

UNICEF Evaluation Office

Evaluation of UNICEF's Humanitarian Response in Syria and the Sub-Region

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Starting from non-violent protests in February 2011, the crisis in Syria accelerated into an all-out conflict inflicting untold suffering and hardship on civilian populations, resulting in 6.65 million children living in dire conditions. Spiralling levels of violence and displacement to this day continue to tear apart the fabric of Syrian society, creating one of the largest refugee crises in recent years. The refugee dimension of the crisis is placing countries in the region – and vulnerable host communities – under such stress that their situation may become politically and socially unsustainable. The political challenges faced locally have changed and evolved, while the security situation is under constant flux. This environment is impacting the implementation challenges and conditions faced by humanitarian organizations assisting the local population. The Syria CALL portal presents a crisis timeline, situation analysis and other information relevant to this crisis.¹

1.2 As of October 2014, the United Nations (UN) estimated that more than eleven million people inside Syria were in need of humanitarian assistance², including 5.1 million children. A further 1.55 million children require assistance across the sub-region³. Approximately 6.4 million people have been displaced inside Syria, with more than a third of all Syrian children no longer living in their own homes and communities. Conservative figures from the UN meanwhile estimate that over 191,000 people have lost their lives in the conflict. With at least 10,000 children killed in Syria since 2011, child casualty rates are the highest recorded in any recent conflict in the region.

1.3 Since 2011 more than 3 million Syrians have left their homes to become refugees in neighbouring countries. This number continues to rise. Some are stranded at the border, while those who are able to cross face multiple hardships, from coping with harsh refugee camp environments, through finding a way to settle in already under-resourced host communities. Syria's regional neighbours have made tremendous efforts to accept the flood of refugees. Yet, in these countries the influx has pushed up demand for already scarce supplies and resources, such as increased competition for livelihoods and access to basic social services, including places in school.

¹ <http://www.syrialearning.org/>

² United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs: <http://www.unocha.org/syria>

³ United Nations Children fund, <http://childrenofsyria.info/>

1.4 In response to the deteriorating crisis in Syria and the sub-region, UNICEF mounted a complex and costly response operation, taking into account the middle-income context of the affected countries and the exponentially growing scale of needs. Since 2012, UNICEF has appealed for nearly US\$ 1.36 billion in total for the Syria Crisis (US\$ 765 million⁴ for 2014 alone, which was more than one third of UNICEF's 2014 annual global Humanitarian Action for Children appeal). Against the appeal since 2012, UNICEF has received a total of US\$ 965 million for the Syria crisis as of September 2014. UNICEF's response now encompasses six country offices – Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, Turkey and Egypt – and coordination between two regional offices – Middle East and North Africa (MENA), and Central and Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CEE/CIS). The situation reports that include updated funding status and other relevant information can be found on UNICEF Website.⁵

1.5 The crisis has been the focus of organization-wide support from January 2013 onward with the declaration of Level 3 (L3) Corporate Emergency Activation Procedures (CEAP)⁶. A massive effort was made to scale up UNICEF's operational and programmatic support. The pre-emergency profile of small upstream-focused country offices was radically changed to meet the needs of large scale emergency-oriented programmes; with the necessary increase in the volume of country office staff, where some countries had to expand more than 300 per cent in less than two years. This scale up facilitated cooperation and support in entirely new areas of programming and the opening of new field sub-offices to support children located in hard to reach areas.

1.6 With the Syria crisis now well into its fourth year, UNICEF requires an independent evaluation of its Humanitarian Response to the Syria Crisis, including the response in the Sub-Region, to advance organizational learning and accountability. A scoping mission and preliminary consultations conducted on behalf of the UNICEF Evaluation Office in September 2014 informed the preparation of these Terms of Reference (ToR). The results of the interviews and the preliminary desk review conducted during this scoping phase will be made available to the evaluators to minimise duplication of effort and provide an indication as to which lines of enquiry are most significant and relevant in pursuing the objectives of the evaluation.

1.7 It is recognized that UNICEF teams and their partners are continuing to provide assistance under very difficult circumstances. In undertaking the evaluation, every effort should be made to use existing sources of information and to minimise demands on staff and partners while undertaking sufficient consultations to allow a systematic and coherent approach.

⁴ United Nations Children Fund, <http://www.unicef.org/appeals/syria.html>

⁵ For further information please refer to: http://www.unicef.org/appeals/syria_sitreps.html

⁶ A Level 3 (L3) emergency is declared on the basis of: scale, urgency, complexity, capacity and reputational risk to UNICEF and/or the UN. In a L3 emergency, UNICEF calls for an institution wide and global mobilisation through its Corporate Emergency Activation Procedure (CEAP). Predefined Simplified Standard Operating Procedure (SSOPs) allow UNICEF to respond effectively and immediately to the situation. A Level 2 (L2) emergency is led and managed by a regional office.

2. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVE

2.1 The evaluation is intended to serve both an accountability function (historical/summative) and a learning function (forward-looking/formative). The scale and funding for the crisis necessitates an accountability function; the fact that the crisis is becoming a protracted emergency necessitates the learning function. Equal weight is attached to both. The evaluation aims to support further strengthening of UNICEF's performance in protecting children's rights and well-being in the region and in responding to large scale multi-country emergencies.

2.2 The purpose of the evaluation is to provide a comprehensive assessment of UNICEF's overall response to the Syria crisis against its own mandate and standards, its stated objectives, and standard evaluation criteria. The evaluation, based on collation and analysis of relevant data and information, will generate evidence, conclusions and key lessons and will make recommendations concerning UNICEF's future humanitarian responses both in the sub-region and elsewhere.

2.3 The main objective is to provide an independent and robust evaluation of UNICEF's emergency response under three main headings (core themes):

(i) UNICEF's **strategy and key programme interventions**, programme choices and related operations, including attributable results.

(ii) UNICEF's **engagement with other actors**, with a primary focus on its role in sector coordination where relevant; and a secondary reflection on its collaborations with key stakeholders, including governments, other UN agencies, beneficiaries and implementing partners.

(iii) UNICEF's **management structures and operational processes**, including its L2 and L3-related procedures, in relation to its Syria crisis response and performance.

The evaluation should take into consideration the evolving political context and its influence on decisions made during each phase of implementation. To this end, a detailed political timeline should be developed alongside the implementation timeline to illustrate the interaction of political and humanitarian events, processes and decisions. The above three themes are further elaborated in the evaluation questions in Section Four below.

2.4 The main intended users of the evaluation are managers and staff in the UNICEF MENA and CEE/CIS Regional Offices and in the Country Offices in the sub-region; senior managers, policy makers and advisors in headquarters; and others in UNICEF for whom the Syria response holds relevant lessons. It is also envisaged that the evaluation should be of interest and use to UNICEF's Governmental partners, donors; other UN agencies; UNICEF's sector co-leads; members of working groups led or co-led by UNICEF and its implementing and other partners.

3. SCOPE

3.1 As noted above, the intention is to evaluate the UNICEF response in terms of three core themes: programme delivery (including programme strategy and programme implementation), external engagement and internal process. However, given the scale, extent and duration of UNICEF's response in the sub-region, it will not be possible to evaluate every aspect of the response, nor to go into equal detail on every element of the programme. While maintaining an overview of the response as a whole, the evaluation will focus on a sub-set of issues for in-depth consideration.

3.2 One of the important elements of this evaluation will be an assessment of how the UNICEF response changed as it moved from a modified L2 to an L3 emergency response. The proposed primary focus period was, therefore, chosen to cover six months of modified L2 period and two years of L3 period. The geographic focus is based on (1) the number of refugees in each country and the scale of UNICEF's response; (2) an initial assessment of availability of data; and (3) ease of access for evaluation purposes. UNICEF's response to the refugee crisis in Turkey will be considered within the scope of the current evaluation – but the source of data and analysis on the response in this country will largely be based on a separate country evaluation to be managed by the UNICEF CEE-CIS Regional Office and Turkey Country Office. The separate evaluation of the UNICEF response in Turkey will be coordinated with this evaluation so that the results of the two evaluations can be easily aggregated. Syria itself is included as a central element of the evaluation, in spite of the acknowledged difficulties posed by access restrictions and limited availability of data. The flagship programmes are those identified by the Regional Office as being of particular importance to the relief effort. In addition, UNICEF's response should be assessed in relation to the established benchmarks, such as the Core Commitment to Children (CCC)⁷ and the degree to which the UNICEF response was aligned with the existing guidelines, standards and criteria.

3.3 Based on initial scoping consultations with staff in the sub-region and in headquarters, the following areas of focus are proposed (subject to further validation in the inception phase):

Temporal focus

- Primary focus on the periods (i) from **first quarter of 2012 to end 2014** (L2/L3 period)
- Secondary focus on mid-2011 to first quarter-2012; and on January 2015 to mid-2015 (i.e. the end of the evaluation period)
- The evaluation will present recommendations on best path forward focused on the period mid-2015 to end 2016.

Geographic focus

- **Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey**

⁷ http://www.unicef.org/emergencies/index_68710.html

Programmatic focus

The evaluation will focus on the UNICEF 'flagship' programme areas:

- WASH: **water supply**
- Health: **immunisation**, with a special analysis of measles and polio immunisations
- Education: **access to education**
- Child Protection: **psychosocial support and Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism⁸ on grave violations against children in armed conflict.**

3.4 The evaluation aims to address UNICEF's response to the emergency across the sub-region. It is not intended to evaluate separately each country programme response. Rather, examples from country programmes will be considered for the light they shed on the four core themes of the evaluation, and on other specific topics identified in the course of the evaluation. To this end, the evaluation questions will follow the lines indicated below. Furthermore, the evaluation should draw to the extent possible on desk reviews, existing programme reviews and evaluations that have produced high quality outputs. This is to avoid duplication and maximise work already undertaken, with an assessment of the quality of outputs to ensure they do not negatively impact this evaluation.

4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The proposed guiding questions for the evaluation cluster into four groups based on the core evaluation themes *[the precise scope will be determined during the inception phase]*:

4.1 UNICEF's role and strategy

(i) Given its mandate and capacities, did UNICEF establish for itself a relevant and appropriate role in the affected countries – with regard to the focus, scale and nature of its interventions? *[In Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey]*

(ii) Did UNICEF establish a clear strategy for its interventions (including advocacy and partnership)? How clear was the theory of change in each case, and was it plausible? Were other strategic options considered? Were the strategies adopted best suited to the prevailing country situation?

(iii) Was UNICEF's strategy adequately informed by needs assessment, prevailing political situation and situational analysis? Did UNICEF have adequate capacity to manage the crisis? Was it related to UNICEF's actual or perceived comparative advantage? Was specific attention given to disaggregated analysis of the needs of children, women and various communities and social groups? How far did UNICEF follow a rights-based approach?

(iv) How responsive was the UNICEF strategy over time to changes in the external environment, including the evolving role of other actors?

⁸ <https://childrenandarmedconflict.un.org/our-work/monitoring-and-reporting/>

4.2 UNICEF's programme and advocacy response⁹

(i) Were the individual components of UNICEF's response to the crisis *appropriate* in kind, *proportionate* to need and *timely*? Did UNICEF give active consideration to alternative approaches?

(ii) Was the programme design and implementation adequately informed by needs assessment and monitoring information? What was the quality of UNICEF's and its partners programme monitoring approaches, processes and systems? How far were results disaggregated?

(iii) How *effective* was UNICEF's response in achieving its objectives? What evidence exists concerning the *results* of UNICEF's responses? What evidence can be produced to show the results improved equity or increased inequalities?

(iv) How *efficiently* did UNICEF use its resources (money, people/time, skills, and reputational assets) in responding to the crisis? What was the cost-benefit profile across the sub-region (actual vs comparative), and how do costs and benefits compare (a) across UNICEF programmes on a country by country basis and (b) with comparator organizations?

(v) How *coherent* was UNICEF's programme in each country? Were sectorial interventions mutually reinforcing? How *consistent* were the overarching approaches with respect to the CCCs and quality of sectorial interventions across the sub-region?

(vi) As the emergency evolved, and taking specific country situations into consideration, how well has UNICEF combined emergency relief and service delivery with more developmental or resilience-related approaches?

(vii) How far did UNICEF attend to cross-cutting issues including equity, gender and disability? Was sufficient attention given to consideration of human rights and equity issues, including discrimination and social exclusion?

4.3 UNICEF's engagement with others

(i) Was UNICEF's choice of partners appropriate and based on adequate assessment of capacity? Was consideration given to the alternative partnership options open to UNICEF?

(ii) How effectively did UNICEF and its partners engage with affected communities and those targeted by its programmes, including children, young people and women, concerning the design and implementation of its responses? What processes of beneficiary feedback were put in place? Were there differences between sectors and geographical locations, including camp and non-camp locations?

(iii) Did UNICEF establish appropriate and productive working relations with key partners including government where relevant (at central/ministerial and local levels) in Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey? Did these relations evolve appropriately over time? Were capacities built to address children issues?

⁹ "Response" includes the UNICEF advocacy response plus the supply and services components of the response.

(iv) Did UNICEF manage to establish effective and mutually accountable implementing partnerships with international and national NGOs in Syria, Lebanon and Jordan? Where such capacity was lacking, how well did UNICEF adapt its approach?

(vi) How well did UNICEF perform as co-lead of the relevant sector working groups and sub-working groups in the sub-region (WASH, Education, Child Protection), particularly within key interagency joint planning processes (SHARP/RRP)? Did it have conflicting interests in this role, and if so how well did it manage such conflicts?

4.4 Internal UNICEF management and process

[For all questions: by country/sub-region]

(i) Were UNICEF's management arrangements for the sub-regional crisis response appropriate and effective? Were roles and accountabilities clear as between HQ, RO, Syria Crisis Hub and Country Offices? As between MENA and CEE-CIS Regions?

(ii) Specifically, how *efficient and effective* was the Syria Crisis Hub mechanism in supporting the response? Were other arrangements considered?

(iii) What effects did the L3 declaration have on the crisis response – initially and over the course of 2013-2014? Were the L3 Simplified SOPs (SSOPs) appropriate to the context, how well were they applied, and what effect did they have on UNICEF's performance?

(iv) Operational support: how *effective and efficient* were UNICEF's operational support services? In particular, how well was the HR function performed? How well were the Supply functions performed? Were the relevant SSOPs applied with respect to HR and operational processes?

(v) Financial and risk management: how *effective and accountable* was UNICEF's management of the funding and finances of the programme? To what extent did the dependence on particular funding sources constrain or support UNICEF's efficiency and effectiveness? (To the extent possible, the audits presented to the evaluators should be used for this question).

(vi) Were applications for Central Emergency Response (CERF) funding timely and appropriate? With respect to effectiveness, efficiency and quality of results, how well were CERF funds managed? (Please refer to following link: <http://www.unocha.org/cerf/about-us/humanitarian-financing> for additional information on CERF grants).

(vii) How well did UNICEF manage related contractual processes (PCA, procurement, supply contracts and other)? Were the relevant SSOPs applied with respect to contractual processes?

4.5 Recommendations

Looking ahead, on the basis of evidence to date and in view of the continuing evolution of the crisis, what should be UNICEF's role from mid-2015 to end of 2016, taking the conflict and political situation into consideration? Does it have the right strategy? What are the relevant options open to UNICEF? Recommendations should cover all aspects of the evaluation, including those related to 4.1 to 4.4 above.

5. METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH

5.1 With regard to the approach taken by the evaluation, given the combined accountability and lesson-learning rationale of the evaluation, a balance will need to be struck between independent scrutiny and participatory approaches. With respect to the latter, a relatively high level of participation is anticipated in terms of feedback and discussion of interim and final findings and recommendations. That said, the intention is not to produce a consensus report, but rather one that reflects the judgement of the Evaluation Team fully informed by evidence and feedback.

5.2 With regard to methodology, the exact questions to be pursued and the methods for pursuing them will be agreed during the inception phase (see below), but some overall stipulations can be made here. The evaluation will employ a mixed-method approach, using qualitative and quantitative techniques and triangulation of data to compile a robust and credible evidence base in order to assess UNICEF's response to the Syria crisis at the global, regional and country levels. Assessing the response will require disaggregated analysis by age, gender, and disability, as well as by camp / non-camp location. Attention is also required regarding issues of equity, child rights and discrimination. It is expected that the evaluation will use the following methods at a minimum:

- **Key informant interviews and focus group discussions:** The Evaluation Team is expected to interview or conduct focus groups with key informants in person or by telephone or Skype. Key stakeholders will include, but not be limited to, UNICEF staff in the relevant Country Offices, Regional Offices and Syria Hub, and headquarters; Immediate Response Team (IRT) and other surge staff, cluster members and partners, national and sub-national authorities, donors, and members of the affected population (including children and youth).
- **Direct observation:** The Evaluation Team will undertake field visits to observe the UNICEF's responses directly and conduct interviews with aid recipients and affected populations to determine their view of UNICEF's programmatic and operational responses. Methods for consulting effectively with affected populations will need to be developed in consultation with UNICEF staff and partners in the relevant areas with a particular focus on the "do no harm" principle ie ensuring that the safety and security of beneficiaries and partners is not compromised by any actions on the part of the evaluation team.
- **Formal desk review:** In addition to rapid review of data in the scoping and inception phases (see below), the Evaluation Team will conduct a systematic and detailed desk review of documents, data and other inputs, building on the existing preliminary desk review conducted in the scoping phase. The Evaluation Team will use appropriate data collection tools to organize the information, in collaboration with the Evaluation Office.

5.3 The evaluation will be conducted in phases as follows:

Phase 1: Scoping Phase (*September/October 2014*)

The scoping phase of the evaluation has already been completed. This involved consultations with key internal and external stakeholders in the sub-region and at headquarters level concerning the purpose and essential elements of the evaluation, together with a preliminary desk review of the availability of relevant data and documentary evidence.

Phase 2: Inception Phase (*February/March 2015*)

Given the work already done in the scoping phase, it is envisaged that the inception phase of the evaluation will not involve a separate mission to the region, but a mission to New York will be required. The purpose of the inception phase is to enable the evaluation team and UNICEF to reach a common understanding as to the nature of the task, the questions to be addressed, the sources and methods to be used, and the outputs to be delivered. It will also enable the evaluation team to undertake initial consultations with key informants, and also to review the available data and documentary material, including material generated in the scoping phase.

The Inception Report, a draft of which will be circulated for comment internally, will form the mutually agreed basis for conducting the evaluation. It should include an evaluation matrix, detailing the questions to be asked together with related indicators and likely sources of verification.

UNICEF will be responsible for providing all of the relevant documentation, including strategy documents, situation and monitoring reports, needs assessment reports, lessons learned exercises, timelines of key decisions and main contact lists of key informants in the Country Offices, the Regional Offices and at headquarter level. Other documents will be made available on request of evaluators through the course of the evaluation. During the inception phase, a detailed stakeholder analysis; tools that will be used for additional data gathering and analysis; and detailed methodological approach should be documented and provided as an annex to the Inception Report.

The Inception Phase will require a visit by the Team Leader and (as appropriate) other members of the team to UNICEF headquarters in New York, for briefing and initial consultations. During this phase, phone consultations and other preparatory communications with the Amman (Middle East and North Africa Regional Office (RO)), Geneva (CEE/CIS RO and EMOPS), New York (EMOPS, PD, EO, etc.) and Copenhagen (Supply Division) and other regional offices will be undertaken.

The main output from this phase will be (i) an Inception Report with annexes indicated below, (ii) a short (two- page) evaluation brief, summarising the purpose, key questions and process for the evaluation, for sharing with internal and external stakeholders. A full bibliography of key documents reviewed for the inception phase is to be provided as an annex to the Inception Report. Where the documents are used to provide secondary data, the source should be clearly noted.

Phase 3: First field mission, data gathering and preliminary briefings (*March/April 2015*)

This is the main data-gathering phase. The timing, schedule and itinerary should be agreed with the Regional Offices and Country Offices, which will facilitate the mission as appropriate. It is envisaged that the field component should commence in the third week of March and last for around four weeks. Based primarily on key informant interviews, direct observation and documentary review, the team should by the end of this phase have produced a preliminary briefing report for discussion with UNICEF staff. The purpose of this is two-fold: (i) to feed into relevant strategic planning and policy review processes (mid-year reviews etc.), and (ii) to provide an initial basis for validation of findings to be followed up in Phase 4.

Prior to the writing of the preliminary briefing report, a presentation from Amman on the initial findings should be given to the two Regional Offices and selected stakeholders. It is envisaged that a discussion of these initial findings with UNICEF staff in the sub-region should help inform the writing of the preliminary briefing report.

The main output from this phase will be (i) a presentation on the preliminary briefing from the first field mission; and (ii) a preliminary briefing report.

Phase 4: Second field mission, validation of findings and production of first draft report (*May 2015*)

This phase is intended to allow time for more detailed follow up on key areas of the evaluation, cross-checking and validation of the provisional analysis from Phase 3, and filling of gaps in documentation, key informant interviews and other consultations. Further field visits are envisaged during this phase, on a basis to be agreed with the regional and country offices concerned. This phase should also allow time for conducting and analysing the results of a beneficiary survey (or multiple surveys) on relevant aspects of the UNICEF response, if this forms part of the agreed methodology. In the inception phase the details of beneficiary surveys will be decided upon. The rapid beneficiary survey undertaken as part of the evaluation of the UNICEF response to the Typhoon Haiyan emergency in the Philippines can be used as a model.

The main output from this phase will be a first full and complete draft of the evaluation report, including all annexes, as a basis for consultation.

Phase 5: Consultation on draft report, revision and production of final report (*June/July 2015*)

This phase allows for full consultation with internal stakeholders on the draft report. Two main rounds of consultation and revision are envisaged (second draft, third draft) plus a more limited consultation on the final draft.

The main output from this phase is the production of a final evaluation report that takes due account of feedback given during the consultation phase. The consultants will be responsible for compiling feedback in the form of a comments matrix for each round of consultation.

Phase 6: Dissemination (July 2015 onwards)

It is envisaged that a final visit to the sub-region will be scheduled to communicate the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation, to facilitate strategic reflection on the response and discuss uptake of lessons learned and recommendations. One or more facilitated, participatory workshops would be conducted with staff from the Regional Offices and Country Offices, potentially also including UNICEF's key partners. This is subject to further discussion with the Regional Offices and Country Offices at the inception phase and later stages of the evaluation.

6. MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

6.1 The UNICEF Evaluation Office will manage the evaluation, in close collaboration with the Country Offices, Regional Offices, the Office of Emergency Operations (EMOPS), Programme Division, and other Divisions and Offices concerned with the Syria crisis. A Senior Evaluation Specialist, supported by an Evaluation Specialist, will manage the evaluation process from start to finish, under the guidance of the UNICEF Director of Evaluation. The Evaluation Office will commission a team of external consultants to undertake the evaluation (see Section Eight below for details).

6.2 A Reference Group will be established at the outset of the evaluation to ensure relevance, accuracy and credibility and therefore utility of the exercise. The Reference Group will serve in an advisory capacity and its main responsibility will be to provide feedback on the main evaluation deliverables. The Reference Group will be chaired by the Evaluation Office Director, with membership composed of members of the Emergency Management Team, or their delegates. A ToR outlining the roles and responsibilities of the Reference Group has been developed and can be shared upon request.

6.3 UNICEF Regional Offices and Country Offices will be kept informed of the evaluation progress on a regular basis, and they will be invited to the participatory workshops at the end of the evaluation process. A webpage on the UNICEF Syria Evaluation Teamsite will be set up for the evaluation to post regular updates, promote communication and ensure transparency.

7. DELIVERABLES AND TIMEFRAME

7.1 The main deliverables and proposed related dates are as follows:

A. Inception Report (including a two-page evaluation brief)

The Inception Report should be no longer than 12,000 words, not including annexes.

Due dates:

- (i) First Draft by 27 February 2015 (for draft Inception Report and two-page evaluation brief)
- (ii) Comments given by 9 March 2015
- (iii) Inception Report finalized by 13 March 2015

B. Initial Findings Presentation; Preliminary Findings Report

Preparation for the field mission is to take place from 16 March – 10 April. Clearance from UNICEF Evaluation Office is needed before field mission can start. The Preliminary Findings Report should be no longer than 5,000 words.

Due dates:

- (i) Initial Findings Presentation by 10 April 2015
- (ii) Preliminary Findings Report by 30 April 2015

C. Evaluation Report

The Evaluation Report should be no longer than 15,000 words, not including Annexes, and should include an executive summary of no more than 2,500 words.

Due dates:

- (i) First full draft by 29 May 2015
- (ii) Second draft by 19 June 2015
- (iii) Third draft by 3 July 2015
- (iv) Final draft by 17 July 2015

8. EVALUATION TEAM

An evaluation team of between 7 and 8 people is envisaged. This would be made up as follows:

Team Leader responsible for the overall delivery of the evaluation according to the ToR and Inception Report. This person will have a minimum of 15 years' experience of working in the humanitarian sector, including previous experience of leading major, multi-disciplinary evaluations. S/he should be conversant with UNICEF, its mission and working methodologies, and should have an in depth knowledge of the international humanitarian system. By preference s/he should have previous experience of managing humanitarian operations or have led major humanitarian evaluations. S/he will have primary responsibility for producing/compiling/editing/writing of the evaluation reports and deliverables indicated in this ToR.

Evaluation Specialists (5 to 6) each with at least 10 years' experience of working in the humanitarian sector, together with substantial evaluation experience. The team needs to cover between them a number of areas of sectoral expertise: WASH, Health, Education, Child Protection, operational support (including HR, logistics, procurement, supplies and ICT) and Financial/Risk management. One team member should have strong supply chain management background that includes logistical support.

Document Analyst and support person, capable of organising and analysis large quantities of data in support of the rest of the evaluation team.

Knowledge of UNICEF mandate, procedures, mode of work in emergencies, and UNICEF previous work in other emergencies would be an asset for the team.

9. TENTATIVE SCHEDULE FOR THE EVALUATION

The Evaluation Office plans to conduct this evaluation over 20 weeks between February and July 2015. The table below provides an overview of the tentative schedule for the Evaluation Team.¹⁰

Date	Task	Team members (WoW*¹ envisaged)	Location
February	Inception phase	TL (4) S1-S6 (3) DA (3)	NY/Home base Home base NY/Home base
09 to 13 March	Preparation for field mission and issuance of travel clearance by EO	TL (1), S1-S6(1), DA(1)	Home base
16 March to 10 April	First field missions; End of mission debrief (ppt)	TL(4), S1-S6 (4), DA (4)	Jordan/ Lebanon/ Damascus* ² / Turkey/Home base
13 to 30 April	Doc review; Phone interviews; and Preliminary Findings Report	TL (3) S1-S6 (3) DA (2)	Home base
01 to 15 May	Second field mission	TL (2) S1-S6 (2) DA (2)	Jordan/ Lebanon/ Damascus* ² / Turkey
18 to 29 May	Report drafting: First full draft out for consultations	TL (2) S1-S6 (2)	Home base
01 to 12 June	UNICEF response and comments compiled and sent to Team Leader		
15 to 19 June	Report drafting: Second draft	TL (1) S1-S6 (1)	Home base
22 to 26 June	UNICEF and stakeholder's response and comments compiled and sent to Team Leader		
29 June to 03 July	Report drafting: Third draft	TL (1)	Home base
06 to 10 July	UNICEF response and comments compiled and sent to Team Leader		
13 to 17 July	Finalizing Report: Final draft	TL (1)	Home base
July onward	Dissemination events	TL (1)	NY/MENARO

*1 WoW – Weeks of Work

*2 When visits to Damascus may not be possible due to security situation, Skype calls, or interaction in Jordan may be undertaken.

¹⁰ TL = Team Leader; S1-S6 = Evaluation Specialists; DA = Document Analyst.

10. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Please note that this ToR will be the basis for a Request for Proposal of Services (RFPS) for both institutional and individual responses. UNICEF reserves the right to use a mixture of institutional and individual contracting to attain best value for money. Therefore detailed costing tables need to be presented with each submission or proposal.

The time frame presented in this ToR is approximate and subject to change. Once funding has been received by Evaluation Office, Request for Proposal of Services advertised, selection process finalized and before contract is issued, the time frame will be finalized based on negotiation between UNICEF and the selected firm.