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1 PURPOSE OF EXPRESSION OF INTEREST (EoI)

UNICEF’s Evaluation Office (EO) is seeking Expressions of Interest (EoI) from qualified institutions (consultancy firms, universities, etc.) for the provision of services to complete an evaluation of the coverage and quality of UNICEF Humanitarian Response in Complex/High-Threat Environments. Institutions that meet the requirements of this EoI in terms of demonstrating their profile, past experience and capacity to conduct this complex evaluation will be shortlisted and invited to submit full technical and financial proposals. This EoI document provides a short description of the evaluation scope of work. Detailed draft terms of reference for the evaluation are annexed to this document.

2 BACKGROUND

The UNICEF Evaluation Office (EO) wishes to commission an institution to undertake an evaluation of ‘Coverage and Quality of UNICEF Humanitarian Response in Complex/High-Threat Environments’ (the evaluation), which forms part of the EO Plan for Global Thematic Evaluations 2014–2017, agreed with the UNICEF Executive Board.

Complex high threat environments refer to humanitarian contexts that are multidimensional in nature, where multiple complexity factors converge and most are political and politicized. This includes but is not limited to armed conflict, restricted access to affected populations, civil or political upheaval, and large scale violations of international humanitarian and human rights law. While programme interventions for all humanitarian situations have their fair share of challenges, the general consensus is that humanitarian response in complex high threat environments has some unique challenges vis-à-vis risks management and principled humanitarian action (which comprises assistance, protection and advocacy). Many of these environments are characterized by fragile or failing political and social institutions, weak governance, limited state capacity or will to respond to needs, and/or affected populations living in areas under the control of non-state entities.¹ In 2015, UNICEF responded to 301 humanitarian situations in 102 countries, of which 63 were socio-political crises, including in countries, such as Syria, South Sudan, Yemen, Burundi, Central African Republic, Iraq, Afghanistan, Somalia, Ukraine, and Nigeria.

Children in countries affected by armed conflict face grave threats and are affected in various ways, ranging from direct killings and injuries, of becoming victims of sexual violence, of being separated from their families, of being recruited and used by parties to conflict, and suffering extreme distress, to more subtle, yet persistent and irreversible effects on schooling, health, nutrition, future opportunities and overall well-being. In complex high threat environments, the most vulnerable people are often located in hard-to-reach or the most insecure locations. Humanitarian response in these settings is conducted in a difficult political and highly insecure environment. As a result, coverage and quality of the humanitarian assistance has been a significant challenge in most complex high threat environments, since insecurity and inaccessibility have limited organizations’ capacity to implement, manage and adequately monitor humanitarian response.

UNICEF aims to meet humanitarian needs in a timely, appropriate, effective and efficient manner, in adherence with the humanitarian principles of humanity\(^2\), neutrality, impartiality, and independence, and in line with UNICEF’s Core Commitment for Children\(^3\) (CCC) and equity approach, endeavouring to reach the most vulnerable and marginalized. Complex high threat environments can pose significant challenges to these principles and objectives, including in working with other humanitarian partners to provide humanitarian assistance to affected populations. Under Humanitarian Reform, sector coordination among the wider Humanitarian Country Team is guided by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Cluster Approach. The aim of the Cluster Approach is to strengthen system-wide preparedness and technical capacity to respond to humanitarian emergencies by ensuring that predictable leadership in the main sectors leads to predictable and effective humanitarian response. UNICEF is the global and country cluster lead agency for nutrition and WASH, and with Save the Children, co-lead agency for education. UNICEF is also the lead agency for the Child Protection Area of Responsibility which falls under the Protection Cluster.

Coverage is important in reflecting UNICEF activities in terms of geography and reach, sectoral or thematic focus, in resource allocations and expenditure. Where UNICEF’s humanitarian access is hindered due to high security threat environments or as a result of restrictions imposed by authorities or other actors, it has become critical to adopt innovative approaches in order to deliver on UNICEF’s mandate and the CCCs. For example, remote programming and third party monitoring have been options used in various locations, given the negative consequences of suspending UNICEF activities which outweigh the risks of implementing the remote programming modality.

### 3 OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to generate practical solutions for the improvement of the coverage and quality of UNICEF response to humanitarian crises in complex high threat environments. It aims to provide a deeper, more systematic and objective analysis across country contexts, of the extent to which UNICEF is succeeding or failing to reach affected populations with high quality programming in complex high threat environments; and how this is attributable to the limits of humanitarian action vis-a-vis political spheres and the conflict dimension (where applicable). This, in turn, should enable UNICEF to innovate and introduce alternative approaches and mitigation measures that will improve the coverage and quality of UNICEF action in such challenging contexts.

\(^2\) For definitions of humanity, neutrality, impartiality, and independence please refer to: [https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/OOM-humanitarianprinciples_eng_June12.pdf](https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/OOM-humanitarianprinciples_eng_June12.pdf)

\(^3\) [https://www.unicef.org/publications/files/CCC_042010.pdf](https://www.unicef.org/publications/files/CCC_042010.pdf)
This evaluation has three specific objectives:

1. To assess UNICEF performance in achieving coverage and quality in its humanitarian action in a sample of complex high threat environments, using both desk and field based studies.

2. To identify the internal and external enabling factors and challenges to UNICEF’s performance in responding to humanitarian crises in complex high threat environments.

3. To provide the analysis required to allow UNICEF to clarify how it fulfils its role in complex high threat environments as a UN agency with a protection mandate, including its designated role in the Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism\(^4\) derived from UN Security Council resolutions on Children Affected by Armed Conflict.

4 **SCOPE OF WORK**

- **Period to be covered**: The evaluation will assess coverage and quality of UNICEF’s response in selected, on-going humanitarian responses in complex environments for the period January 2015 to the present. With respect to past responses in CHTE, the evaluation will only rely on evidence from evaluations and reviews.

- **Thematic focus (UNICEF and partners)**. The evaluation focuses on coverage and quality of UNICEF’s humanitarian response in complex high threat environments:
  
  - **Coverage** is defined as: ‘The extent to which major population groups facing life-threatening suffering are being (or were) reached by humanitarian action’\(^5\). For UNICEF, the concept of coverage also includes the extent to which UNICEF is identifying and reaching the most vulnerable, and is addressing differences in vulnerability due to, for example, age and gender, and disability.
  
  - **Quality** of humanitarian response does not have a unified definition in UNICEF. For the purposes of the evaluation, the assessment of quality is understood to be the degree to which UNICEF is adhering to the benchmarks set out in its Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action (CCCs) in complex high threat environments, and also supplementary commitments the organization has made to: 1) the Core Humanitarian Standard\(^6\), 2) technical standards for humanitarian programming (primarily the Sphere standards\(^7\) and INEE minimum standards\(^8\)), 3) Accountability to Affected Populations, 4) commitments made by UNICEF at the World Humanitarian Summit, especially within the Grand Bargain\(^9\). In assessing performance, the evaluation will recognize that this list represents a mixture of well-established and new commitments by UNICEF.

- **Sectoral coverage**: The evaluation has no specific sector focus and will assess performance in all sectors where UNICEF plays a leading role in complex high threat environments.

---

\(^4\) For further information on MRM, click [here](#).


\(^6\) [https://corehumanitarianstandard.org/the-standard](https://corehumanitarianstandard.org/the-standard)

\(^7\) [http://www.sphereproject.org/](http://www.sphereproject.org/)


- **Geographic coverage:** This is a global evaluation and aims to generate learning and proposals for the enhancement of UNICEF’s performance in all the complex high threat environments where UNICEF operates. The evaluation will generate evidence using a case study approach, with a total of 12 case studies covering four to five UNICEF regions.

*For more information on the scope, please refer to the draft terms of reference for this exercise at the end of this document.*

### 5 PERIOD OF ASSIGNMENT AND EVALUATION APPROACH

The evaluation team is expected to be contracted in July or August 2017. The evaluation will begin in September 2017. The evaluation has been designed to follow a phased approach, so that the concepts, scope and methodology employed are well understood and tested before the main evaluation is launched.

**Pilot Phase / Phase 1 - (September – December 2017)**
This phase will orient an evaluation team, and develop the elements of the methodology. The pilot phase will consist of an inception stage, a field visit and data collection stage, analysis stage, and report writing stage. This phase includes pilot case studies (one country-visit based and one desk-based). The countries will be selected by UNICEF EO based on consultation with the evaluation’s Reference Group. List of countries that are considered are presented in Annex Two of the attached ToR. The purpose of the pilots is to test the relevance and feasibility of the proposed evaluation and case study approaches. The pilot country visit case study will be undertaken by a majority (ideally all) of the evaluation team members to ensure learning across the team concerning the application of the case study methodology. Five reports are expected during this stage: an inception report (including issues related to evaluability and a document review as an annex), a report for the country visited (25 pages + annexes), a report for the desk-based country (15 pages + annexes); a methodological report (20 pages); and a full evaluation report that brings together the above mentioned reports (40 pages + annexes). In addition, the Pilot phase will conclude with three presentations. The first will be the preliminary findings from the country visited that will be delivered to the staff of that country office. The second will be on the evaluation report, findings, conclusions and recommendations. The third presentation will focus on the methodology and tools to be employed during Phase 2. This presentation will propose any revisions to the evaluation methodology and tools to be used for subsequent country visit based, and desk based, case studies.

*The contract for the evaluation will include a break clause at the end of Phase 1. If Phase 1 is completed satisfactorily, the same evaluation team will be asked to continue directly to the implementation of Phase 2.*

**Main Evaluation / Phase 2 (January – June 2018)**
Like the first phase, this phase will consist of an inception stage, a field visit and data collection stage, analysis stage, and report writing stage. It will begin with the preparation of an inception report that draws from the methodological report in phase 1. The main evaluation phase will be based on approximately twelve case studies. The countries will be selected by the UNICEF Evaluation Office based on consultation with the Reference Group for the evaluation, regional directors and country representatives. Seven country case studies (15 pages + annexes) will be based on remote interviews.

---

10 In advance of launching this EOI a scoping and learning phase were completed meaning much of the background work for the evaluation has already been documented.

11 If Phase 1 is not completed satisfactorily, Phase 2 may be retendered. At this stage, the Director of Evaluation is not committed to any particular course of action in the event of the results of Phase 1 not reaching the required standard.
and a document review. Five country case studies (25 pages + annexes) will be based on a document review as well as country visits which will involve interviews, beneficiary consultation and direct observation. The first draft evaluation report will be assembled by the evaluation team according to UNICEF evaluation report standards, once the 12 case studies are completed. This will be presented to UNICEF staff at a workshop to 1) share learning from the evaluation between and beyond the case study countries, 2) test the report’s findings and recommendations against field and political realities, and 3) generate practical actions steps. The team will prepare a presentation based on the final evaluation report.

6 DESIRED TEAM COMPOSITION AND PROFILE

The team is expected to be composed of four or five members, including the team leader. Based on their understanding of the task, the team may choose to enlist additional expertise as they see fit, including subcontracting with national evaluation partners for field-based activities, and specialized technical experts, as necessary.

The evaluation team should offer the following demonstrated experience, knowledge and competencies:

- Humanitarian evaluation experience of large scale programmes
- Field experience of humanitarian response in complex high threat environments
- Previous work or consultancy experience with UNICEF and understanding of UNICEF’s mandate is desirable
- Sectoral knowledge of a majority of UNICEF programme sectors: Child Protection, WASH, Nutrition, Health, Education, as well as the areas indicated in UNICEF’s Core Commitments to Children (CCCs)
- Advanced understanding of humanitarian principles, humanitarian space, humanitarian access, security management, gender, equity, risk assessment, international humanitarian law, human rights law, the human rights based approach to programming, humanitarian advocacy, Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism12, ‘Do No Harm’ principles13
- Advanced understanding of UN coordination for humanitarian response (including roles of the Humanitarian Coordinator and humanitarian clusters), and interagency instruments applied to humanitarian response (strategic response planning, needs overview etc).14
- Advanced understanding of accepted norms and standards for humanitarian response; Core Humanitarian Standards, Sphere standards, INEE, and IASC guidance materials for protection and cross cutting issues in humanitarian response
- Advanced understanding of current humanitarian initiatives, including the results of the World Humanitarian Summit and implementation of the Grand Bargain.
- Gender balanced team and geographic regional balanced team (desirable)
- Advanced technical knowledge, skills and expertise in evaluation concepts and capacity to execute a multi-country evaluation, including field level case studies;
- Strong quantitative and qualitative data collection, and analysis and synthesis skills
- Highly developed communications skills; presentation, facilitation, and report writing in English.

---

12 https://www.unicef.org/protection/57929_57997.html
14 as detailed at https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/
- English language skills. French and Arabic language skills for interviews are an asset.

7 SUBMISSION OF EXPRESSION OF INTEREST (EoI)

Institutions are encouraged to complete and submit the attached EoI form. EoIs should be sent to evalofficeapplications@unicef.org, with copy to Jane Mwangi (jmwangi@unicef.org) and Laura Olsen (lolsen@unicef.org) no later than close of business on 17 May, 2017. Please quote “Evaluation of the Coverage and Quality of UNICEF Humanitarian Response in Complex/High-Threat Environments” as the subject in your correspondence.

This EoI does not constitute a solicitation. We do not require bids or proposals at this stage; we merely seek your expression of interest in this work. A response to this call for Expression of Interest does not automatically ensure that you will be selected to participate in this work. Successful vendors will be invited to respond to a Request for Proposals.

UNICEF reserves the right to change or cancel requirements at any time during the EoI and/or solicitation process. UNICEF also reserves the right to require compliance with additional conditions as and when issuing the final tender document. If you have any questions about this EoI, please email Jane Mwangi (jmwangi@unicef.org) and Laura Olsen (lolsen@unicef.org).
UNICEF Evaluation Office – Expression of Interest Form
Evaluation of the Coverage and Quality of UNICEF Humanitarian Response in Complex/High-Threat Environments

Please fill-in the form and submit to evalofficeapplications@unicef.org / copy to jmwangi@unicef.org & lolsen@unicef.org

Full Name of Institution: 

Type of Entity: 

User Salutation: □ Dr. □ Ms. □ Mr.

First Name of focal point: 

Last Name of focal point: 

Job Title/Role in Institution: 

Mobile Phone Number: ___-___-____ (please include country & city code)

Fax Number: ___-___-____ (please include country & city code)

Contact E-mail Address: 

Mailing Address: 

City / State: 

Postal Code: 

Country: 

Address of Internet Website: 

Alternate Contact Person & Email address: 


Please answer the following mandatory questions (*maximum three pages*):

1. Briefly describe the organisational and financial profile of your institution, including
   - Its organisational structure, including any associates, partner firms, etc. and the numbers of years it has been operating;
   - Its most relevant past experience(s) in relation to the proposed consultancy
   - The extent your team benefits from (a) back-office/logistics support and of what nature, (b) a network of international partners or associates that could be mobilised for country case study work, (c) any other support that might facilitate an assignment of this breadth.

2. Provide information which will enable us to determine whether the proposed team from your company/organization has relevant humanitarian and evaluation experience, and possess the experiences, knowledge and competencies highlighted in this EoI. Information should include:
   - Profiles of the proposed team leader and team members including a description of the evaluation experience, humanitarian experience and technical competencies of all team members
   - A description of the evaluations the team members have carried out

3. Please attach the curriculum vitae of the team leader and all members as an annex.

4. Confirmation that your institution or any individual team members:
   - Has no on-going litigation with the UN
   - Is not currently removed/invalidated or suspended by the United Nations or UN system organizations
DRAFT -- Terms of Reference

Evaluation of the Coverage and Quality of UNICEF Humanitarian Response in Complex High-Threat Environments

April 2017

Evaluation Office
1 Introduction .................................................................................................................. 1
2 Evaluation background, rationale and use ................................................................. 1
  2.1 Background .............................................................................................................. 1
  2.2 Rationale for the evaluation: .................................................................................. 5
  2.3 Evaluation use ........................................................................................................ 5
3 Purpose, objectives and approach of the evaluation .................................................. 6
4 Scope of the evaluation ............................................................................................... 6
5 Evaluation approach ................................................................................................... 7
6 Evaluation phasing ....................................................................................................... 8
7 Evaluation methodology ............................................................................................. 8
  7.1 Evaluation Phase 1 – Inception and Pilot (4 months) ............................................. 8
    7.1.1 Document Review .............................................................................................. 8
    7.1.2 Interviews .......................................................................................................... 9
    7.1.3 Pilot Case Studies .............................................................................................. 9
    7.1.4 Presentation and revision of methodology and tools ......................................... 9
  7.2 Evaluation Phase 2 – Full evaluation (6 months) .................................................. 9
    7.2.1 Case Study Selection ......................................................................................... 9
    7.2.2 Country visit based case studies ...................................................................... 10
    7.2.3 Draft evaluation report ..................................................................................... 11
    7.2.4 Consultation ...................................................................................................... 11
    7.2.5 Final Draft Report ............................................................................................ 12
    7.2.6 Management Response .................................................................................... 12
8 Deliverables ................................................................................................................ 12
9 Ethical and safety considerations: ............................................................................. 17
10 Potential Evaluation Limitations .............................................................................. 17
11 The evaluation team .................................................................................................. 18
12 Evaluation Stakeholders ............................................................................................ 19
13 Evaluation Management ............................................................................................ 20
  13.1 Evaluation Manager .............................................................................................. 20
  13.2 Reference Group .................................................................................................. 20
  13.3 Evaluation Focal Points ....................................................................................... 21
Annex 1 – Draft Evaluation Questions ....................................................................... 22
Annex 2 – Possible case study countries and selection criteria .................................... 25
Annex 3 – Document Repository .................................................................................. 29
### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAP</td>
<td>Accountability to Affected Populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAC</td>
<td>Children Affected by Armed Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEAP</td>
<td>UNICEF Corporate Emergency Activation Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCs</td>
<td>Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHTE</td>
<td>Complex High Threat Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHR</td>
<td>Division of Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DROPS</td>
<td>Deputy Representative and Operation Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSA</td>
<td>Daily Subsistence Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMOPS</td>
<td>Office of Emergency Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Evaluation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBViE</td>
<td>Gender Based Violence in Emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMT</td>
<td>Global Management Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAC</td>
<td>Humanitarian Action for Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Information Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMS</td>
<td>Information Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Inception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Level Two Emergency as defined by UNICEF CEAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Level Three Emergency as defined by UNICEF CEAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRM</td>
<td>Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSE</td>
<td>Non-State Entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYHQ</td>
<td>New York Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Programme Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG</td>
<td>Reference Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRM</td>
<td>Rapid Response Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHA</td>
<td>Strengthening Humanitarian Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPM</td>
<td>Third Party Monitoring/Monitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Purpose

To generate practical solutions to improve the coverage and quality of UNICEF response to humanitarian crises in complex high threat environments.

### Timeline

The evaluation will be undertaken in two phases: 1. Pilot Phase, involving one field visit and review (4 months, provisionally September – December 2017); 2. Main Evaluation Phase, involving case studies, analysis, consultation and reporting (6 months, provisionally January 2018 - June 2018).

### Reporting to

Evaluation Manager (Senior Evaluation Specialist: Humanitarian), UNICEF Evaluation Office

---

### 1 INTRODUCTION

The UNICEF Evaluation Office (EO) wishes to commission an institution (consultancy firms, university) to undertake an evaluation of ‘Coverage and Quality of UNICEF Humanitarian Response in Complex/High-Threat Environments’ (the evaluation), which forms part of the EO Plan for Global Thematic Evaluations 2014–2017, agreed with the UNICEF Executive Board.

This Terms of Reference has been prepared by EO, in consultation with an internal Reference Group, and drawing on a Scoping Report, which accompanies this Terms of Reference (ToR), and is to be read in conjunction. As explained below, the evaluation will be preceded by a Learning Phase, the results of which will become available before the evaluation begins.

### 2 EVALUATION BACKGROUND, RATIONALE AND USE

#### 2.1 Background

UNICEF is mandated by the United Nations General Assembly to advocate for the protection of children’s rights, to help meet their basic needs and to expand their opportunities to reach their full potential. The organization is committed to continually improve its performance for children, including in humanitarian settings.

Emergencies\(^{15}\) have negatively affected children’s and women’s rights realization, both directly (i.e., through death, injury, and loss of protective forces) and indirectly (i.e., by disproportionately affecting poor countries and eroding development gains).\(^{16}\) Accordingly, the call to humanitarian action has been central to UNICEF’s mandate since the Organization’s inception in December 1946, when it was originally named the United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund. Later, the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and its Optional Protocols further articulated UNICEF’s mandate and mission.

The CRC and its associated Protocols identified the universal rights enshrined within it as inalienable – and non-severable during emergencies – and conferred specific rights and duties

---

\(^{15}\) An emergency is defined by UNICEF as a situation that threatens the lives and well-being of large numbers of a population and requires extraordinary action to ensure their survival, care and protection (United Nations Children's Fund, "Programme Policy and Procedure Manual: Programme Operations", UNICEF, New York, 22 January 2009.

in emergency situations. The Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action (‘the CCCs’), revised in 2010, constitute UNICEF’s central policy on how to uphold the rights of children affected by humanitarian crisis. They provide UNICEF and its partners with a framework for humanitarian action, and commit it to help realize these rights in emergencies. The CCC indicators are also part of the UNICEF’s Strategic Plan, and thus a core business of the organization. The CCCs have a programme commitments for each one of UNICEF sectors of intervention and operational commitments adapted to the phase of the humanitarian response (Preparedness, Response and Early Recovery). Each Commitment also has its corresponding benchmark.

Over time, UNICEF’s role in emergencies has grown to keep pace with escalating needs. An estimated 535 million children – nearly one in four – live in countries affected by conflict or disaster, often without access to medical care, quality education, proper nutrition and protection. More than 1 in 10 children are living in countries and areas affected by violent, often protracted conflicts, translating to nearly 250 million children living in countries affected by conflict. Natural disasters continue to endanger the wellbeing of hundreds of millions of children living in areas prone to floods, droughts, cyclones earthquakes and, tsunamis. Climate change poses an ever more serious threat to children, with over half a billion children living in flood-prone areas and nearly 160 million living in high drought-risk regions. Children are also facing a new generation of fast-spreading epidemics like Ebola.

Figure 1 provides a snapshot of UNICEF’s role in emergencies over the past decade. In 2014, 98 UNICEF country offices (COs) responded to 294 humanitarian situations, including large-scale Level 3 responses to the crises in the Central African Republic, Iraq, the Philippines, South Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, and the Ebola outbreak in West Africa. In 2015, this had grown to 102 COs and 310 humanitarian situations. As significant as the number of such crises, is the importance of their intensity and the extent and nature of the threats, vulnerabilities and needs to which they give rise.

---


18 Nutrition, Health, WASH, Child Protection, HIV/ AIDS and Education


20 UNICEF Press Release, “Nearly a quarter of the world’s children live in conflict or disaster-stricken countries” December, 2016. [https://www.unicef.org/media/media_93863.html]

21 UNICEF 2016 Humanitarian Action for Children; [www.unicef.org/appeals/]


Over the past decade, financial resources contributed by partners to support UNICEF’s work in responding to the needs of children affected by crisis have increased almost three-fold. More than one-third of overall UNICEF funds are allocations to emergencies. Figure 2 shows the funding received since 2006. In 2015, UNICEF received US$1.780 billion in revenue, an increase of nearly US$1.2 billion compared to 2006. The increase in funding has enabled UNICEF to support multiple, simultaneous large-scale emergencies requiring organization-wide response, including in the Central African Republic, Iraq, Nepal, South Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yemen.

Complex high threat environments refer to humanitarian contexts that are multidimensional in nature - where multiple complexity factors converge and that are political and politicized. This includes but is not limited to armed conflict, restricted access to affected populations, civil or political upheaval, and large scale violations of international humanitarian and human rights law. While programme interventions for all humanitarian situations have their fair share of challenges, the general consensus is that humanitarian response in complex high threat environments has some unique challenges vis-à-vis risks management and principled humanitarian action (which comprises assistance, protection and advocacy). Many of these

---


25 Change in accounting policy to IPSAS on 1 January 2012 does not allow for comparisons between 2012 figures and prior years
environments are characterized by fragile or failing political and social institutions, weak governance, limited state capacity or will to respond to needs, and/or affected populations living in areas under the control of non-state entities. In 2015, UNICEF responded to 301 humanitarian situations in 102 countries, of which 63 were socio-political crises, including in countries, such as Syria, South Sudan, Yemen, Burundi, Central African Republic, Iraq, Afghanistan, Somalia, Ukraine, Nigeria.

Children in countries affected by armed conflict face grave threats and are affected in various ways, ranging from direct killings and injuries, of becoming victims of sexual violence, of being separated from their families, of being recruited and used by parties to conflict, and suffering extreme distress, to more subtle, yet persistent and irreversible effects on schooling, health, nutrition, future opportunities and overall well-being. In complex high threat environments, the most vulnerable people are often located in hard-to-reach or the most insecure locations. Humanitarian response in these settings is conducted in a difficult political and highly insecure environment. As a result, coverage and quality of the humanitarian assistance has been a significant challenge in most complex high threat environments, since insecurity and inaccessibility have limited organizations’ capacity to implement, manage and adequately monitor humanitarian response.

UNICEF aims to meet humanitarian needs in a timely, appropriate, effective and efficient manner, in adherence with the humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality, and independence, and in line with UNICEF’s CCC and equity approach, endeavouring to reach the most vulnerable and marginalized. Complex high threat environments can pose significant challenges to these principles and objectives, including in working with other humanitarian partners to provide humanitarian assistance to affected populations. Under Humanitarian Reform, sector coordination among the wider Humanitarian Country Team is guided by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Cluster Approach. The aim of the Cluster Approach is to strengthen system-wide preparedness and technical capacity to respond to humanitarian emergencies by ensuring that predictable leadership in the main sectors leads to predictable and effective humanitarian response. UNICEF is the global and country cluster lead agency for nutrition and WASH, and with Save the Children, co-lead agency for education. UNICEF is also the lead agency for the Child Protection Area of Responsibility which falls under the Protection Cluster.

Coverage is important in reflecting UNICEF activities in terms of geography and reach, sectoral or thematic focus, in resource allocations and expenditure. Where UNICEF’s humanitarian access is hindered due to high security threat environments or as a result of restrictions imposed by authorities or other actors, it has become critical to adopt innovative

---


27 Whereby human suffering must be addressed wherever it is found. The purpose of humanitarian action is to protect life and health and ensure respect for human beings. (https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/OOM-humanitarianprinciples_eng_June12.pdf)

28 Humanitarian actors must not take sides in hostilities or engage in controversies of a political, racial, religious, or ideological nature.

29 Humanitarian action must be carried out on the basis of need alone, giving priority to the most urgent cases of distress and making no distinctions on the basis of nationality, race, gender, religious belief, class or political opinion.

30 Humanitarian action must be autonomous from the political, economic, military or other objectives that any actor may hold with regards to the areas where humanitarian action is being implemented.
approaches in order to deliver on UNICEF’s mandate and the CCCs. For example, remote programming and third party monitoring have been options used in various locations, given the negative consequences of suspending UNICEF activities which outweigh the risks of implementing the remote programming modality.

2.2 Rationale for the evaluation:
The challenges of managing around security/access constraints and quality of UNICEF’s programming has emerged in several recent UNICEF evaluations. The evaluation of the UNICEF humanitarian response in complex high-threat environments aims to provide a deeper, more systematic and objective analysis across country contexts, of the extent to which UNICEF is succeeding or failing to reach affected populations with principled and high quality programming in complex high threat environments; and how this is attributable to the limits of humanitarian action vis-a-vis political spheres and the conflict dimension (where applicable). This, in turn, should enable UNICEF to innovate and introduce alternative approaches and mitigation measures that will improve the coverage and quality of UNICEF action in such challenging contexts.

The evaluation is high profile and of political importance. UNICEF needs to, and needs to be seen to, take stock of the effectiveness of its response to crises in high-profile complex high threat environments, where a large and increasing percentage of its emergency programme resources are expended and take up a growing proportion of total UNICEF programme spend, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of UNICEF humanitarian expenditure in complex high threat environments (CHTE) against:</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total humanitarian expenditure</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total UNICEF programme expenditure</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following consultations between the Director of Evaluation and the Evaluation Committee, the evaluation has been included in the Evaluation Office (EO) Plan for Global Thematic Evaluations, 2014–2017, submitted to the UNICEF Executive Board, which states:

‘A thematic evaluation of the UNICEF humanitarian response in complex high-threat environments would allow for a deeper and more systematic analysis with a view to further improving, where possible, the coverage and quality of UNICEF action in such challenging contexts’.

2.3 Evaluation use
The evaluation will be used to generate consensus and a global action plan to improve UNICEF’s performance in its response to humanitarian crises in complex high threat environments. The end client for the evaluation is the UNICEF Executive Board. Internally, the primary stakeholder for the evaluation is the Office of Emergency Programmes (EMOPS) as the division responsible for policy, guidance and support for UNICEF’s humanitarian action. Implementation of any recommendations emerging from the evaluation for the improvement of UNICEF’s response in complex high threat environments will require a collective effort across UNICEF’s regions and divisions. A management response will be prepared following the evaluation and will assign responsibilities for an agreed set of actions to divisions and offices, as required.

---

31 Executive Board document E/ICEF/2016/3, para 22
3 PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND APPROACH OF THE EVALUATION

The **purpose of the evaluation** is to generate practical solutions for the improvement of the coverage and quality of UNICEF response to humanitarian crises in complex high threat environments.

The **objectives of the evaluation** are:

4. To assess UNICEF performance in achieving coverage and quality in its humanitarian action in a sample of complex high threat environments, using both desk and field based studies.

5. To identify the internal and external enabling factors and challenges to UNICEF’s performance in responding to humanitarian crises in complex high threat environments.

6. To provide the analysis required to allow UNICEF to clarify how it fulfils its role in complex high threat environments as a UN agency with a protection mandate, including its designated role in the Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism deriving from UN Security Council resolutions on Children Affected by Armed Conflict.

4 SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

- **Period to be covered**: The evaluation will assess coverage and quality of UNICEF’s response in selected, on-going humanitarian responses in complex high threat environments for the period from January 2015 to the present. With respect to past responses in CHTE, the evaluation will only rely on evidence from evaluations, reviews and monitoring systems in place.

- **Thematic focus (UNICEF and partners)**. The evaluation focuses on coverage and quality of UNICEF’s humanitarian response in complex high threat environments:
  - **Coverage** is defined as: ‘the extent to which major population groups facing life-threatening suffering are being (or were) reached by humanitarian action’. For UNICEF, the concept of coverage also includes the extent to which UNICEF is identifying and reaching the most vulnerable and in need, and is addressing differences in vulnerability due to, for example, age and gender, and disability.
  - **Quality** of humanitarian response has no definition in UNICEF. For the purposes of the evaluation, the assessment of quality is understood to be the degree to which UNICEF is adhering to the benchmarks set out in its Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action (CCCs) in complex high threat environments, and also supplementary commitments the organisation has made to: 1) the Core Humanitarian Standard, 2) technical standards for humanitarian programming (primarily the Sphere standards and the INEE minimum standards and the Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action), 3) Accountability to Affected Populations, 4) commitments made by UNICEF at the World Humanitarian Summit, especially within the Grand Bargain. In assessing performance, the evaluation will

---

32 For further information on MRM, click [here](#).
34 [https://corehumanitarianstandard.org/the-standard](https://corehumanitarianstandard.org/the-standard)
recognise that this list represents a mixture of well-established and new commitments by UNICEF.

- **Sectoral coverage:** The evaluation has no specific sector focus and will assess performance in all sectors where UNICEF plays a leading role in complex high threat environments.

- **Geographic coverage:** This is a global evaluation and aims to generate learning and proposals for the enhancement of UNICEF’s performance in all the complex high threat environments where UNICEF operates. The evaluation will generate evidence using a case study approach, with a total of 12 case studies covering 4-5 UNICEF regions, as detailed under evaluation methodology, below.

## 5 EVALUATION APPROACH

In its approach, the evaluation is expected to:

1. **Address issues specific to complex high threat environments.** The evaluation will focus on a number of core issues (to be agreed in the learning phase) specific to humanitarian response in these environments. While a number of challenges faced by UNICEF in responding in complex high threat environments may be general to all UNICEF humanitarian responses, the evaluation will focus on whether, and if so how, these challenges uniquely play out in complex high threat contexts.

2. **Focus on the field.** The primary data to be collected by the evaluation is *good practice* and *innovation* by UNICEF country offices and their partners operating in complex high threat environments. In the evaluation, considerations of theory, policy and guidance are secondary to the improvement of field practice.

3. **Add value to the field.** Where UNICEF country teams are engaged in the evaluation, they should derive some direct benefit for the current humanitarian response. The evaluation team will provide real-time feedback on the initial case study findings to the UNICEF country office before the team leaves the country.

4. **Be learning focused.** As in all UNICEF evaluations, the evaluation will combine accountability with learning. However, the emphasis is more on learning than on accountability. The evaluation will take an inductive approach to extract lessons from field practice.

5. **Assess UNICEF contribution.** Humanitarian response is a collective multi-stakeholder enterprise. The evaluation will assess UNICEF’s contribution to results, more than direct attribution.

6. **Be consultative.** The evaluation manager and the evaluation team will ensure that key stakeholders are consulted on emerging findings and recommendations to ensure that they are tested, refined and actionable.

7. **Build on past evaluative exercises.** The evaluation should maximise the use of past evaluations and lessons learned exercises and engage country and regional offices to provide evidence that is not already available elsewhere.
Bidders are invited to propose how they will carry out the evaluation in line with this approach.

6 EVALUATION PHASING

1. This is the first UNICEF evaluation focused specifically on its humanitarian action in complex high threat environments. As noted above, UNICEF does not have one clear set of measures for quality in humanitarian programming. For all these reasons, the evaluation has been designed to follow a phased approach, so that the concepts, scope and methodology employed are well understood and tested before the main evaluation is launched.

2. The evaluation is preceded by a Scoping phase, the report from which is complete and available to bidders as a separate Annex to this ToR, and a Learning phase, which will be completed before the evaluation begins. A document repository was assembled for the Scoping Study and for future use by the evaluation team and the documents held in the repository are listed in Annex 3. The subsequent Learning phase will use an electronic survey to gather and document perceived good practice in increasing coverage and quality and country office perceptions of the challenges faced in operating in complex high threat environments.

3. The evaluation itself has two phases, Phase 1 – Inception and Pilot, including pilot case studies and methodology review, and Phase 2 - the main evaluation, comprising case studies, analysis, consultation and reporting. Bidders are asked to submit proposals for Phases 1 and 2 combined.

4. The contract for the evaluation will include a break clause at the end of Phase 1. If Phase 1 is completed satisfactorily, the same evaluation team will only be asked to continue directly to the implementation of Phase 2.³⁸

7 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

7.1 Evaluation Phase 1 – Inception and Pilot (4 months)

Much of the background work for the evaluation inception report will have been provided by the scoping and learning phases. The inception period will be used to consider issues related to evaluability, orient the evaluation team, make any final adjustments to the ToR and develop the elements of the methodology.

7.1.1 Document Review

Building on this scoping exercise and the accompanying literature review, the evaluation team will undertake a more extended desk review of the following:

- UNICEF evaluations
- UNICEF policy documents
- UNICEF humanitarian training materials
- UNICEF funding data for humanitarian response in complex high threat environments
- UNICEF response plans and reports on operations in complex high threat environments

³⁸ If Phase 1 does not result in a satisfactory completion of work contracted, Phase 2 may be retendered. At this stage, the Director of Evaluation is not committed to any particular course of action in the event of the results of Phase 1 not reaching the required standard.
• Data on human resource deployments and recruitment to emergencies in complex high threat environment countries
• Policy and evaluation reports from a few key partners working in complex high threat environments specifically focusing on coverage and quality
• Relevant academic and research literature

7.1.2 Interviews
The inception phase will include HQ-level interviews with (provisional list):
• UNICEF – managers of key Divisions at HQ including Geneva and Copenhagen
• UN agencies - OCHA, UNFPA, UNHCR, WFP
• INGOs – e.g. NRC, IRC, MSF
• ICRC
• Donors – top 7-8 humanitarian donors to UNICEF for response to complex high threat environments
• Consultants/academics -- two to three that are familiar with UNICEF work in CHTE

The evaluation team will generate a synthesis report of the findings from the above interviews, not exceeding 10 pages, as an annex to the inception report.

7.1.3 Pilot Case Studies
Phase 1 will include two pilot case studies, one country-visit-based and one desk-based. (See under Phase 2 for explanation of the case studies). The pilot case study countries will be selected by UNICEF. The purpose of the pilots is to test the relevance and feasibility of the proposed case study approaches. The pilot country visit based case study will be undertaken by a majority (ideally all) of the evaluation team members to ensure learning across the team concerning the application of the case study methodology.

7.1.4 Presentation and revision of methodology and tools
The evaluation team will present the findings of the case studies to EO and the Reference Group (RG), and propose revisions to the evaluation methodology and tools to be used for subsequent country visit based, and desk based, case studies.

If the inception and pilot phase has been satisfactorily completed, the same evaluation team will be invited by EO to conduct Phase 2, based on their original bid. If Phase 1 is not completed satisfactorily, EO will negotiate with one of the other suppliers whose bid met the requisite technical standards to revise their bid to undertake Phase 2 only, or Phase 2 may be re-advertised.

7.2 Evaluation Phase 2 – Full evaluation (6 months)

7.2.1 Case Study Selection
The choice of a total of 12 country case studies for inclusion in the evaluation will be based on a balance between selection criteria, as described in Annex 2. (5 country visit based case studies and 7 case studies based on document review and remote interviews). Before the RFP for the evaluation is issued, the Reference Group will propose a list of countries for mission

39 And the newly established ICRC, MSF, UNHCR, WFP, and Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue Centre initiative, the Centre for Competence in Humanitarian Negotiation
based and desk based study.\textsuperscript{40}

Once agreement has been obtained from the relevant ROs and COs, a final list will be included in the inception report, understanding that there may be last minute changes before the country visits take place should the operating environment of one or more crisis change.\textsuperscript{41}

### 7.2.2 Country visit based case studies

Each visit-based country cases study will be conducted by at least two consultants (apart from the pilot case study – see 7.1.3 above). Each country visit mission will require 8-10 working days in-country.

Well in advance of the country visit, country level documents and data will be requested and collated regarding:

- Current programmes, past reviews, lessons learned and evaluations
- UNICEF and interagency/government appeals
- Government policy/legislation
- Coordination and information management mechanisms
- Interagency/cluster response plans needs assessments
- Data from programme monitoring systems HPMS (and MRM, GBViE IMS, where possible)
- UNICEF emergency funding overall, funding by sector
- UNICEF human resources for the emergency response
- Technical support provided to offices, including deployments from RRM, regional offices
- Prior evaluation of the humanitarian system core agencies that are available either on the ERDB or on the ALNAP evaluation database

Country visit based case studies will include Interviews with:

- UNICEF staff
- UN Special Representatives (where relevant), Resident/Humanitarian coordinator,
- UN integrated mission
- UN agencies (OCHA, UNFPA, WFP, UNHCR, DPKO, OHCHR – others as relevant)
- INGÖ partners
- Government ministries (where possible)
- Major donors to UNICEF humanitarian response, where represented. (2-3 donors should be interviewed remotely if they are not present)
- Implementing partners, including those undertaking remote programming
- The relevant UNICEF regional office and ‘regional IASC’, where active
- Others as agreed with the country office

Desk based case studies will include remote interviews with:

- UNICEF staff
- Resident/Humanitarian coordinator,
- UN missions (where relevant)

\textsuperscript{40} For Case Study countries, EO will consult the relevant regional directors and country representatives to obtain their agreement.

\textsuperscript{41} The number of desk based studies could be increased if there are more than 7 promising cases emerging from the learning phase e-survey. If so, the budget will be adjusted accordingly.
• 3-4 UN agencies
• 3-4 INGO partners and, where relevant possible, government ministries
• 2-3 Implementing partners, including those undertaking remote programming
• The relevant UNICEF regional office

Visit based case studies will include:
• Beneficiary consultation. As far as possible, qualitative feedback will be gathered via participatory methods (e.g. focus groups), as far as the security environment will allows (bearing in mind that the evaluation is not programme critical). The evaluation team may work with local consultants or NGOs to increase the scope for direct engagement with affected individuals/communities. Any interaction should maintain full respect for the dignity confidentiality, privacy and security of informants, avoiding degrading and ineffective ‘flying’ visits. As far as possible, interaction with beneficiaries should be of some benefit to them, not just to the evaluation.
• Direct observation of projects, where possible. International consultants may be limited in their access to projects in high risk environments.

The result of the case studies will be a separate report for each, up to 25 pages plus annexes for the five country visit based reports, and up to 15 pages plus annexes for the desk based case studies (total 12 reports). Country offices will be given two weeks to comment on their respective draft reports before the evaluation team finalizes them, providing detailed feedback on how the comments have been used.

7.2.3 Draft evaluation report
The first draft evaluation report will be assembled by the evaluation team according to UNICEF evaluation report standards, once the case studies are completed (or have reached at the draft report stage).

7.2.4 Consultation
It is proposed that a selection of staff and managers from HQ/RO/CO’s affected by complex high threat environments should be convened for a 2-day meeting (perhaps 3-day), to be led by the Evaluation Office and EMOPS, in partnership, to review and debate the draft report, and its proposed recommendations.

The evaluation team (at a minimum, the evaluation team leader) will present the draft evaluation report findings and recommendations, but will not facilitate the meeting. The purpose of the workshop will be 1) to share learning from the evaluation between and beyond the case study countries, 2) validate the report’s findings and recommendations against field and political realities, and 3) generate practical actions steps. This will require careful facilitation to ensure that the meeting refines the evaluation’s findings and proposed recommendations.

As an alternative, or as well as, the Global Workshop, the draft evaluation results should be presented and debated at 1-2 half-day sessions at Regional Management Team (RMT) meetings and/or Deputy Representatives and Operations Chiefs (DROPs) meetings. These meetings will not be able to consider the evaluation findings to the same depth as the workshop.

These consultations will not affect the independence of the evaluation. The team leader will
use the results of the workshop at their discretion in finalizing the evaluation report.

7.2.5 Second Draft Report and Final Report
Using the results of the workshop, the team leader will generate the second draft evaluation report and submit it to EO. This report will subsequently be finalized based on feedback of EO.

7.2.6 Management Response
Once received and reviewed by EO, the Reference Group and some of the workshop participants will reconvene to debate the final evaluation findings and recommendations and to comment on the management response prepared under the leadership of the Deputy Executive Director (Programmes). Other follow up processes should then be initiated by the DED, with periodic progress reporting.

8 DELIVERABLES

Phases 1 will produce:\[42:\]
a) Inception Report, which considers issues of evaluability, and includes required annexes, namely document review, synthesis of interviews, etc.
b) Country Case Study Report (based on country visit) + presentation delivered before leaving the country
c) Country Case Study Report (based on desk review and interviews)
d) Report on lessons learned regarding the methodology and tools to be used for future country case studies, specifically those in phase 2
f) Draft Evaluation Report based on document review, interviews at HQ and RO, and the two country case studies (above)
g) Presentation to the reference group about the draft evaluation report and a presentation on lessons learned regarding the methodology and tools
h) Draft and Final Evaluation Report, including executive summary and annexes

Phase 2 will produce
a) Inception report, that draws from the Phase 1 report about revisions to the methodology and tools for country case studies
b) Four to five visit-based country case study reports (and presentations, delivered on leaving the country)
c) Six or seven desk based country case study reports
d) Draft global evaluation report synthesizing the country visit-based reports and the desk-based case study reports
e) A global workshop/webinar, or other consultative process as proposed by the bidder and agreed with EO, on the evaluation report
f) Final evaluation report, plus executive summary and annexes
g) PowerPoint (or similar) presentation that summarizes the evaluation
h) Dissemination of the evaluation

---
42 Bidders are free to propose changes to the structure of deliverables to enhance their clarity. However, products are expected to conform to the stipulated number of pages, where specified.
Details about the deliverables are below.

**Phase 1**

a) **Inception report:** The inception report will be instrumental in confirming a common understanding of what is to be evaluated, including additional insights into the execution of the evaluation beyond the ToR and considers issues of evaluability. The evaluation team will refine and confirm evaluation questions and the scope of the evaluation, further improve on the evaluation methodology in agreement with the evaluation manager and the reference group. The report will include, *inter alia,*

- Evaluation purpose and scope – confirmation of objectives and the main themes of the evaluation;
- Evaluation criteria and questions – final set of evaluation questions, organised under evaluation criteria for assessing performance;
- Evaluation methodology – a description of data collection methods and data sources; draft data collection instruments (with a data collection toolkit as an annex); a data analysis plan; a discussion on proposed paths to enhance the reliability and validity of evaluation conclusions; the field visit approach, a description of the quality review process; and, a discussion on the limitations of the methodology;
- Proposed structure for the final report;
- Evaluation work plan and timeline, including a travel plan;
- Resources requirements – detailed budget allocations tied to evaluation activities and deliverables.
- Annexes, including the evaluation framework and questions, data collection toolkit, and data analysis framework, stakeholders mapping, synthesis of interviews (see 7.1.2) and document review.
  - The document review report will present preliminary findings from the desk-based document review and analysis of UNICEF and inter-agency documents, (assessment, planning, monitoring and evaluation, reporting) and other UNICEF and non-UNICEF research and evaluations, building on the scoping report and supporting literature review from the scoping and learning phases. It may be 10 – 20 pages in length.

The inception report will be 15 - 20 pages in length, plus annexes, and will be presented at a formal meeting of the reference group. A summary of initial key informant interviews, highlighting key themes emerging from the interviews, will be annexed to the inception report.

b) **Country Case Study Report (based on country visit) + presentation delivered before leaving the country:** This report will include:

---

43 UNICEF has instituted the Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS), a system where final evaluation reports are quality-assessed by an external independent company against UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports. The evaluation team is expected to reflect on and conform to these standards as they write their report. The team may choose to share a self-assessment based on the GEROS with the evaluation manager.
• a description of the context and the humanitarian situation, and overview of the national and international humanitarian response;

• a statement of findings regarding the coverage and quality of UNICEF’s humanitarian response to the crisis in question, based explicitly on data and evidence collected;

• an assessment of UNICEF’s strengths, weaknesses, challenges and lessons learned regarding the coverage and quality of UNICEF’s humanitarian response (specifically those elements related to complex high threat environments), against the evaluation criteria set out in the evaluation framework;

• recommendations on how UNICEF can improve its humanitarian response to the crisis;

• annexes (evaluation terms of reference; background materials used; annotated description of methodology, including any limitations experienced; and, list of people/groups interviewed).

It should not exceed 25 pages in length (excluding executive summary and annexes). Additionally, before leaving the country the team will prepare and deliver a presentation on the preliminary findings for the country office staff.

c) Country Case Study Report (based on desk review and interviews): The desk based case study report will cover the same ground as the country visit based case study but in less depth. The report will not exceed 15 pages, plus executive summary and annexes. The desk based study will be focused on learning. It will concentrate on lessons learnt and on documenting good practices, rather than providing recommendations.

d) Report on lessons learned regarding the methodology and tools to be used for the two country case studies: This report, no more than 20 pages in length, will describe the experience of the methods and tools used in the country case studies, describe their strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations to improve the methods and tools for Phase 2.

e) Draft Evaluation Report based on document review and the two country case studies:

The report will not exceed 40 pages, (excluding the executive summary and annexes). The structure of the evaluation report will be set out in the inception report. The report should cover:

• Background, purpose and objectives of the evaluation

• An assessment of UNICEF’s mandate, strengths, weaknesses, challenges and successes in achieving coverage and quality in its humanitarian response in complex high threat environments

• Evaluation findings, well substantiated by the data and evidence, and cross-referenced against the evaluation questions and organised by evaluation criteria;

• A limited and prioritised set of actionable recommendations, based on the evaluation conclusions

• Annexes (evaluation terms of reference; bibliography and list of background materials used; annotated description of methodology; data analysis framework, list of people interviewed, etc.).
f) Presentation to the reference group about the draft evaluation report and the report on lessons learned regarding the methodology and tools: The team will come to NY to make these presentations to the reference group who will provide feedback.

g) Final Evaluation Report: This report is identical to (e) Draft Evaluation Report, see above, although it will incorporate the feedback from the Reference Group.

**Phase 2**

a) Inception report, that draws from the Phase 1 report about revisions to the methodology and tools for country case studies:
The inception report will be instrumental in confirming a common understanding of what is to be evaluated, including additional insights into the execution of the evaluation beyond the ToR. The evaluation team will refine and confirm evaluation questions and the scope of the evaluation, further improve on the evaluation methodology, based on the report about methods and tools from Phase 1, in agreement with the evaluation manager and the reference group. The report will include, *inter alia*,

- Evaluation purpose and scope – confirmation of objectives and the main themes of the evaluation;
- Evaluation criteria and questions – final set of evaluation questions, organised under evaluation criteria for assessing performance;
- Evaluation methodology – a description of data collection methods and data sources; draft data collection instruments (with a data collection toolkit as an annex); a data analysis plan; a discussion on proposed paths to enhance the reliability and validity of evaluation conclusions; the field visit approach, a description of the quality review process\(^{44}\); and, a discussion on the limitations of the methodology;
- Proposed structure for the final report;
- Evaluation work plan and timeline, including a travel plan;
- Resources requirements – detailed budget allocations tied to evaluation activities and deliverables.
- Annexes, including the evaluation framework and questions, data collection toolkit, and data analysis framework stakeholders mapping

The inception report will be 15 - 20 pages in length, plus annexes, and will be presented at a formal meeting of the reference group. A summary of initial key informant interviews, highlighting key themes emerging from the interviews, will be annexed to the inception report.

b) Five visit-based country case study reports (and presentations, delivered on leaving the country)
These reports will include:

\(^{44}\) UNICEF has instituted the Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS), a system where final evaluation reports are quality-assessed by an external independent company against UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports. The evaluation team is expected to reflect on and conform to these standards as they write their report. The team may choose to share a self-assessment based on the GEROS with the evaluation manager.
• a description of the context and the humanitarian situation, and overview of the national and international humanitarian response;
• a statement of findings regarding the coverage and quality of UNICEF’s humanitarian response to the crisis in question, based explicitly on data and evidence collected;
• an assessment of UNICEF’s strengths, weaknesses, challenges and lessons learned regarding the coverage and quality of UNICEF’s humanitarian response (specifically those elements related to complex high threat environments), against the evaluation criteria set out in the evaluation framework;
• recommendations on how UNICEF can improve its humanitarian response to the crisis;
• annexes (evaluation terms of reference; background materials used; annotated description of methodology, including any limitations experienced; and, list of people/groups interviewed).

They should not exceed 25 pages in length (excluding executive summary and annexes). Additionally, before leaving each country the team will prepare and deliver a presentation on the preliminary findings for the country office staff.

c) Seven desk-based country case study reports: The desk based case study reports will cover the same ground as the country visit based case studies but in less depth. Each report will not exceed 15 pages, plus executive summary and annexes. The desk based studies will be focused on learning. The desk based case studies will concentrate on lessons learnt and on documenting good practices, rather than providing recommendations.

d) Draft global evaluation report, with executive summary and annexes:

The report will not exceed 50 pages, plus the executive summary and annexes. The structure of the evaluation report will be set out in the inception report. The report should cover:
• Background, purpose and objectives of the evaluation
• An assessment of UNICEF’s mandate, strengths, weaknesses, challenges and successes in achieving coverage and quality in its humanitarian response in complex high threat environments
• Evaluation findings, well substantiated by the data and evidence, and cross-referenced against the evaluation questions and organised by evaluation criteria;
• A limited and prioritised set of actionable recommendations, based on the evaluation conclusions
• Annexes (evaluation terms of reference; bibliography and list of background materials used; annotated description of methodology; data analysis framework, list of people interviewed, etc.).

The first draft of the final report will be received by the evaluation manager who will work with the team leader on necessary revisions.

e) A global workshop, or other consultative process as proposed by the bidder and agreed with EO

The team will present the findings of the evaluation and solicit feedback from the Reference Group and key stakeholders.
f) Final evaluation report, plus executive summary and annexes: This report is identical to (d) Draft Evaluation Report, see above, although it will incorporate the feedback from the Reference Group.

g) PowerPoint (or similar) presentation that summarizes the final evaluation report: This will include purpose, methods, findings, conclusions and recommendations.

h) Webinar to disseminate the evaluation findings.

Reports will be prepared in English, according to the UNICEF House Style (to be shared with the winning bidder) and UNICEF standards for evaluation reports as per GEROS guidelines (also to be shared with the winning bidder).

9 ETHICAL AND SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS:

- Conventional ethical guidelines are to be followed during the evaluation. Specific reference is made to the UNEG and UNICEF ethical guidelines and code of conduct for evaluation\textsuperscript{45}. Any sensitive issues or concerns should be raised with the evaluation management team as soon as they are identified.

- The evaluation methodology should not introduce risks to participants in the evaluation by exploring sensitive issues that may unbalance delicate relationships between partners, or by exposing stakeholders to security or other risks. The bidder should indicate as part of its proposal how it intends to avoid introducing harm in the conduct of the evaluation.

- The evaluation methodology may indicate children as informants or objects of study. In all contacts with children, the UNEG and UNICEF ethical guidelines regarding issues like confidentiality and not exposing the child to danger must be carefully respected.

- In addition to exercising ethical considerations for informed consent, no participant other than UNICEF staff may be compelled to cooperate with the evaluation. UNICEF staff are expected to participate where requested to by their management.

10 POTENTIAL EVALUATION LIMITATIONS

The evaluation is likely to be subject to the limitations common to humanitarian evaluations, and perhaps more so, given the challenges of operating in complex high threat environments.

- Poor data in terms of quality and comparability in UNICEF and UNICEF partner reports and information systems

- Lack of clear programme goals against which to assess results

- Lack of records of sensitive discussions and operational decisions and reluctance of senior staff to be explicit about how such decisions were reached

- Limited access to field locations and communities because of security constraints, which may or may not be mitigated using local consultants

- The workload of busy field staff may limit the time and attention they give to the evaluation

• Staff turnover means that first hand informants from earlier phases of UNICEF humanitarian responses may not be available (partially mitigated by EO/DHR tracing staff transferred to new duty stations),
• Beneficiary participation will be relatively hard to arrange, with risks of limited added value (evaluators should either do it well, or, where this is likely to produce little benefit, not at all).

Bidders are invited to indicate how these limitations might be mitigated.

11 THE EVALUATION TEAM

The Evaluation Office will contract with an institution (consulting firm, research institute, university, or a vendor with similar capacities), which will offer a core team of 4-5 qualified evaluation professionals. Based on their understanding of the task, the team may choose to enlist additional expertise as they see fit, including subcontracting with national evaluation partners for field-based activities.46

A well-qualified evaluation team is required for this evaluation, including an experienced humanitarian evaluation team leader with an understanding of, and past evaluation experience covering, key issues pertaining to UNICEF’s response in complex high threat environments, supported by a further 3-4 evaluation team members.

The core evaluation team must offer the following demonstrated experience, knowledge and competencies:

• Humanitarian evaluation experience of large scale programmes
• Field experience of humanitarian response in complex high threat environments and conflict settings where access and security represent major challenges.
• Previous work or consultancy experience with UNICEF and understanding of UNICEF’s mandate is desirable
• Sectoral knowledge of UNICEF programme sectors: Child Protection, WASH, Nutrition, Health, Education (of a majority, if not all, sectors), as well as the Core Commitments to Children
• Advanced understanding of humanitarian principles, humanitarian space, humanitarian access, security management, gender, equity, risk assessment, international humanitarian law, human rights law, the human rights based approach to programming, humanitarian advocacy, Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism47, ‘Do No Harm’ principles48
• Advanced understanding of UN coordination for humanitarian response (including roles of the Humanitarian Coordinator and humanitarian clusters), and interagency instruments applied to humanitarian response (strategic response planning, needs overview etc.)49
• Advanced understanding of accepted norms and standards for humanitarian response; Core Humanitarian Standards, Sphere standards, INEE, Child Protection Minimum Standards, and IASC guidance materials for protection and cross cutting issues in humanitarian response

46 For more information about insurance and liabilities please see Annex A of UNICEF Institutional Contracts.
47 https://www.unicef.org/protection/57929_57997.html
49 as detailed at https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/
- Advanced understanding of current humanitarian initiatives, including the results of the World Humanitarian Summit and implementation of the Grand Bargain.
- Gender balanced team and geographic regional balanced team (desirable)
- Advanced technical knowledge, skills and expertise in evaluation concepts and capacity to execute a multi-country evaluation, including field level case studies;
- Strong quantitative and qualitative data collection, and analysis and synthesis skills
- Highly developed communications skills; presentation, facilitation, and report writing in English.
- English language skills. French and Arabic language skills for interviews are an asset.

The evaluation team leader will:
- Report to the evaluation manager;
- Work full time on the evaluation throughout its duration;
- Agree the plan for all aspects of the evaluation with the evaluation manager;
- Conduct the evaluation according to UN Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2008), the UNEG Norms and Standards (2016), and UNICEF Ethical Research Guidelines involving children in humanitarian settings (found at https://www.unicef-irc.org/research/);
- Prepare the evaluation report according to the UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards (2010), with all evaluation product(s) written in English (or French for any Francophone country visits);
- Ensure that the evaluation produces evidence and analysis to the highest possible standards;
- Flag any limitations/constraints to the evaluation manager at the earliest opportunity, so that, as far as possible, they can be addressed, with any outstanding limitations noted in the evaluation report;
- Propose and conduct the evaluation with appropriate methodologies;
- Ensure that confidentiality is maintained and that the evaluation does not increase physical or reputational risks for UNICEF stakeholders operating in complex high threat environments;
- Take responsibility for delivering the evaluation in accordance with the Terms of Reference; and
- Ensure the quality of all the evaluation products.

Current UNICEF staff and consultants may be involved as informants or in specific roles (e.g. member of the Reference Group) but are not eligible to be evaluation team members. Former UNICEF staff with the requisite experience may be proposed to be members of the evaluation team but any prior involvement with UNICEF should be declared in the technical proposal, and any conflict of interest should be declared in advance. The EO reserves the right to reject former UNICEF staff members where a possible conflict of interest may potentially exist or be deemed to exist.

12 EVALUATION STAKEHOLDERS

Key stakeholders for the evaluation are as follows:
- **End Client for the Evaluation** – the UNICEF Executive Board
- **Client for the Evaluation Team** – UNICEF Director of Evaluation
- **Evaluation Manager** – Senior Evaluation Officer, Evaluation Office.
- **Evaluation Office principal stakeholder for the evaluation** – EMOPS and members of the RG
- **Evaluation Sponsor** – Deputy Executive Director (Programmes) to be closely engaged as a key informant, to be briefed periodically on the progress and emerging results of the evaluation, to attend (or at least open) the workshop, and to discuss and sign off on the evaluation management response.
- **Evaluation Reference Group** – (see below)
- **Client for the country specific findings of individual case studies** – the Country Representative

### 13 EVALUATION MANAGEMENT

#### 13.1 Evaluation Manager
The evaluation will be managed by the Evaluation Manager (EM) from UNICEF’s Evaluation Office, who will have overall responsibility for:

- facilitation of initial consultations with relevant staff in the UNICEF HQ, and arrange for subsequent meetings and consultation with the global reference group;
- day-to-day coordination and supervision of all activities of the evaluation team, and decision-making;
- technical management of all phases the evaluation, according to the terms of reference and stipulations of the inception report;
- consulting and liaising with the Evaluation Reference Group in key moments in the evaluation, including collation and rationalisation of Reference Group written comments on evaluation products;
- liaising with evaluation focal points in the case study countries;
- facilitating internal and external review and quality assurance processes, including being the liaison between UNICEF and the reference group;
- approving all deliverables, based on consultation with the EO Director;
- preparing publishing-ready versions of the reports for issuing by the Director, Evaluation Office; and
- providing overall guidance to the evaluation team on UNICEF requirements and standards for evaluative work.

#### 13.2 Reference Group
To be appointed by the Director, Evaluation Office, a Reference Group (RG) will provide advice to the evaluation, with members responsible for receiving and responding to progress updates and evaluation products. The RG will undertake any additional consultations required within their own Divisions/Offices and review the inception report, the first country case studies, and the draft and final draft reports. The RG will provide written comments on key evaluation products to the evaluation team through the evaluation manager. The RG will contribute to the consultation processes, management response, action plan and dissemination strategy post-evaluation. The RG membership includes:

- Senior Evaluation Specialist (Humanitarian), Evaluation Office, who will chair the reference group;
- One Senior Advisors (Security) and the Humanitarian Policy Specialist for CHTE, Office of Emergency Programmes (EMOPS);
- One Senior Advisor, Programme Division (PD);
- Supply Specialist, Supply Division (SD)
- Regional Emergency Adviser, Middle East North Africa Regional Office (MENARO)
• Regional Evaluation Adviser, East Asia and Pacific Regional Office (EAPRO)
• Evaluation Specialist (Humanitarian), Evaluation Office, and reference group secretariat.

Before the evaluation begins, the Director of Evaluation will invite three individuals external to UNICEF to join the RG, including at least one from a partner UN agency and at least one academic or independent consultant with expertise in humanitarian action in complex high threat environments.

13.3 Evaluation Focal Points

For all case studies, and well in advance, the UNICEF Country Office will be invited by the Director of Evaluation to designate a focal point for the evaluation, whose role will be to facilitate communication between the evaluation team and the staff of the country office, and to provide the necessary assessments, plans, reports and other background documentation. In the case of country visits, the focal point will assist with the planning of the evaluation team’s itinerary and appointments and other logistical support, as required.
ANNEX 1 – DRAFT EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation framework below sets out the main evaluation questions and sub-questions to be addressed by the evaluation under the standard OECD DAC evaluation criteria, as modified for humanitarian action. The questions may be developed further or modified in consultation between the evaluation team, EO and the Reference Group during the inception phase. Bidders should refer to the relevant sections of the Terms of Reference for discussion of the terms, Coverage and Quality, and potential issues arising in their evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation questions group by Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>In UNICEF’s humanitarian response in complex high threat environments…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriateness</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How well does UNICEF’s risk, conflict and political economy analysis underpin the relevance and design of its humanitarian response strategy and its humanitarian programme design?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent has UNICEF provided humanitarian assistance based on humanitarian need, in accordance with the humanitarian principle of impartiality, and paid attention to equity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coherence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent has UNICEF’s humanitarian work been guided by the humanitarian principles (HPs) of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence, and how has this affected coverage and quality, in particular:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent have decisions by UNICEF senior leadership at country, regional and HQ levels been guided by humanitarian principles, including compromises and trade-offs between the humanitarian principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What support have UNICEF managers had, in-country, from other parts of the organisation (e.g. regional and HQ levels) in applying humanitarian principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent has UNICEF influenced government, the clusters, the Humanitarian Country Team and UN integrated missions in favour of a principled approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is UNICEF’s degree of freedom to act independently in accordance with the humanitarian principles, versus being constrained by UN, government or other actors in doing so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How has UNICEF supported and enabled its partners to apply the humanitarian principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How has UNICEF’s ability to follow humanitarian principles been affected (positively and negatively) by donor funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How well has UNICEF maintained its neutrality as a humanitarian actor?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In the view of affected communities, parties to the conflict, humanitarian agencies, donors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In its use (or avoidance of the use) of civil military assets and armed escorts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Whilst speaking out against human rights violations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• When linking its development and humanitarian programming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Connectedness**
### Evaluation questions group by Evaluation Criteria

**In UNICEF’s humanitarian response in complex high threat environments…**

5. To what extent is UNICEF contributing to national and local resilience to future crises by building local capacity of humanitarian services, and national and local systems for protection, and what is the likely effect on the coverage and quality of the ongoing or future responses?

### Coverage

6. How successful has UNICEF been in securing and maintaining access to affected communities in complex high threat environments? What have been the enabling and constraining factors and what lessons can be learned about the most effective means of securing access?
- Through innovation
- Through the application of alternative programming, such as remote programming
- By advocating for increased access
- By negotiating for increased access
- By forming partnerships with local government, NGOs and other actors
- By use integrated sector programming
- By leading interagency consensus and action to expand coverage?
- How well have regional offices and HQ supported country offices in these roles?

7. To what extent has the application of the UN’s Security Management System and Programme Criticality Framework, and the inter-agency Stay and Deliver strategy, enabled or constrained UNICEF’s humanitarian access? How successful has UNICEF and its partners been in increasing access by building ‘acceptance’ with communities?

### Effectiveness

8. How successful has UNICEF been in its advocacy with donors to address funding shortfalls affecting humanitarian action in complex high threat environments, including through application to the CERF, CHFs and ERF’s?

9. How well is UNICEF using programme monitoring, including third party monitoring, to improve the quality of its humanitarian programming? How effectively does UNICEF programme monitoring consider coverage and quality?

10. How well prepared is UNICEF at HQ, RO and CO levels for new humanitarian crises at high risk of emerging in contexts that are not yet complex high threat?

### Efficiency

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation questions group by Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> How have UNICEF’s revised humanitarian systems improved the efficiency of its response? (Corporate Emergency Activation Procedure, Simplified Standard Operating Procedures, and HR mechanisms (IRT, ERT, rapid deployment procedures) and longer term recruitment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> How well is UNICEF managing the financial risks associated with its humanitarian programming in complex high threat environments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-cutting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong> To what extent is UNICEF aware of, and meeting, its own CCC benchmarks and its commitment to international humanitarian standards (Core Humanitarian Standard, Sphere/INEE standards, Accountability to Affected Populations, WHS commitments)? Which humanitarian programme standards are applied in practice?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 2 – POSSIBLE CASE STUDY COUNTRIES AND SELECTION CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 1988</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chronic with peaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>WCA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 2127, 2262</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chronic with peaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>WCA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>254.6</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 1533</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chronic with peaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>274.8</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 1518, 1267, 1989, 2253</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High / med</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 1970, 1267, 1989, 2253</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>WCA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Medium risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>Incidence</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Chronic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(no UNM)</td>
<td>High risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>156.9</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(no UNM)</td>
<td>Nat. dist risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(no UNM)</td>
<td>Nat. dist risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-East Nigeria</td>
<td>WCA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes (no UNM)</td>
<td>High risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>147.5</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Medium / High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes (no UNM)</td>
<td>Chronic with peaks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>328.5</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 751, 1907</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chronic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>279.0</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 2206</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chronic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Palestine</td>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>165.9</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 1591</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Chronic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic***</td>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>302.9</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 1267, 1989, 2253</td>
<td>Yes (no UNM)</td>
<td>Chronic with peaks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>CEECIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No (no UNM**)</td>
<td>Medium risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>CEECIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No? (no UNM)</td>
<td>High risk (becoming chronic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>156.59</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (limits)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SCR 2140, 1267, 2140, 1267</td>
<td>Yes (no UNM)</td>
<td>Chronic with peaks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>ORE</td>
<td>High Threat</td>
<td>High Action</td>
<td>Low Action</td>
<td>UNM</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(no UNM)</td>
<td>High risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORE** = Other Resources Emergency

**HAC** = Humanitarian Action for Children (Appeal document)

*’Other situations’*

**while there is no UN mission in Georgia, until mid-2009 there was a DPKO mission (UNOMIG) and to date there is a special monitoring mission of the EU (EUMM). Similarly so, while no UN Mission in Ukraine, there is a special monitoring mission of the OSCE (OSCE SMM).**

***Excluding the refugee crises in Lebanon, Jordan, or Turkey, which are not complex high threat environments (except for immediate border areas)**
Additional Case Study Selection Criteria

The choice of a total of 12 country case studies for inclusion in the evaluation will be based on a balance between the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>Countries that illustrate well the challenges of operating in complex high threat environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning potential</strong></td>
<td>Countries judged to have a high likelihood of the evaluation finding learning of corporate significance (from good practice, and perhaps from less-than-good practice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment level</strong></td>
<td>Countries with complex high threat environments where UNICEF has made the largest investments. (In descending order, countries with investments over US$200M between 2012-2015, were: Somalia, Syria, DRC, South Sudan, Iraq).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currency</strong></td>
<td>Countries where UNICEF response to complex high threat environments is on-going or where those with first-hand knowledge of the response and responsible for new/good/innovative practice are available and willing to take part.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td>For country missions, the evaluation team should be able to talk to (and ideally meet) key informants – local staff, local government, local NGOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variety</strong></td>
<td>A mix of examples of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Countries with complex high threat environments country-wide, versus those with complex high threat environment only in a discrete area and functional governance and/or child protection/rights systems in elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At least two middle income countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At least one sub-regional crisis (crossing at least one country border)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At least five countries on the Security Council sanctions/ CAAC Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At least two countries with a UN integrated mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At least two countries not declared L2/L3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At least two poorly funded crisis responses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these criteria, the selection of desk and country mission based country case studies will need to achieve a spread across 4-5 UNICEF regions. For case studies to be successful, the support of the relevant regional directors and country representatives is required. Gaining this support is the responsibility of the Evaluation Office, not of the evaluation team.
ANNEX 3 – DOCUMENT REPOSITORY

The following documents have been assembled into a UNICEF OneDrive directory and will be made available to the evaluation team. The list is included here by way of illustration of the documents already assembled. Bidders will not be provided access to the repository. While many of the documents are in the public domain, bidders are not expected to have comprehensively reviewed the documents in the repository as part of the bidding process.

A - General Documents
1998-09 Evaluating in complex emergencies.pdf
2010-05 Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action.pdf
2012-18-Strategic_framework_for_partnerships-ODS-English.pdf
2014 Core Humanitarian Standard.pdf
2014-01-16 Humanitarian Policy issues relevant to Operating in Complex high Threat Environments.pdf
2014-09 ALNAP Quality in Humanitarian Action.pdf
2015-06-02 Complex high threat CCC checklist.pdf
2015-09 Reps refresher on CHTE.DOCX
2015-10 Saving Lives Together.pdf
2016 -10 UNICEF Strategic Plan (Framework).pdf
2016-01 Statistics of Attacks on Aid Workers.xlsx
2016-05 Grand_Bargain_final.pdf
2016-07-05 Reps Note on operating in Complex High Threat Env.pdf
2016-10-04 Country Humanitarian Risk Index (INFORM).xlsx
2016-10-04 INFORM Global Results Report 2017 .pdf
2016-11 Enhanced Programme and Operational Support in Fragile Contexts (UNICEF).pdf
2017-01-18 EMOPS - list of countries for CHTE evaluation.docx

B - L2-3 Evaluative and Research Documents
2011 - Horn of Africa
2012-05 Somalia RTE (IA).pdf
2012-06 Horn of Africa RTE Synthesis (IA).pdf
2012-08 Horn of Africa Lessons learned (UNICEF).pdf
2013-02 Somalia Drought Response Mid-term evaluation (IFRC).pdf

2013 - CAR
2015-06 CAR Country Office Audit (UNICEF).pdf
2015-09 Engage to stay and deliver (NRC).pdf
2016-03 CAR Evaluation (IA).pdf
2016-03 CAR Evaluation (UNICEF).pdf
2016-07 Synthesis of Evaluations Philippines South Sudan CAR (IA).pdf
### 2013 - Mali
- 2013-07 Mali RTE (UNICEF).pdf

### 2013 - Syria Region
- 2013-07 UNHCR Syria Refugees RTE (UNHCR).pdf
- 2014-12-10 IFRC Syria RTE (IFRC).pdf

### 2015-01 UNHCR - Independent Programme Evaluation (IPE) of UNHCR’s response to the refugee influx in Lebanon (UNHCR).pdf
### 2015-04 WFP Syria Regional Response Evaluation (WFP).pdf
### 2015-12 Syria Region Evaluation (UNICEF).pdf
### 2016-01 WFP CPE Palestine (WFP).pdf
### 2016-03 OCHA Syria Evaluation Report (OCHA).pdf
### 2016-05 Syria Evaluation Synthesis (IA).pdf

### 2014 - Ebola
- 2015-04 Ebola at Pace Lessons Learnt Final (UNICEF).docx
- 2016-11 UNICEF Ebola Evaluation.docx

### 2014 - Iraq
- 2015 WFP CPE Iraq (WFP).pdf
- 2016-01 Iraq Country Office Audit (UNICEF).pdf

### 2014 - South Sudan
- 2014 Operational Peer Review South Sudan (IA).pdf
- 2015-03 Preparatory Desk Review South Sudan.pdf
- 2015-08 South Sudan Audit (UNICEF).pdf
- 2015-11 South Sudan Evaluation (IA).pdf
- 2016-07 Synthesis of Evaluations Philippines South Sudan CAR (IA).pdf

### 2015 - Chad - Niger - Cameroon
- 2016-02 Bad Blood Research Summary (UNICEF).pdf
- 2016-06 Forced Displacement by Boko Haram Conflict (UNHCR-WB).pdf

### 2015 - Yemen
- 2015 Operational Peer Review Yemen (IASC).pdf

### 2016 - Libya
- 2016-10 Case Study 9 Libya.pdf

### 2016 - Nigeria
- 2016 Children left behind Uprooted or trapped by Boko Haram (UNICEF).pdf
- 2016-12-02 North East Nigeria Briefing Children’s lives and futures at risk (Save the Children).pdf

### C - Thematic Documents

#### Accountability
- 2016 Accountability to the Affected Populations in Early Recovery (IA).pdf
2016 Enhancing informed engagement with conflict affected communities in Yemen (IA).pdf
2016 Protection and Accountability to affected Populations (IASC).pdf
2016 Yemen Common Service Feedback Mechanism (IASC).pdf
2016-10 Listening to communities in insecure environments (IA).pdf

Advocacy

Children and Armed Conflict
2015-11 Guidance Note on UNICEF and CAAC Agenda.pdf

Coordination
2015 Cluster Guidance Eng final version.pdf

Efficiency
2014-09 SIDA Value for Money in Humanitarian Response.pdf

Finance
2016-06-07 Overview Innovative Financing.docx
2017-01 Humanitarian Expenditure 2012-2015.xlsx
2015 to 2017 Global Humanitarian Assistance Reports (see link in txt)

Fragile environments
2016 OECD States of Fragility 2016.pdf
2016-11 UNICEF Enhanced Programme and Operational Support in Fragile Contexts.pdf

Humanitarian Access
2010-06 UNHCR - No Entry! A review of UNHCR's response to border closures in situations of mass refugee infl.pdf
2011 To Stay and Deliver (OCHA).pdf
2012-07 Access strategies in ECHO funded interventions.pdf
2016 ToR for WFP evaluation on Access.pdf
2016-11-02 ToR UNICEF Access Advisor HQ draft.doc
2016-12-07 ToR WFP Humanitarian Principles and Access.pdf

Integrated Programming
2014 Integrated programming Study (UNICEF).pdf

LDH
2014-03 ODI HPG remaking the case for LRRD.pdf

Monitoring
2012 Remote accountability in volatile operating environments.pdf
2016-09 Technologies for monitoring in insecure environments.pdf
2016-10 Monitoring aid in insecure environments.pdf
2016-10 Third- party monitoring in insecure contexts.pdf

Preparedness
2016-12-29 UNICEF Preparedness Guidance Note (UNICEF).pdf

Protection
2011 IASC Protection in Natural Disasters.pdf
2016-12 FBA Brief Protection of Civilians.pdf

Remote Management
2012-06-12 Remote Programming guidance (Final version).pdf
2014 ICRC Remote Management.pdf

Risk Management
2009 UNICEF Risk Management (ERM) Policy.pdf
2009-05-14 UNICEF ERM Policy OED Memo.pdf
2015 UNICEF ERM Risk Assessment and Reporting.pdf
2015-08 OSC-Guidelines -Mission Security Clearance.docx