsequently on its price. The proposal with the best overall value, composed of technical merit and price, will be recommended for approval. UNICEF will set up an evaluation panel composed of technical and procurement staff and their conclusions will be forwarded to the internal UNICEF Contracts Review Committee, or other relevant approving authority.

The evaluation panel will first evaluate each response for compliance with the requirements of the request for proposal (RFP) procedure of UNICEF. Responses deemed not to meet all of the mandatory requirements will be considered non-compliant and rejected at this stage without further consideration. Failure to comply with any of the terms and conditions contained in this RFP, including provision of all required information, may result in a response or proposal being disqualified from further consideration.

All bidders' proposals will be reviewed by 7 December, 2018. It is expected that the contract with the selected bidder will be signed not later than 17 December.

The overall weighting between technical and price evaluation will be as follows: The technical component will account for 70% of the total points allocated and the financial component will account for 30% of the total points allocated.

The assessed technical score must be equal to or exceed 42 of the total 70 points allocated to the technical evaluation in order to be considered technically compliant and for consideration in the financial evaluation.

Technical evaluation	Points
1. Overall Response e.g. the understanding of the assignment by the proposer and the alignment of the proposal submitted with the ToR	10 points
1.1. Completeness of response	5 points
1.2 Overall concord between RFP requirement and proposal	5 points
2. Company and personnel	25 points
2.1 Range and depth of organizational experience with similar projects	4 points
2.2 Samples of previous work	3 points
2.3 Number of customers, size of projects, number of staff per project	3 points
2.4 Client references	7 points
2.5 Key personnel: relevant experience and qualifications of the proposed team for the assignment	8 points
3. Proposed Methodology and Approach e.g. Work plan showing detail sampling methods, project implementation plan in line with the project	35 points
3.1 Proposed work plan and approach of implementation of the tasks as per the ToR	15 points
3.2 Implementation strategies, monitoring and evaluation, quality control mechanism	10 points
3.3 Technologies used - compatibility with UNICEF	5 points
3.4 Innovative approach	5 points
Price proposal	Points
	30 points