



TERMS OF REFERENCE

TITLE	Impact Feasibility Assessment (IFA) for UNICEF - UNFPA global programme to end child marriage and the joint programme for the elimination of female genital mutilation (FGM)
CONTRACT MODALITY	Two Consultants (Impact evaluation expert and a thematic expert on harmful practices and social norms)
LOCATION OF ASSIGNMENT	Home-based with potential travel to selected countries
DURATION OF CONTRACT	Phase I: April 2022- July 2022 (child marriage) (Phase II: August 2022 -October 2022 (FGM) – subject to a separate contract at a later date TBD)
RECRUITING OFFICER	Senior Evaluation Specialist, UNICEF Evaluation Office

Background

For the purpose of this assignment the definition of **impact** is broadly aligned with the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD/DAC) approach defining impact as ‘the extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects. It underscores a causal attribution as a required element of the impact analysis, but recognizes that complex and multi-faceted programmes can only be assessed based on the level of ‘contribution’ they make to the higher-level change in policy, systems or well-being outcomes. In other words, UNICEF adopts an inclusive approach in evaluating ‘impact’ recognizing that both ‘attribution’ and ‘contribution’ are based on causal questions and are both critical. Within this assignment, ‘impact evaluation’ or ‘impact component’ aims to establish tangible and long-lasting change in the lives, behaviors and practices of girls, families and communities as a result of intervention/s of a specific programme.

Rigorous impact evaluations designed with a mix of complementary methods can answer a range of questions including ‘How big of a difference does the intervention make?’ ‘For whom in particular?’ and ‘At what cost?’ It has potential to demonstrate the added value of the programme and make a credible case for the allocation of limited resources where they make the biggest impact. Careful examination of programmatic characteristics and contextual factors are required to determine the most appropriate design and evaluation approach to measure impact. Moreover, a combination of complementary approaches is typically applied to critically examine multi-component, multi-layered and multi-country global programmes or initiatives.

There is a global evidence gap on the impact of programming to address harmful practices and social norms affecting opportunities girls have in education, health, and other aspects of their lives. Addressing this gap is needed to inform the implementation of the 2022-2025 Strategic Plans of both UNICEF and UNFPA, and to ensure that the programmes have the best information possible to reach their objectives. There is also a strong demand for rigorous evidence on outcomes and impacts from donors and UN system partners, including the one outlined in the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system (QCPR). Timely and contextualized evaluative evidence on effects at outcome and impact level will enable UNICEF and UNFPA to stay relevant for the national policy process. It will also deepen agile organizational learning and demonstrate contribution to results in the most diverse contexts.

The global Joint Programmes of UNICEF and UNFPA to end child marriage and to eliminate female genital mutilation (‘FGM’) have for many years intended to be catalysts of change at the global, regional, and national levels in addressing practices, attitudes, and behaviors.¹ There is strong interest from donors and programme teams to

¹ See UNFPA/UNICEF joint evaluations of: (a) the FGM Joint Programme phase I (2013), (b) phase I and II (2019), (c) phase III (2021); (d) GPECM phase I (2019). <https://www.unfpa.org/evaluation>

examine outcome- and impact-level results in the next phases of the global Joint Programmes. In response to this need UNICEF and UNFPA are launching a consultancy to conduct an Impact Feasibility Assessment (IFA) covering two thematic areas: Child marriage (work package 1) and FGM (work package 2).

The Impact Feasibility Assessment (IFA) will support UNICEF and UNFPA global evaluation processes by finding what are the feasible and most appropriate evaluation designs or approaches to evaluate global programme effects at outcome and eventually impact levels.

UNFPA-UNICEF Global Programme to End Child Marriage ('GPECM') was designed with the understanding that ending child marriage is a long-term goal to catalyze change through incremental steps to address the complex socio-cultural and structural factors that underpin the harmful practice. The programme design covered three phases:

- Phase I (2016-2019) aimed to strengthen critical institutions and systems in select locations globally to deliver quality services and opportunities to a significant number of adolescent girls, and to establish the foundations for attitudes, behaviours, and norms against child marriage in families and communities.
- Phase II (2020-2023) is meant to accelerate actions to end child marriage by: enhancing investments in and support for both unmarried and married adolescent girls; engaging key actors in catalysing shifts toward positive gender norms; increasing political support and resources for gender-responsive policies; engendering respect for laws and by improving data and evidence on what works.
- Phase III (2024-2030) aims to ensure that a larger proportion of adolescent girls fully enjoy a childhood free from the risk of marriage and experience healthier, safer, and more empowered life transitions.

The first phase of the Global Programme targeted adolescent girls (aged 10-19) at risk of child marriage or already in a union, using a range of different strategies and working with multiple partners and stakeholders at national, regional and global levels in 12 countries within four regions.² Countries were selected based on child marriage prevalence rates, projected burden, regional distribution and levels of government engagement, with attention paid to including a variety of diverse contexts to allow for a broader understanding of what factors work effectively in different settings. An [evaluation of Phase I of the Global Programme](#) highlighted that the programme is on track to achieve programme outputs and is valued for its unique contributions to normative frameworks and multi-sectoral collaboration. It also noted that insufficient efforts have been put into the measuring and documenting of results and experiences, and that despite efforts to reach the most vulnerable, interventions have not always reached the most remote areas.³ The Phase II evaluation is scheduled to start in the last quarter of 2022 and its results will inform the design of the Phase III of the GP.

The UNFPA-UNICEF Joint Programme on the Abandonment of Female Genital Mutilation ('FGM'): Accelerating Change is a global programme, implemented in 17 countries⁴, that links community-level transformation of social norms that often drive FGM with laws banning the practice and access to quality sexual and reproductive health and child protection services for girls and women at risk of, and affected by, FGM. The Joint Programme has been implemented since 2008 and it has recently completed its third phase of implementation.

- Phase I (2008-13) aimed 'to contribute to a 40 per cent reduction of the practice among girls aged 0-15 years, with at least one country declared free of FGM/C by 2012'. It began with eight countries, but by the end of the first phase was operating in 15 countries.
- Phase II (2014-17) was launched with the expansion to two further countries (the current 17 countries), and also supported regional and global efforts to eliminate FGM. The objective was revised from Phase I to 'contribute to the acceleration of the total abandonment of FGM in the next generation (i.e., next 20 years) through a 40% decrease in prevalence among girls 0-14 years in at least 5 countries and at least one country declaring total abandonment by the end of 2017'.

² Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Sierra Leone, Uganda, Yemen, Zambia

³ United Nations Population Fund and United Nations Children's Fund, 'UNFPA-UNICEF Global Programme to End Child Marriage: Joint evaluation report', UNFPA and UNICEF, New York, May 2019.

⁴ Burkina Faso, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Nigeria, Senegal, Sudan, Somalia, Uganda and Yemen

- Phase III (2018-21) took a holistic and comprehensive approach to creating an enabling environment through policy and legislation, supporting access to comprehensive services, and empowering communities to drive social change within a gender responsive/ transformative agenda.

The Joint Programme's hypothesis remains that: if policies and legislation are in place and appropriately resourced for the elimination of FGM, and women and girls at risk of and affected by FGM access comprehensive services, and individuals, families and communities accept the norms of keeping girls intact, then there will be elimination of FGM at the household, community, and society levels by 2030. With the key goal of challenging and changing social norms, the Joint Programme's approach consists of community dialogues and human rights education, reaching commitments to FGM abandonment through organized diffusion of knowledge to larger portions of the community, and to other communities and localities. This approach relies on the engagement of community leaders, religious leaders and youth, including using innovative tools and social media for knowledge sharing mechanisms. The Joint Programme also operates at regional and global levels with specific objectives and agenda points, such as: the cross-border work, the regional advocacy and partnership work with regional and sub-regional entities. The intergovernmental agenda is particularly important area of work at the global level. The Joint Programme is expected to commence Phase IV in 2022.

Purpose and objectives

The purpose of this assignment is to conduct an independent assessment of opportunities for and limitations to integrating a rigorous impact component into the framework of the planned global joint evaluations in harmful practices:

- a) *Child marriage* as a part of the global Joint UNFPA-UNICEF Programme, phase II (to be conducted in the late part of 2022/2023)
- b) *FGM* as a part of the global Joint UNFPA-UNICEF Programme, phase IV (midterm to be conducted in 2024/2025)

The exercise will provide an expert, independent assessment of the opportunity for integrating one or more complementary approaches to provide impact evidence on innovative and scalable community-led interventions. The selection of specific technical options to measure impact will be based on the defined criteria of feasibility (technical as well as contextual, time, resources etc.), validity and rigor. The scope of work shall neither favor nor preclude any of the possible options but rather create the opportunity to systematically assess all expertly defined feasible and rigorous alternatives.

The IFA will provide recommendations to the global evaluation and programme management teams and propose methodological approaches and adaptations required to achieve robust and coherent evaluation design that generate evidence on interventions that can be taken to scale to advance the relevant SDG agenda. The methodological recommendations should not be limited to approaches establishing valid attribution but, if appropriate, discuss the benefits of using alternative quasi-experimental or non-experimental approaches that would allow evaluate programme outcomes and impact through programme contribution. A set of transparent criteria for the selection of appropriate methodological approaches should be finalized at the inception phase of this assignment.

In each programmatic area, the IFA aims to do the following:

- Review global evidence gaps at outcome and impact levels⁵ in reference to the programmatic focus of UNICEF and UNFPA joint work, the Theory of Change (TOC) of both programmes, objectives and expected results.
- Assess the extent to which linked interventions and outcomes identified in the literature can be applied in the context of UNICEF and UNFPA global programmes on transformation of norms and behaviours and their alignment with the Theory of Change (TOC).

⁵ Outcomes are understood as a measurable change in the well-being status or behaviors along the specified domains (with reference to TOC) including but not limited to reproductive health, psychological conditions, access to education and health services etc. 'Impact' implies sustainable, long-term change that the programme intervention or policy make. Some impact evaluation literature use 'impacts' and 'outcomes' interchangeably drawing from the specific programmatic conceptualization as per TOC.

- Select the most seemingly innovative, transformative (potentially scalable) interventions (or their combination), and assess the plausibility of them delivering outcome and impact results (based on global evidence as well as data produced by the JPs monitoring and reporting systems).
- Conduct cross-country comparisons to identify the most appropriate and feasible (sub)national and programmatic contexts for measuring effects at outcome and eventually impact levels.
- Based on the analysis of specific programme and country contexts, propose the evaluation designs (if any) to measure attribution (if deemed feasible and appropriate) or contribution of selected interventions. The proposed design/s should:
 - Identify design aspects of the joint programme interventions at country level as in relation to the global theories of change (adequacy of the joint programme contextualization)
 - Mention the suitability of available sources of data proposed for use: existing monitoring and reporting systems of the joint programme at country level, programmatic surveys, etc. to measure relevant indicators and overall fit for purpose and able to provide granular data at the community and sub-national levels;
 - Articulate the steps, budget and timeline to integrate any identified impact components into the planned evaluations (considering that primary data collection may need to be collected, etc.);
 - Estimate the nature and volume of support from the joint programme at country and community levels including interventions being implemented and interventions that have been implemented in the past and are not completed, the levels of funding, actual coverage of the joint programme at country level, and multi-stakeholder engagement/ other actors working in the same area with similar goals among other factors; and
 - Identify methodological adaptations to the global evaluation designs to achieve a greater evaluative focus on impacts and outcomes.

Given differences between the two programmatic areas on numerous levels (e.g., in programme development, the nature of the “interventions”, programme monitoring and reporting systems, and levels and robustness of the data available, external factors including context and stakeholders and partners involved), the objectives will be further refined during an inception phase.

Scope and analytical process

The work on thematic areas of child marriage and FGM are linked together under the harmful practices area, based on programmatic linkages and certain common elements and complementarities in key aspects - including their multi-sectoral and multi-year design, conceptual frameworks (i.e. social norm change framework), geographic coverage, their catalytic natures, donors, and joint coordination structures and governance. However, the IFA will be implemented under two separate work packages sequenced to follow one another. This will allow more focused effort on each work package and ongoing learning and adjustments.

Four distinct analytical stages will form part of the investigation under the IFA, each building on and extending the evidence collected earlier in the process.

1. Stock taking on ‘what works?’ in connection to the Theory of Change and countries of the Global programmes’

The objective of this stage is to conduct rapid review of the most recent (circ. 5-10 years) documents and available evidence to identify the set of potential interventions in addressing FGM and child marriage that the IFA may focus on. Those interventions should be mapped across countries that have conducted them, tested and validated indicators at the outcome and impact levels (at the intervention level) appropriate within gender transformative framework of specified countries. The review will build on the wealth of information generated and systematized by the joint programmes and go beyond it as necessary. It is expected that at this stage the consultants will coordinate their review with the UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti and previous UNICEF-UNFPA work on evidence synthesis/review and evaluations. The findings will provide reference points for further development of methodological approaches. The result of this stage is identified interventions which need to be cross-checked with the list of interventions currently planned or implemented under UNFPA and UNICEF global programmes using global TOC, annual reports, and other documentations. The resulting list of interventions and corresponding countries will be further narrowed down in the next stage of analysis.

2. Review of country cases and selection of interventions at community level

Based on the identified impact evidence gaps and review of ongoing interventions under UNICEF-UNFPA global programmes, this stage of the analysis aims to narrow down the set of candidate interventions at the community level in the light of country contexts. This exercise will adopt both a *forward-looking* (on interventions that are now being planned) as well as *backward-looking* (interventions already implemented in some countries/ communities and contexts) approach.

Many conditions have to be met for a country to launch an impact evaluation on selected intervention package, not least the existing or emerging demand for impact evidence and political will to scale up the intervention, stability of the political situation and local conditions allowing conducting work in safe conditions. Generally, the analysis at this stage should systematically examine contextual factors including but not limited to the national prevalence rates and country progress towards reductions in harmful practices, the level of socio-economic conditions, population structure, the decentralization level, COVID-19 situation, humanitarian status, reliability of existing data (primary and secondary), and even more important the JP monitoring and reporting systems and the quality and level of data produced/ available. The latter conditions are important as they will affect operational modalities of potential evaluation of impact. Informed by previous stage, the focus should be on potentially scalable interventions with general expectation to generate positive intermediary and long-term outcomes could be good candidates.

3. Programmatic dive-in

This stage of assessment focuses on the selected subsets of countries/ interventions under each joint programme. The objective is to better understand the programme/intervention logic (TOC) and modalities, implementation conditions, geographic coverage across communities, and the timeline. This is critical to make a reasonable judgement on whether we can achieve internal validity by accurately estimating the counterfactual through a valid control/comparison group, use natural experiment or adopt a theory-based approach to assess 'contribution' rather than attribution of the programme. Diagnostics of available data sources is an important aspect of analysis at this stage and should include the monitoring data with the focus on their suitability to be used credibly (as an alternative to primary data collection or as a complementary source).

A range of impact evaluation methods can be considered to construct a valid counterfactual including quasi-experimental approaches. Each such method (e.g., instrumental variables, regression discontinuity design, difference in difference, and matching) have their specific requirements and limitations. In addition, natural experiment designs can be considered for ongoing interventions (*backward looking*, '*summative*' approach). The result of this stage will be an expert agreement on the feasibility of constructing a rigorous counterfactual in selected countries and recommendation on the design options (or a combination of approaches). This analysis under IFA does not replace the inception phase of each evaluation (including or not an impact component) where the design of the impact component is defined in much more details through consultations with national partners and stakeholders. Both work packages (A- Child Marriage; B-FGM) will focus on *potential* programmatic conditions that have to be met to evaluate impact of selected interventions.

4. Integration of impact component into the global evaluation design.

The objective of this stage is to assess methodology, finance- and process-related implications of integrating an 'impact component' into the planned global evaluations conducted at the central level (i.e., managed by the Evaluation Offices). It is expected that a set of concrete recommendations for global programme and evaluation teams will cover each of these aspects in great detail outlining:

- The suitability of the Joint Programme for an integrated impact component (aspects to consider: nature of the joint programme/ intervention being evaluated; level of funding and actual coverage of the joint programme at country level; other partners, actors working in the same area);
- Data requirements and information needs;
- Conditions for methodological coherence and complementarity of different evaluation approaches and designs;
- Cost and time implications for the planned evaluation; and
- Any other key issues that might arise.

The recommendations should take into account the commonalities between different FGM and child marriage joint global programmes suggesting (if possible and appropriate) efficiency gains through combining efforts in evaluating impact at the country/ community level wherever appropriate.

Methodology

The IFA will be based on the desk review of published literature, programme documents, reporting and monitoring systems of the programme available in public domain and/or obtained through support of the UNICEF and UNFPA Joint Programme staff and country offices, as well as, completed evaluations of the joint programmes. Some comparative multi-country analysis can be undertaken at stage 2 to examine contextual factors and conditions for the identified selected interventions. Diagnostics of existing data sources, their quality, frequency of collection and scope will be conducted at the stage 2 and 3. This can include the existing assessment surveys, programme monitoring and reporting systems, administrative and household data (such as: Demographic health surveys).

During stage 3 the IFA will also collect information through direct consultations with programme staff in the selected countries. Specific methods of engagement with country-level staff are to be determined later as analysis progresses, based on the country context, but there are no plans for a large-scale formal data collection. While a series of online engagement with programme implementers is a minimum requirement, short field missions to collect required programmatic data and engage with programme stakeholders are normally more efficient to understand the full programmatic context and intervention modalities which are crucial in determining what kind of IE design is feasible on the ground. Face to face engagement with stakeholders is also invaluable for the validation of preliminary diagnosis of stages 1 and 2. These missions can be considered if other pre-conditions of country-level engagement are met in earlier stages of the review but will depend on the COVID-19 travel situation, travel restrictions and other safety considerations.

Process and reporting

The IFA process will aim to be adaptive and interactive. The consultant/consultants will have regular communication with the supervisor (UNICEF, Senior Evaluation Specialist, Methods and Impact) and the UNICEF and UNFPA evaluation managers and conduct de-briefs to joint programme coordination teams on the emerging findings after each stage of the investigation. During a short inception phase the scope and timeline will be further refined and agreed upon. The consultant/consultants might also be asked to present the findings to the joint programme steering committee and integrate their recommendations and comments in the final products.

A consultant/consultants can apply for either both work packages or just one, according to their thematic expertise and availability. The consultants can subcontract part of the work to complement the expertise. A clear explanation has to be given in the proposal on how the skills and experiences of a sub-contractor or a co-investigator will benefit the process and the quality of the deliverables. A sequencing approach is provisioned: the work will commence with *work package 1* followed by *work package 2*.

Indicative timeline and sequence of the work packages

Work package	Tentative timeline of the
WP 1: Child Marriage	April 4th – July 31st, 2022
<i>Stage 1: Mapping evidence gaps on ‘what works?’</i>	April 4 th – April 22 nd , 2022
<i>Stage 2: Selection of country cases and interventions at community level</i>	April 23 rd – May 6 th , 2022
<i>Stage 3: Programmatic dive-in</i>	May 7 th - June 30 th , 2022

Stage 4: Finalisation of the final report incorporating comments and suggestions from UNICEF and UNFPA	July 1 st – July 31 st , 2022
WP 2: FGM WP2 will follow similar time schedule with possible adjustment in duration of each stage based on the experience of WP1.	August 1st – October 31st, 2022

The timeline incorporates the time for revisions of products based on UNICEF and UNFPA feedback.

Deliverables⁶:

Deliverables	Delivery Timeframe	Impact expert Impact technical lead (expert in quasi-, experimental, and non-experimental evaluation methods) (Experts' expected level of effort)
<u>Deliverable 1 (stage 1):</u> Deliverable/product(s): Concise summary synthesis of global evidence at the outcome and impact level for each theme (up to 5-10 pages in total). This includes the review of the validated by literature outcome and impact measures (with corresponding concepts) aligned with relevant thematic TOCs (can be in the annex). Summary ppt.	By April 22 nd 2022	7 days
<u>Deliverable 2 (stage 2):</u> Deliverable/product(s): Intervention mapping matched with cross-country contextual analysis and recommendations for 1-2-3 shortlisted countries for more in-depth analysis (e.g., excel sheet with color coding and supplementary explanatory notes and ppt).	By May 6 th , 2022	8 days
<u>Deliverable 3 (stage 3)</u> Deliverable/product(s): Outline of the appropriate and feasible design options for evaluating impacts in each thematic area of child protection and selected countries given intervention parameters, implementation conditions and the nature of the expected outcomes and impacts (up to 10 pages on each work package, not counting annex). Summary ppt.	By June 30 th , 2022	22 days
<u>Deliverable 4 (stage 4):</u> Deliverable/product(s): Final report with presenting technical options and methodological recommendations on integrating impact component into the planned global evaluations (no more than 20 pages excluding attachments). Summary ppt.	By July 31 st , 2022	7-14 days
Total		40-48 days

Payment Schedule:

Payments will be processed upon acceptance of the corresponding deliverable from both evaluation managers, UNICEF and UNFPA, and against an invoice that will refer to the contract reference and deliverable number.

⁶ Given as an indication and can vary between WP1 and WP2

Payments will be formally approved by the supervisor in UNICEF, as the organization holding the contract. The delivery dates below are applicable to the WP1 only and will be updated for the work package 2. The number of days is based on indicative level of effort.

1. Payment on completion of deliverables 1 and 2: 40%
2. Payment on completion of Deliverables 3 and 4: 60%

Qualifications and specialised knowledge

The IFA will be led by a team of two experts with extensive knowledge and experience in conducting mixed methods impact evaluations and thematic experience on child protection, gender equality, social norms, community-based mobilization (across the development-peace-humanitarian nexus). If two candidates form the team for this assignment they can apply jointly, the CV and full application packages should be submitted for each candidate outlining the complementarity of skills and expertise. UNICEF also reserves the right to set up a team of consultants in to implement each work package if this is expected to enhance the quality of the final products.

The consultants must also demonstrate a clear understanding of the UN system and ensure that the feasibility assessment is conducted in line with the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System and abides by UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct. UNEG guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation should also be reflected throughout the evaluation.

*Required qualifications and expertise of **impact evaluation expert**:*

- *Academic qualifications.* Graduate degree in Social Science or relevant discipline (economics, sociology, evaluation, public policy, or related field).
- At least five years of experience leading impact evaluations in development and humanitarian contexts preferably as part of comprehensive programme evaluation efforts including feasibility scoping, designing, and implementing quasi-, experimental, and mixed methods approaches for evaluation of development programmes.
- Proven skills in or good understanding of evaluation methodologies for evaluating outcomes and impacts, including non-experimental, theory-based approaches as well as experimental and quasi-experimental approaches.
- Data diagnostics, data analysis using secondary data sources including cross-country time series.
- Research or evaluation experience in topics relevant for the assignment (child protection, gender, harmful practices, social norms).

*The **impact evaluation expert** should demonstrate the following skills and competencies*

- Proven experience with the ethics of evidence generation; experience collecting data from vulnerable groups; familiarity with ethical safeguards.
- Familiarity with UNICEF and UNFPA programmatic mandate in harmful practices and understanding of evidence generation process in this area is an asset.
- Delivering evaluations and research projects with tight deadlines, complex national contexts and multi-stakeholder consultative process.
- Applied knowledge and application of UNEG norms and standards.
- Excellent abilities in presenting technical information to a non-technical audience, including excellent drafting and presentation skills in English.
- Strong ability to interact with a wide range of stakeholders, particularly on issues that are politically sensitive.
- Proficiency in English and French (by at least one expert) is required. Knowledge of other UN languages is an advantage.

How to apply:

Interested candidates must submit the following documents:

1. CV and cover letter.
2. The financial proposal should indicate consultant's daily rate and expected total budget with a breakdown cost for each stage of the work.
3. The budget can include travel costs as a separate item but given the uncertainty about feasibility of travel at this stage, UNICEF reserves the right to exclude the estimated travel amount from the prospective contract amount.
4. The application should be accompanied by short examples (through links provided or attached documents) of analyses that show experience and competence to undertake this consultancy in line with the required qualifications described above.
5. A consultant/consultants can apply for either both work packages or just one, according to their thematic expertise and availability. The consultant can subcontract part of the work to complement the expertise. A clear explanation has to be given in the proposal on how the skills and experiences of a sub-contractor or a co-investigator will benefit the process and the quality of the deliverables.

Remarks

Only shortlisted candidates will be contacted and advance to the next stage of the selection process.

Individuals engaged under a consultancy will not be considered "staff members" under the Staff Regulations and Rules of the United Nations and UNICEF's policies and procedures and, will not be entitled to benefits provided therein (such as leave entitlements and medical insurance coverage). Their conditions of service will be governed by their contract and the General Conditions of Contracts for the Services of Consultants. Consultants are responsible for determining their tax liabilities and for the payment of any taxes and/or duties, in accordance with local or other applicable laws.