

## TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

Title	Type of engagement	Duty Station:
International consultant for formative evaluation of community-led water supply and sanitation interventions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consultant	Remote/home-based

**Context:**

Since the latest round of conflict and displacement in Myanmar was initiated with the 1 February 2021, UNICEF and other UN agencies have developed engagement guidelines that prioritize implementing partnerships with civil society organizations. In the WASH sector, this has translated into community-based and community-led interventions for water supply and sanitation, whereby UNICEF provides direct support to local communities, NGO partners and private sector for the design, procurement, installation and maintenance of water supply and sanitation systems. This evaluation will aim to assess and learn from UNICEF's engagement with this work in Magway and Ayeyarwady regions.

In 2023, 28,755 people (14,934 females) gained access to basic drinking water services through UNICEF direct support. This support for community managed water supply reached 6,621 households in 36 communities in Chauk (Magway region) and Bogale (Ayeyarwady region) Townships. Profile survey, gravity-fed pipe network design, uPVC pipes and Solar Powered Water Systems were provided for installation of the piped water system with metered system with nominal cost recovery for operation and maintenance. The cost for transportation from temporary depot to the target communities, pipe fittings, water meter, digging trenches, plumbing and refilling trenches was covered by the community themselves. Young professionals were trained to provide Climate Resilient Water Systems. The training includes construction of bed-mounted collector wells near the perennial streams, rivers and construction of infiltration gallery wells with long intake pipes in sandy, non-perennial streams.

Communities have shown their commitment to gaining access to clean drinking water by actively contributing to the project's capital investment and service delivery cost. The capital contribution includes the construction of overhead water storage tanks, installation of water meters, and digging trenches for water mains. Water user committees have taken responsibility for maintaining these facilities and ensuring regular service delivery, while households pay designated tariffs based on their water consumption.

Community participation and leadership is the key to achieving sustainable water service delivery. The ongoing conflict in other regions of the country poses significant challenges in achieving planned targets for community water supply. In this challenging context, the importance of community participation in all stages of project planning, implementation, and management, as well as the necessity of maintaining technical engagement with counterpart departments, became evident.

In sanitation, according to baseline and endline assessments in the project area, an additional 43,786 people (comprising 22,068 females and 21,718 males, including pe) from Ngape, Pwintphyu, Salin (Magway region) and Bogale townships (Ayeyarwady region) gained access to basic sanitation services since 2021. Climate-resilient sanitation facilities (where risk analysis was carried out, preventive measures included, the services are reliable at all times, resilient to seasonal variability and extreme weather events; service delivery models are robust and ensure longer term sustainability) were provided

to 11,800 vulnerable households in Pwintphyu, Salin, and Bogale townships, through cooperation with local sanitation entrepreneurs. 190 communities have been certified as open defecation-free (ODF) after a self- and external ODF verification process. Thus, an additional 116,195 people are now living in an ODF community since 2021.

A handwashing behaviour change programme was implemented in 796 communities of Ngape, Pwintphyu, Salin and Bogale townships, reaching 499,024 people (male: 247,516, female: 251,508), since 2021. Community volunteers delivered the seven key hygiene messages around water, sanitation, handwashing behaviour, food, waste, menstrual hygiene, and personal hygiene, to the communities through the interpersonal communication (IPC) approach.

Achievements have fallen short of planned targets due to limited funding for the sanitation and hygiene programme, with priority being given to emergency WASH response and life-saving activities in other regions of the country. Travel restrictions in project implementation areas have also necessitated a reduction in activities, primarily focusing on community mobilization. Additionally, rising inflation has affected household willingness to invest in renovating existing toilets and constructing new ones.

Previously, health messages were transmitted through group education sessions. However, the group sessions became impractical due to restrictions on community gatherings and travel. To address this challenge, UNICEF introduced the WASH-IPC (Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Interpersonal Communication) approach to promote improved hygiene practices.

This approach is primarily carried out by community volunteers at the local level. In this context, these volunteers have adapted IPC methods, including one-on-one, group, and mass communication. They consistently conducted WASH-IPC activities for 10 days each month. Since these sessions originate within the community itself, they are highly effective in engaging with local residents and promoting positive hygiene behaviours.

A UNICEF WASH Social and Behaviour Change (SBC) workplan review identified standardized messages for seven hygiene behaviours. Cartoons and graphic illustrations were designed, and these messages were organized on a flip chart. Community volunteers utilize these flip charts during hygiene education sessions. Furthermore, the graphic illustrations and standard key messages are promoted on social media channels during WASH events and campaigns.

**Purpose of Activity/Assignment:**

This evaluation will be carried out to assess and learn from the implementation of community-based climate-resilient water and sanitation programmes in Magway and Ayeyarwady regions.

The primary audience of the evaluation will be UNICEF management, which will use the evaluation to make evidence-informed decisions regarding future enhancement of community-based and climate-resilient water and sanitation programmes in Myanmar. The evaluation will also inform UNICEF programming on preparedness for WASH sector emergency response in the dry zone and delta regions. The secondary audience of the evaluation will be NGO implementing partners and local communities, who will use the evaluation results and process to learn from and build their ownership of programme approaches.

## Scope of Work:

### 1. Objectives, and scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will have the following primary objectives:

1. To inform next steps for programme scale-up and evidence-based advocacy on community-based and climate resilient water supply and sanitation.
2. To provide evidence to support UNICEF's overall approach to climate-resilience programming, and related contributions to building community resilience.
3. To enhance community ownership of and demand generation for climate resilient WASH.
4. To inform humanitarian-development nexus programming, especially around emergency preparedness in vulnerable regions of the country.

The scope of the evaluation will cover UNICEF engagement in community-based and climate resilient water supply and sanitation interventions in the dry zone and delta regions (Magway and Ayeyarwady) since February 2021. The period prior to the military takeover and other ongoing emergency WASH interventions in other regions will be out of scope.

The evaluation will only examine work under the following two outputs of UNICEF cooperation:

- Water Supply: By 2023, deliver equitable, safe, gender sensitive and climate resilient drinking water supply services to vulnerable populations in targeted States and Regions at scale.
- Sanitation and Hygiene: By 2023, end open defecation and promote demand for safe, climate smart and equitable sanitation and hygiene services among vulnerable communities in targeted areas.

### 2. Evaluation framework and questions

The framework to be used in this evaluation is based on the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria supplemented and adjusted where necessary to ensure that the evaluation meets specific objectives. The criteria covered under this evaluation are relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and coherence. In addition, cross-cutting equity, gender equality and human rights considerations are also considered. Some key questions include:

#### **Relevance** of the programme:

1. *To what extent is the programme relevant to the identified needs of target populations and their families?*
  - *Are the programme and interventions customized enough to address the needs of the target population by age, gender, and other factors?*
2. *Were relevant partners involved in the programme design and implementation, including target population, and their families? To what extent are community perceptions monitored and included in programme design, including through feedback and complaint mechanisms (under Accountability to Affected Populations)?*
3. *Is the project responsive to changing needs and circumstances, including climate change? Was it adjusted through the course of its implementation, including through adoption of climate-resilient approaches?*

4. *To what extent has emergency preparedness been built into the design of the programme, in order to enhance community resilience? How do existing programmes contribute to emergency preparedness in the target communities?*

**Effectiveness** of the programme:

5. *To what extent have the objectives of the programme been realized? Has climate resilience been built into the programme enough to allow for seasonal variation?*
6. *What are the main barriers in accessing water supply and sanitation services for populations in the target regions? What are some of the solutions that could be applied to overcome them?*
7. *What are the (perceived) advantages and challenges of the programme, from the community perspective?*

**Sustainability** of the programme:

8. *To what degree does the programme build capacities of local communities for climate resilient implementation? Are there any specific capacity gaps that need to be addressed and/or strengthened to further support community resilience?*
9. *Are there sufficient resources allocated to sustain the programme in the future? Is the current budget allocation approach sustainable?*
10. *To what extent are demand generation activities contributing to future sustainability of the programme? Is there sufficient private-sector engagement to support future sustainability?*

**Coherence** of the programme:

11. *To what extent are there synergies and interlinkages between the programme and other interventions carried out by partners?*
  - *Do coordination mechanisms between key stakeholders exist, and if so, to what extent are they well designed, clear and active? Are there differences in coordination at national or sub-national levels?*
  - *To what extent are stakeholder perceptions (among partners) monitored and included in programme prioritization?*

**Cross-cutting dimensions:**

12. *Are there any difficulties in accessing water supply and sanitation services for women or persons with disabilities? Are there any special barriers or concerns from a gender or disability perspective?*
13. *What are the main concerns and/or barriers linked to the assessment of different age groups, particularly young children and the elderly?*

Gender equality, equity and human rights considerations must also be used as a lens when responding to all evaluation questions and not be limited to the cross-cutting questions posed above. Reference and use of rights-based frameworks such as CRC, CCC, CRPD, CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks are expected in the design of the evaluation and analysis and presentation of findings.

The above evaluation questions are indicative. Through a consultative process, the evaluator is expected to review the feasibility of answering the existing evaluation questions and propose changes if needed during the inception phase ensuring that all questions can be answered. As agreed, evaluation questions will need to be answered in the final report and will guide the findings of the evaluation.

### 3. Evaluation approach and methodology

Based on the objectives of the evaluation, this section indicates a possible approach, methods, and processes for the evaluation. Methodological rigor will be given significant consideration in the assessment of proposals. Hence consultants are invited to interrogate the approach and methodology proffered in the ToR and improve on it, or propose an approach they deem more appropriate, which should be guided by the UNICEF's revised Evaluation Policy (2023)<sup>1</sup>, the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016)<sup>2</sup>, Guidance on Integrating Disability Inclusion in Evaluations and Reporting on the UNDIS Entity Accountability Framework Evaluation Indicator<sup>3</sup>, UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation (2014)<sup>4</sup>, UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator, UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2020)<sup>5</sup>, UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards and Research, Evaluation and Data Collection and Analysis (2015)<sup>6</sup> and UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards (2017).<sup>7</sup> Moreover, the evaluation should consider throughout issues of equity, gender equality and human rights. In their proposal, consultants should clearly refer to triangulation, sampling plan, ethical considerations (including ethical clearance) and methodological limitations and mitigation measures. They are encouraged to also demonstrate methodological expertise in evaluating similar initiatives.

It is expected that the evaluation will employ non-experimental, mixed methods approach drawing on key project documents, the constructed Theory of Change and the monitoring framework for guidance.

The evaluation takes a formative approach with the purpose of informing potential adjustments in the programme design and its delivery system.

At minimum, the evaluation will draw on the following methods:

- Desk review of project documents and other relevant data;
- Review and analysis of secondary quantitative data;
- Key Informant Interviews (KIIs);
- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs);
- Observation of programme processes;

The data collected should be disaggregated by sex, age, disability etc. where relevant.

Sampling of KIIs and FGDs should be done in consultation with UNICEF. The evaluation sample should reconsider a balance of criteria such as socioeconomic indicators, remoteness, ethnicities, age groups, etc.

To enrich the analysis, the evaluation will use, to the extent possible, any quantitative data gathered and reported by implementing partners on a regular basis. The evaluation will also make use of any partnership reviews that have been conducted with implementing partners.

Conventional ethical guidelines are to be followed during the evaluation. Specific reference is made to the revised UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System and UNEG Ethical Guidelines as

<sup>1</sup> UNICEF's revised Evaluation Policy: <https://www.unicef.org/executiveboard/media/18416/file/2023-27-Revised-evaluation-policy-EN-ODS.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> UNEG Norms: <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>, UNEG Standards: <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/22>

<sup>3</sup> <https://unevaluation.org/document/detail/3050>

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1616>

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866>

<sup>6</sup> [https://www.unicef.org/supply/files/ATTACHMENT\\_IV-UNICEF\\_Procedure\\_for\\_Ethical\\_Standards.PDF](https://www.unicef.org/supply/files/ATTACHMENT_IV-UNICEF_Procedure_for_Ethical_Standards.PDF)

<sup>7</sup> [https://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/files/UNICEF\\_adapted\\_reporting\\_standards\\_updated\\_June\\_2017\\_FINAL\(1\).pdf](https://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/files/UNICEF_adapted_reporting_standards_updated_June_2017_FINAL(1).pdf)

well as to UNICEF's revised Evaluation Policy, and the UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation and Data Collection and Analysis and UNICEF's Evaluation Reporting Standards.<sup>8</sup> In case children or vulnerable populations are expected to be included under the data collection, ethical review from an IRB will be required and will be responsibility of the evaluation team upon approval of the inception report. Good practices not covered therein are also to be followed. Any sensitive issues or concerns should be raised with UNICEF as soon as they are identified.

There are several limitations to the evaluation which can hinder the process, notably: (i) disaggregated data may not be available at the local level, or the quality of available data may not be satisfactory; (ii) engagement with government partners will be limited, as per UNCT engagement guidelines under the current Myanmar context. Applicants should discuss the above or other potential limitations (including limitations of proposed methodologies and sampling) in their proposal and further identify them during the inception phase. The limitations that could lead to changes in evaluation questions and scope of analysis and mitigation measures should be clearly identified at the inception phase before initiation of data collection.

#### **4. Evaluation management and coordination**

The evaluation will be conducted by an external evaluator to be recruited by UNICEF Myanmar. The evaluator will operate under the direct supervision of the UNICEF Evaluation Specialist, which will coordinate management with other relevant stakeholders. This evaluation management team will be responsible for the day-to-day oversight and management of the evaluation and for the management of the evaluation budget; will assure the quality and independence of the evaluation and guarantee its alignment with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines; will provide quality assurance checking that the evaluation findings and conclusions are relevant and recommendations are implementable, and; will contribute to the dissemination of the evaluation findings and follow-up on the management response. The final report will also be approved by the Country Representative at UNICEF Myanmar.

Additional stakeholders including NGO implementing partners will be engaged to support management of the evaluation. These stakeholders will contribute to preparation and design of the evaluation, including providing feedback and comments on the inception report and on the technical quality of the work of the consultants; provide comments and substantive feedback to ensure the quality – from a technical point of view – of the draft and final evaluation reports; assist in identifying internal and external stakeholders to be consulted during the evaluation process; participate in review meetings organized by the evaluation management team and with the evaluation team as required; play a key role in learning and knowledge sharing from the evaluation results, contributing to disseminating the findings of the evaluation and follow-up on implementation of the management response.

The consultant will work in close collaboration with NGO implementing partners, local communities and private sector entities<sup>9</sup> throughout the evaluation, under the supervision of UNICEF. Some of these parties will be convened by UNICEF as an Evaluation Reference Group (ERG).

<sup>8</sup> Please refer to: <http://www.unicef.org/evaluation>

<sup>9</sup> Such as local sanitation entrepreneurs, sanitation product sellers, and maintenance companies. Water supply has less private sector engagement as products are mostly procured by UNICEF from offshore.

#### **5. Evaluation team profile**

The evaluation will be conducted by engaging a qualified individual consultant (Team Leader). The proposed consultant may be supported by an additional assistant (Team Member/Technical Expert).

The Team Leader will sign the contract and be responsible for undertaking the evaluation from start to finish, for managing the evaluation, for the bulk of data collection, analysis and consultations, as well as for report drafting and communication of the evaluation results.

The Team Member will play a major role in data collection, analysis and presentation, and preparation of the debriefings and will make significant contributions to analysis and writing of the main evaluation report. The Team Member may also be responsible for providing back-office support for logistics and administrative matters.

The evaluation team should be balanced with respect to gender, if possible, to ensure accessibility of both male and female informants during the data collection process. It is vital that the same individuals that develop the methodology for the proposal will be involved in conducting the evaluation. In review of proposals, while adequate consideration will be given to the technical methodology, significant weighting will be given to the quality, experience (based on CVs and written samples) and relevance of individuals who will be involved in the evaluation.

#### **Expected travel for the Team Member/Technical Expert**

The Team Member will be required to travel to towns in the Magway and Ayeyarwady regions. An estimated number of travel days and frequency should be included in the proposal.

Work Assignments Overview	Deliverables/Outputs	Delivery deadline	Estimated Budget
<b>Inception phase</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inception meeting (online)</li> <li>2. All relevant documents are reviewed, explanatory discussions held, and inception report submitted compliant with UNICEF requirements</li> <li>3. Second and final draft of the inception report presented to UNICEF/ERG</li> </ol>	Inception report	31/08/24	20%
<b>Data collection phase</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pilot data collection tools and conduct field-based data collection based on the methodology described in the Inception Report</li> <li>2. Relevant methods applied to analyse primary and secondary data and prepare preliminary evaluation findings report and presentation. During this time, the draft final report will begin to be drafted as analysis takes place.</li> </ol>	Initial findings presentation and report	31/10/24	40%
<b>Final phase</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prepare and submit first draft of evaluation report</li> <li>2. Revise the first draft and submit second draft final evaluation report to UNICEF and other stakeholders in a multi-stakeholder workshop and prepare presentation and other materials</li> <li>3. Present evaluation findings, conclusions and draft recommendations at the multi-stakeholder validation workshop</li> <li>4. In addition to the feedback from workshops, receive written feedback to second draft of the report</li> <li>5. Final evaluation report, executive summary, evaluation brief and other materials finalized. The brief should be in both English and Burmese.</li> </ol>	Final report, presentation and brief	15/12/24	40%
Full details of expected deliverables are outlined in Annex 1.			



## Annex 1<sup>i</sup>

### Submission of applications:

- Letter of Interest (cover letter)
- CV of proposed team (team leader, plus team member, if any)
- Performance evaluation reports or references of similar consultancy assignments
- Technical proposal: The written technical proposal will be submitted in electronic (PDF) format and include the following elements, at a minimum:
  - a) Narrative description of the team leader's experience and capacity in the following areas:
    - Evaluation of climate-resilient or community-based WASH interventions;
    - Previous assignments in developing countries in general, and related to WASH or climate programmes, preferably in South-East Asia; and
    - Previous and current evaluation assignments using UNEG Norms and Standards.
  - b) Relevant references of the team leader (past and on-going assignments) in the past five years. UNICEF will contact reference persons for feedback on services provided by the team leader.
  - c) Samples or links to samples of previous relevant work listed as reference of the proposer (at least two), on which the team leader directly and actively contributed or authored.
  - d) Methodology proposed, with minimum repetition of this ToR. There is no minimum or maximum length. If in doubt, ensure sufficient detail.
  - e) Work plan, which will include as a minimum requirement the following:
    - General work plan based on the one proposed in the ToR, with comments and proposed adjustments, if any; and
    - Detailed timetable by activity (must be consistent with the general work plan and the financial proposal).

Please note that the duration of the assignment will be from August to December 2024, and it is foreseen that the Team Leader will devote roughly 70% of their time to the evaluation. The presence of a conflict of interest of any kind (e.g., having worked for or partnered with UNICEF on the design or implementation of the community-based WASH programme will automatically disqualify prospective candidates from consideration).

### Evaluation Criteria (This will be used for the [Selection Report](#) (for clarification see [Guidance](#)))

#### A) Technical Evaluation (points out of 75)

- Educational background: 5 points
- Relevant experience: 15 points
- Technical proposal: 55 points

#### B) Financial Proposal (points out of 25)

The maximum number of points shall be allotted to the lowest Financial Proposal that is opened /evaluated and compared among those technical qualified candidates who have attained a minimum (50) points score in the technical evaluation. Other Financial Proposals will receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest price.

Please see more details for evaluation criteria in Annex 2.

The Contract shall be awarded to candidate obtaining the highest combined technical and financial scores, subject to satisfactory results from a verification interview and reference checks.

<sup>1</sup> Costs indicated are estimated. Final rate shall follow the “best value for money” principle, i.e., achieving the desired outcome at the lowest possible fee. Consultants will be asked to stipulate all-inclusive fees, including lump sum travel and subsistence costs, as applicable.

Payment of professional fees will be based on submission of agreed deliverables. UNICEF reserves the right to withhold payment in case the deliverables submitted are not up to the required standard or in case of delays in submitting the deliverables on the part of the consultant.

**Text to be added to all TORs:**

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.

The selected consultant is solely responsible to ensure that the visa (applicable) and health insurance required to perform the duties of the contract are valid for the entire period of the contract. Selected consultant are subject to confirmation of fully-vaccinated status against SARS-CoV-2 (Covid-19) with a World Health Organization (WHO)-endorsed vaccine, which must be met prior to taking up the assignment. The vaccine mandate, does not apply to consultants who will work remotely and are not expected to work on or visit UNICEF premises, programme delivery locations or directly interact with communities UNICEF works with, nor to travel to perform functions for UNICEF for the duration of their consultancy contracts.

UNICEF offers [reasonable accommodation](#) for consultants with disabilities. This may include, for example, accessible software, travel assistance for missions or personal attendants. We encourage you to disclose your disability during your application in case you need reasonable accommodation during the selection process and afterwards in your assignment.

---

## Annex 1: Evaluation deliverables and timeline

Evaluation products expected for this exercise are:

- a) An inception report (in English), in an agreed format, in preparation for data collection, and a PowerPoint presentation of the inception report (in English) to present to the ERG;
- b) A report of the initial evaluation findings from primary data collection (in English), including a desk review analysis and a PowerPoint presentation of the initial findings (in English) to facilitate a stakeholder consultation exercise;
- c) A draft report (in English) and final report (in English) that will be written in accordance to the requirements of the Global Evaluation Report Oversight System<sup>1</sup> and revised until approved (incl. a complete first draft to be reviewed by the ERG and UNICEF; a second draft to be reviewed by the ERG, and a final draft);
- d) A PowerPoint presentation of the final report (in English) to be used to share findings with the ERG and for use in subsequent dissemination events;
- e) A four-page evaluation brief (in both English and Burmese) that is distinct from the executive summary in the evaluation report and is intended for a broader, non-technical and non-UNICEF audience.

Outlines and descriptions of each evaluation product are meant to be indicative, and include:

- Inception report: The inception report (of maximum 20 pages, excluding annexes) will be key in confirming a common understanding of what is to be evaluated, including additional insights into executing the evaluation. At this stage the evaluation team will refine and confirm evaluation questions, confirm the scope of the evaluation, further improve on the methodology proposed in the ToR and their own evaluation proposal to improve its rigor, as well as develop and validate evaluation instruments. The report will include, among other elements: i) evaluation purpose and scope, confirmation of objectives and the main themes of the evaluation; ii) evaluation criteria and questions, final set of evaluation questions, and evaluation criteria for assessing performance; iii) evaluation methodology (i.e., sampling criteria), a description of data collection methods and data sources (incl. a rationale for their selection), draft data collection instruments, for example questionnaires, with a data collection toolkit as an annex, an evaluation matrix that identifies descriptive and normative questions and criteria for evaluating evidence, a data analysis plan, a discussion on how 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; iv) proposed structure of the final report; v) evaluation work plan and timeline, including a revised work and travel plan; vi) resources requirements (i.e., detailed budget allocations, tied to evaluation activities, work plan, deliverables); v) annexes (i.e., organizing matrix for evaluation questions, data collection toolkit, data analysis framework); and vi) format of an evaluation briefing note for external communication purposes. The inception report will be presented at a formal meeting of the ERG.
- Initial evaluation findings: This report will present the initial evaluation findings from primary data collection, comprising the desk-based document review and analysis of the programme. The report developed prior to the first drafts of the final report should be 10 pages, or about 6,000 words in length (excluding annexes, if any), and should be accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation that can be used for validation with key stakeholders.
- Final evaluation report: The report will not exceed 50 pages, excluding the executive summary

and annexes.

- PowerPoint presentation: Initially prepared and used by the evaluation team in their presentation to the ERG, a standalone PowerPoint will be submitted as part of the evaluation deliverables.
- An evaluation brief of four pages (distinct from the executive summary, both in English and Burmese) for external users will be submitted to the ERG as part of the evaluation deliverables.
- Reports will be prepared according to the UNICEF Style Guide and UNICEF Brand Toolkit (to be shared with the winning bidder) and UNICEF standards for evaluation reports as per Geros guidelines (referenced before).

Quality assurance of evaluation key reports: The first draft of the final report (in English) will be received by the ERG and UNICEF who will revert with comments within 5 working days, and work with the team leader on necessary revisions. The second draft will be sent to the ERG, which will consolidate all comments on a response matrix and request the evaluators to indicate actions taken against each comment in the production of the final draft. The evaluators need to revert with revised reports within one week of receipt of comments. All final deliverables are to be developed with attention to disability accessibility features and to maximise its utility and accessibility.<sup>i</sup>

The documents produced during the period of this consultancy will be treated strictly confidential and the rights of distribution and/or publication shall solely reside with UNICEF (as per standard terms and conditions). Some of the documents (see where indicated in the deliverables above) should be developed in both English and Burmese. The translation costs are to be covered by the consultants and clearly budgeted in the financial proposal. Any costs regarding disability accessibility features are to be clearly budgeted in the financial proposal as well (if any).

## Annex 2: Detailed selection criteria

### TECHNICAL EVALUATION

Criteria	Points	Unit of Analysis
<b>Experience of Key Personnel</b>		
1. Range and depth of experience with similar projects (reference to similar contracts)	5	Information on similar activities having been undertaken by the team of individuals going to be involved in this evaluation (max 3 points) Recent and current contracts with similar agencies (UN, NGOs) using UNEG Norms and Standards (max 2 points)
2. Team Leader (relevant experience, qualifications, certifications)	10	Number of years of relevant professional experience in delivering high-level, evidence driven evaluations of WASH and climate interventions or similar, and preferably in East Asia (max 2 points) Experience in WASH or climate sectors or similar (max 2 points) Experience as team leader or project manager (max 1 point) Quality of written sample (max 4 points) Qualifications/certificates (max 1 point)
3. Team Member (relevant experience, qualifications, certifications)	5	Numbers and respective years of relevant professional experience in climate-resilient WASH programmes (max 2 points) Relevant technical expertise in in collecting and analysing quantitative and qualitative data (max 2 points) Qualifications/certificates (max 1 point)
<b>Proposed Methodology and Approach</b>		
4. Description of implementation, operational methodology	40	Description of the proposed process for conducting the quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis including the tools that will be used (max 10 points) Match between the proposed approach and requested scope of the evaluation (max 10 points) References to relevant data and information sources (max 5 points) Description of data analysis (max 5 points) Other creative, innovative referenced ideas for methodology/tools and presentation of findings (max 10 points)
5. Timeframe	10	Adherence of the proposed timeframe and work plan to the ToR (max 5 point) Adherence to all the milestones outlined in the ToR (max 5 point)
6. Potential constraints considered	5	At least two considerations outlined (max 2 points) Description of the process and procedures to deal/mitigate these constraints (max 2 points) Reference to additional resources which can be made available for the evaluation (max 1 point)
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>Maximum 75 (minimum 50 points required to advance to the price evaluation)</b>

### PRICE EVALUATION

Criteria		Total costs (in USD\$)
<b>Sub-Total</b>	25	The maximum score assigned to the price proposal (i.e., 25 points) will be allocated to the lowest priced proposal. All other price proposals receive scores in inverse order and proportional to the lowest price (i.e. double the price would receive half the score).
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>Maximum 100</b>