

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

Title:	Funding Code	Type of Contract	Duty Station:
Evaluation consultant for the diversions for children in conflict with the law in Zambia		Individual consultant	National level as well as 4 pilot districts of Lusaka, Kapiri Mposhi, Ndola and Kitwe
Purpose of Activity/Assignment: To conduct an independent evaluation of the introduction and implementation of diversion in Zambia: 2017- 2021			
Scope of Work: 1. OVERALL CONTEXT, THE RATIONALE AND OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION Zambia is categorized as a lower-middle income country. Zambia experienced over a decade of economic growth, which was followed by economic stagnation and more recently, having been hit by covid-19, a negative trend in GDP. Zambia has one of the fastest growing populations in the world, which is now at an estimated 19 million, of which around 54% are children. Poverty is estimated at 54.4% and extreme poverty at 40.8%. Poverty is predominant in rural areas, estimated at 60.8% and less present in urban areas where it is estimated to be at 12.8% (2018LFS). Inequality is one of the key development challenges, with Zambia's gini-coefficient being at 57.1 (data from 2015) making it one of the most unequal societies in the world (World Bank data on Gini Coefficient). Fiscal space has significantly contracted, and it is unrealistic to anticipate a growth in investments in service provision (in absolute terms) in the coming years (including for child offenders). The area of juvenile offending in Zambia is governed by its Constitution, the Juvenile's Act, the Criminal Procedure Code and the Penal Code. In addition, Zambia is signatory to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child ratified in 1991 and the Africa Union Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child ratified in 1992. These 2 international instruments provide the basic international standards for child rights and child protection that apply to ALL children, including child offenders. The most recent international standards that apply specifically to children in conflict with the law, are the General Comments 24 of the United Nations Committee of the Rights of the Child on "Children's Access to Justice". International standards are also stipulated in the UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice (Beijing Rules), UN Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of their Liberty (Havana Rules) and the UN Guidelines for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency (Riyadh Rules). The most notable recent literature in the area of child offending includes, the 2015 'Bottleneck Analysis' on child detention in Zambia conducted by the Human Rights Commission, the Auditor General's Performance audit report for the years 2014-17 released in 2018 ¹ (the "Auditor General's Report"), the 2018 MCDSS Report on Children Deprived of Liberty in Detention and Correctional Facilities in Zambia released in 2018.			

¹ Auditor General of the Republic of Zambia (2018) Performance Audit on the Juvenile Justice System in Zambia for the Period 2014 to 2017 (Unpublished).

At the heart of the international standards in the area of child offending is use of detention and deprivation of liberty as last resort. This applies to pre-trial detention in police stations and prisons as well as custodial sentencing in prisons and reformatory schools. Other international standards in the area include the age of criminal responsibility, which is 14 years, diverting children away from judicial systems at pre-trial stage as well as use of alternative, meaning non-custodial, sentencing – for those child offenders that were trialed.

The age of criminal responsibility in Zambia is 8 years which is one of the youngest in the world.

National data systems on the number of children in detention (pre-trial detention or custodial sentencing) do not exist and data can usually be obtained only for some institutions and not others – at any given time (e.g. police stations, reformatory schools and juveniles in prison). Nevertheless, monitoring missions and reports (listed above) have consistently drawn attention to the over-use of detention for even minor crimes. They have also drawn attention to the prolonged periods of time alleged child offenders have spent in pre-trial detention.

The UNICEF Global Child Protection Strategy and the UNICEF Zambia Country Programme have prioritized the introduction of diversionary schemes for child offenders. This includes diverting a case of child offending at the level of the police (or later by prosecution or judge) away from criminal proceedings and back into the social welfare system. A child can be diverted into a rehabilitative community-based programme that focuses on restorative justice or reintegration of the child into the community. The negative impact of detention has been well documented in literature from a whole range of countries. Detention puts a child's wellbeing at risk and increases risk to diseases due to overcrowded facilities. Children that go through the justice system experience fear and trauma and face stigma, which can cause life-long mental health consequences. As such, the personal cost of detention to the children is immeasurable in terms of the destructive impact on their development, and on their ability to lead healthy and constructive lives in their societies. The associated financial costs to governments can also have a negative impact on national budgets/expenditures and can become a financial drain. Furthermore, detention has little inherent re-integrative and rehabilitative value. The CRC obliges States to develop procedures that allow children to be dealt with without resorting to judicial proceedings or trial wherever appropriate and desirable.

In view of the foregoing, the rationale of the National Diversion Framework (NDF)² is to support juvenile justice stakeholders focus on reforming the system not to be punitive but to divert children back into social welfare system and offer supervision, treatment and rehabilitative services. The NDF is expected to implement the provision of Article 2 of the Convention on the Right of Child (CRC, 1989), that articulates that detention of juveniles should always be the last resort and only for the shortest period of time. The NDF has been developed to harness referrals and cooperation between social workers, law enforcement officers, prosecutors, courts and NGOs in the child justice system. Further, it is envisaged that the NDF has strengthened the involvement of all stakeholders in the child justice system and thereby enhanced their capacity to utilise non-custodial measures such as community-based services as alternative to detention, prosecution and custodial sentences, with child rights respected and protected, in line with international standards.

In the most general terms, the object of this evaluation is to what extent has UNICEF made progress in preventing detention of children and introducing diversions and diversionary schemes in Zambia.

UNICEF has been working closely with key government counterparts on introducing diversion since 2017. Following the adoption of the NDF in 2018, followed by the Multi-sectoral Training Manual on diversion and the Operational Manual for Diversion Service Providers, the M&E Framework was put in place in 2019 and guided the training of stakeholders that took place the same year. Further, UNICEF supported MCDSS to develop a National Communication Strategy on diversion (2020) which is an essential tool to raise awareness and understanding of the diversion programme or use of non-custodial measures in general for children in conflict with the law. It is assumed that improving communication of the key

² <https://www.unicef.org/zambia/reports/juvenile-justice-national-diversion-framework-2018>

messages and content of the NFD to relevant stakeholders on the benefits of diversion will lead to institutions' and the community's ability to adapt to new practices and have diversion meaningfully implemented throughout the country. Emphasis on 2020 was on monitoring and supportive supervision, strengthening data and reporting as well as strengthening the role of NGOs in advocacy against detention and use of diversions and other alternatives. This was enabled through introducing an NGO – UpZambia – into the partnership. Emphasis in 2021 will also be on roll-out of the communications plan. Stakeholders: The key stakeholders at both national and district levels are: Ministry of Community Development and Social Services (guardians of protection of rights of juvenile offenders, responsible for coordination diversions and implementing probation), Zambia Police and Drug Enforcement Commission (organs of the Ministry of Home Affairs interacting with child offenders, diverting cases or processing cases to prosecution), the National Prosecution Authority and Judiciary. In addition, Ministry of Youth Sports and Child Development play a key role in defining child policy and advocating for child rights. Non-government organizations play a key role in providing services for child offenders, be it as diversionary schemes, as free legal aid or as advocates on individual cases or advocates for juvenile justice reform more broadly. All the above stipulated actors are represented in the Child Justice Forum which is based in the Judiciary and has a key coordination role to play in the area of child offending.

Geographical Scope: The geographical scope of this evaluation includes the efforts invested at national level to provide an appropriate framework for preventing detention and applying diversion as well as the piloting in four districts and these include: Lusaka, Kapiri-Mposhi, Ndola and Kitwe.

The most common type of crimes committed by juvenile offenders is petty theft. However, each pilot district faces a range of local crime problems that emerge in response to the local economy and local social dynamics. These vary across communities and locations within each district. For example, Kitwe is struggling with youth gang related crimes; Kapiri-Mposhi with property (theft) and personal violent crimes (assault); whilst drug crimes and sexual related offences cut across all the four districts. Though no research is available to show causal factors for such child crimes, there are strong indications that these are linked to poverty, youth unemployment, school drop-out, technology (cybercrimes), poor parenting and children transitioning to adulthood, and testing boundaries and experimenting as part of this process.

Data on child offenders and the use of detention is partial at best and is not collected and analyzed in a systematic manner with regular intervals. Data from different sources at district level does not necessarily add up and national data is not available as regular collation and publication of such data does not take place. Data from the comprehensive monitoring of the Ministry of Community Development and Social Services conducted in 2018³, from NGO monitoring and from join UNICEF and government monitoring missions shows that juvenile offending is most prominent in the Lusaka and Copperbelt provinces (which are the geographical regions with greatest disparities) and that the vast majority of offences are committed by boys. Data sets from monitoring missions and NGOs will be made available to the consultant implementing the evaluation. Statistics from the pilot districts have not been consistent and Covid-19 although it has disrupted implementation of diversion, including mediation, conflict resolution and activities supporting children to be reintegrated back into the community, it also led to a reduction in pre-trial detention in the Lusaka Province (due to efforts to reduce congestion). Data from 2020⁴ show that out of 800 arrests in pilot districts, 113 were diverted (104 boys and 9 girls) and 195 alternative measures (180 boys and 15 girls) were applied. This is an 14% of application of pre-trial diversion and a 24,4% application of non-custodial sentencing. Unfortunately, comparative data from other districts is not available and neither is comparative data from previous years.

A total of USD 500 000 have been invested in child justice reform over the time-period stipulated.

³ This unpublished report submitted to UNICEF will be made available for the evaluation.

⁴ Extracted from monitoring reports

Theory of Change: the programme intervention was not guided by a developed Theory of Change. For this reason, the consultant will be reconstructing a Theory of Change with UNICEF and the Child Justice Forum - retro-actively (more detail in stipulated tasks consultant needs to undertake).

2. THE PURPOSE of the EVALUATION

The purpose of this evaluation is to contribute to the advancement of child justice reforms in the direction of limiting the use of detention against child offenders and advancing the use of diversion.

The main users of the evaluation are those actors of government that engage with juvenile offenders and are responsible for implementing responsive measures. The evaluation will provide recommendations for advancing policy and practice in juvenile justice reform. More specifically, the envisaged users of the evaluation are:

- 1) The Ministry of Community Development and Social Services, who are responsible for the welfare of all children, including child offenders. The social welfare officers are a key actor in referral of child offenders to community programmes as part of the process of implementing diversions.
- 2) The Ministry of Youth, Sport and Child Development, which acts as the child rights custodian of the executive government and advances and coordination child policy, including for child offenders.
- 3) The Ministry of Home Affairs whose departments of Zambia Police and Drug Enforcement Commission can divert child offenders away from judicial processes and back into social welfare responses rather than applying detention.
- 4) The National Prosecution Authority and Judiciary who also play a key role in application of diversions and when it comes to the Judiciary also, the application of alternative sentencing.
- 5) The Non-government organizations who provide community services for youth, including child offenders or who provide free legal aid and advocate for individual child offenders who have been detained or part of a judicial process.
- 6) The NGO child rights networks and organizations who advocate for the advancement of child rights in Zambia
- 7) UNICEF, who will continue to work closely with all the above actors to advance the rights of child offenders, in particular as part of the new Country Programme which is to be defined in 2022
- 8) In addition to the duty bearers defined above, the evaluation will also benefit the rights holders. These are children who have engaged in offending or may be associated with offending and they can also provide useful insight in the evaluation process (defined in more detail later in ToR).

All the above actors can benefit from the knowledge that can be generated from an evaluation and recommendations on how they can better play their part in advancing child offenders, in particular as this relates to limiting detention and application of diversionary schemes. The Government is in the process of finalizing the Children's Code which will fully regulate this area of work.

3. Objectives

The main objective of this evaluation is to provide recommendations to the executive and judicial branches of government and UNICEF on how to better support prevention of detention and application of diversion for child offending in Zambia. UNICEF will continue to engage in supporting the government to prevent detention through application of diversion for juvenile offenders and this evaluation will assist the government and UNICEF in improving its approach in this endeavor. Hence this is a formative evaluation.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are to assess the programme's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability as these relate to advancing the rights of child offenders. The evaluation needs to pay special attention to whether progress made is equitable and accessible to different

categories of children (urban/rural, more/less educated) and whether it has benefited boys and girls differently.

4. THE SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

This evaluation will assess UNICEF and government efforts in two main areas:

- 1) Providing a national framework for implementation of diversions in Zambia (including the National Diversion Framework, the Operational and Capacity Building Plans) and contributing to advancing regulations in the area.
- 2) Piloting this national framework in four Districts (Lusaka, Ndola, Kitwe and KapiriMposhi).

5. Evaluation framework

The evaluation framework includes the evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability with proposed evaluation questions given in the table below. The justification for excluding the criteria of impact is also explained in the table below.

Evaluation criteria	Indicative evaluation questions
Relevance:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent did the programme design respond to the GRZ priorities in juvenile justice reform? • To what extent was the programme design relevant with respect to applying international child rights standards in juvenile justice reform? • To what extent did the programme design take into account differences related to boy and girl offenders, urban and rural settings and other equity related issues.
Effectiveness:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent did the programme contribute to defining a quality national framework for implementation of diversions? Was the process of development participatory? • To what extent did the programme develop quality tools for operationalization of the National Diversion Framework (guidelines, training packages, monitoring tools etc)? Was the process participatory? • To what extent has the piloting of diversionary measures contributed to reduction of detention and application of diversion for child offenders in four pilot districts. • Has the piloting of the diversion programme contributed to protection of the rights of child offenders and how? • Has the piloting of the diversion programme equally benefited boy and girl offenders and children from urban and rural settings? Are there any other equity issues that were not taken into account in the piloting of diversion? • To what extent did the piloting of diversions impact on drafting child rights regulations? • To what extent has the project improved data management related to juvenile offending? • To what extent has the pilot assisted in supporting adequate communications for development? • How has the Covid-19 pandemic influenced the response to child offending?
Efficiency:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well did the programme transform the available resources into intended outputs and results? • What were the most important cost drivers in the programme, and how were costs contained without compromising results?

Sustainability:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has the project been embedded in government systems of participating institutions? • To what extent was the project owned and led by the government? • What mechanisms (systems, financial, human resources, etc.) are in place and what are the gaps that need to be addressed, so as to secure the continuation of the programme beyond the pilot phase? • What are the barriers related to legal provisions limiting the implementation of diversions? • Is the programme ready for scale-up to new districts and what gaps need to be addressed before scaling up?
Impact:	<p>Due to limited resources, this evaluation will not assess the impact that application of diversionary measures had on child offenders. Given the wealth of research implemented in other countries, that looks at the negative consequences of detention on a child's mental health and on fueling recidivism, it is assumed that keeping children out of detention is also important for Zambia's children. In addition, an accompanying study seeking real-time feedback from child offenders during and after the judicial process, is being looked into as an opportunity – at a later date. This being a formative evaluation, it was not deemed as essential to include the criteria related to impact.</p>

6. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology consists of four components: 1) a desk review of regulatory framework, studies, programme products, monitoring reports and available data; 2) the completion of a survey through a questionnaire completed by key stakeholders at national level and from the 4 pilot districts; and 3) Focus groups and bi-lateral interviews with key informants.

1) The proposed documents for desk review include:

- International Human Rights Treaties and recommendations: UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child; UN General Comment No. 10 and No. 24; CRC Concluding Observations 2016 for Zambia; UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice (Beijing Rules), UN Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of their Liberty (Havana Rules) and the UN Guidelines for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency (Riyadh Rules).
- The 2015 'Bottleneck Analysis' on child detention in Zambia conducted by the Human Rights Commission, the Auditor General's Performance audit report for the years 2014-17 released in 2018⁵ (the "Auditor General's Report"), the 2018 MCDSS Report on Children Deprived of Liberty in Detention and Correctional Facilities in Zambia released in 2018.
- The relevant national regulations (Juvenile's Act, draft Children's Code, Penal Code, Criminal Procedure Code)
- The National Diversion Framework, Training Package and Operational Manual
- Programme Monitoring Reports
- UNICEF Country Programme Document;
- UNICEF Annual Workplan Plans

⁵ Auditor General of the Republic of Zambia (2018) Performance Audit on the Juvenile Justice System in Zambia for the Period 2014 to 2017 (Unpublished).

2) Online survey:

An online survey will be designed by the evaluation consultant and will be filled in by all key stakeholders listed under the Section 2 of this ToR entitled “Purpose”. The survey will be completed by representatives from each stakeholder from both HQ and district levels.

The draft survey questions need to take into account issues of child rights of juvenile offenders, how the programme may have differently impacted on boys and girls and what equity concerns remain (e.g. urban/rural divide, access to justice for specific groups of children such as migrant children or children with disability).

3) Focus groups and bilateral interviews:

The consultant is expected to have a meeting with all members of the Child Justice Forum, and these can be conducted as bilateral interviews, either online or in person. In addition, focus groups in each of the pilot districts are planned and these include with law enforcement authorities, social welfare, prosecution/judiciary, NGOs and children/youth that have interacted with the juvenile justice system as child offenders.

The guidelines for focus group discussions and bilateral interviews will be reviewed by UNICEF. The guidelines need to take into account issues of child rights of juvenile offenders, how the programme may have differently impacted on boys and girls and what equity concerns remain (e.g. urban/rural divide, access to justice for specific groups of children such as migrant children or children with disability).

Depending on the Covid-19 situation at the time of implementation, the consultant may need to resort to online meetings and focus groups. Such a decision will be decided together with UNICEF who will provide the necessary support for transitioning to an online modality of work.

7. ETHICAL CONSIDERATION

UNICEF has a set of ethical principles, and checklist regarding research and evaluations which must be upheld to and are provided on the following link:

https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/UNICEF_adapated_reporting_standards_updated_June_2017_FINAL.pdf The evaluator should clearly identify in the Inception Report, the potential ethical issues specific to this evaluation as well as the management of these issues.

Any interviews with juveniles under 18 would be conducted by the District Social Welfare Office who has a mandate for such interactions.

8. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The report is expected to make reference to and reflect UNICEF evaluation standards.

The recommended length of the final report is 40-60 pages.

The recommended contents are as follows:

- 1.1 Table of contents
- 1.2 Executive summary of main findings
- 1.3 Purpose of evaluation
- 1.4 Evaluation objectives
- 1.5 Findings and analysis be structured around issues and related findings/lessons learnt
Subsection should separately cover each of the evaluation aspects including the following: relevance, effectiveness, coherence, efficiency, impact, sustainability and equity
- 1.6 Conclusion
- 1.7 Recommendations
- 1.8 Lessons learned

2. List of stakeholders consulted, missions undertaken, data collection tools used, survey questionnaire, focus group and interview guidelines (annexed in full)

PROJECT Management

- The consultancy will be managed by the Section Chief, Planning Monitoring and Evaluation (PME).
- The quality assurance for the evaluation will be provided by the Evaluation Reference Group, UNICEF Research and Evaluation Committee (REC). Further, review will be provided by the Regional Office.
- On the side of the Government the quality assurance will be supported by the Ministry of Community Development and Social Services and the Child Justice Forum;

Child Safeguarding

Is this project/assignment considered as "[Elevated Risk Role](#)" from a child safeguarding perspective? (*Less than 2 hours and moderated through a 3rd party*)

☐ YES ☒ NO If YES, check all that apply:

Direct contact role ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, please indicate the number of hours/months of direct interpersonal contact with children, or work in their immediately physical proximity, with limited supervision by a more senior member of personnel:

Child data role ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, please indicate the number of hours/months of manipulating or transmitting personal-identifiable information of children (name, national ID, location data, photos):

More information is available in the [Child Safeguarding SharePoint](#) and [Child Safeguarding FAQs and Updates](#)

Budget Year: 2021	Requesting Section/Issuing Office: Child Protection/Lusaka-Zambia	Reasons why consultancy cannot be done by staff: Ethical grounds to allow independent knowledge generated by an independent expert. Further, an outsider can bring new and innovative ideas to the table and finally to avoid biasness.	
Included in Annual/Rolling Workplan: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No, please justify: Support MCDSS in implementing Diversion and alternatives to Deprivation of liberty for juvenile offenders.			
Consultant sourcing: <input type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> International <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Both Consultant selection method: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Competitive Selection (Roster) <input type="checkbox"/> Competitive Selection (Advertisement/Desk Review/Interview)		Request for: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New SSA – Individual Contract <input type="checkbox"/> Extension/ Amendment	
If Extension, Justification for extension: Not Applicable			
Supervisor: Zodwa Mthethwa	Start Date: 15-11-2021	End Date: 03-04-2022	Number of Days (working) 60 (4.5 months)
Work Assignment Overview			
Tasks/Milestone:	Deliverables/Outputs:	Timeline	Estimate Budget
1. Inception report	An inception report and desk review: A detailed work-plan for the evaluation. A draft survey Guideline for bilateral interviews Guidelines for focus group discussions Initial findings from the desk review	20 days	33%
2. Implement survey, focus groups and bilateral interviews; triangulate findings with desk review and prepare draft evaluation	Submission first draft evaluation report. Present a PPT slide deck presentation that summarizes the evaluation including introduction, methods, results conclusions/recommendations to key stakeholders.,	20 days	33%
3. Finalization of the report	Final report and Policy Briefs	20days	34%

Budget Year: 2021	Requesting Section/Issuing Office: Child Protection/Lusaka-Zambia	Reasons why consultancy cannot be done by staff: Ethical grounds to allow independent knowledge generated by an independent expert. Further, an outsider can bring new and innovative ideas to the table and finally to avoid biasness.	
Included in Annual/Rolling Workplan: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No, please justify: Support MCDSS in implementing Diversion and alternatives to Deprivation of liberty for juvenile offenders.			
Consultant sourcing: <input type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> International <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Both Consultant selection method: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Competitive Selection (Roster) <input type="checkbox"/> Competitive Selection (Advertisement/Desk Review/Interview)		Request for: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New SSA – Individual Contract <input type="checkbox"/> Extension/ Amendment	
If Extension, Justification for extension: Not Applicable			
Supervisor: Zodwa Mthethwa	Start Date: 15-11-2021	End Date: 03-04-2022	Number of Days (working) 60 (4.5 months)

Estimated Consultancy fee			
Travel International (if applicable)			
Travel Local (please include travel plan) (vehicles and fuel)			
DSA (if applicable) <i>Including costs of meetings (including missing lunch or lunch for participants where required), costs of focus groups and daily allowances.</i>	<i>Kapiri Mposhi, Ndola and Kitwe on applicable rate based on actual travel days</i>		
Total estimated consultancy costsⁱ			
Minimum Qualifications required: <input type="checkbox"/> Bachelors <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Masters <input type="checkbox"/> PhD <input type="checkbox"/> Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter Disciplines. Social Science, preferably in law, social/child welfare, social work or related technical field. 	Knowledge/Expertise/Skills required: Technical knowledge of theories, principles and methods in the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> child protection systems approach, improving justice for children, and in use of data and indicators in child protection. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10-15 years of relevant Zambian policies and legal framework of juvenile justice Excellent analytical and report writing skills as well as good negotiation and communication skills. Computer skills: Experience in Microsoft Word, Excel and Power Point 5-10 years of gender and children's rights Specific skills and knowledge required include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to effectively collaborate with stakeholders and rights-holders with different technical and sectoral backgrounds Fluency in written and spoken English Knowledge of local languages is an added advantage. 		
Administrative details: Visa assistance required: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation arranged by the office: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Home Based <input type="checkbox"/> Office Based: If office based, seating arrangement identified: <input type="checkbox"/> IT and Communication equipment required: <input type="checkbox"/> Internet access required: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Request Authorised by Section Head (PME):	Request Verified by HR:		

Approval of Deputy Representative Operations (if Operations)

Approval of Deputy Representative (if Programme)

Representative (in case of single sourcing/or if not listed in Annual Workplan/or for Sections reporting to the Rep)

ⁱ 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 or individual contract 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 and Individual Contractors. Consultants and individual contractors 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.